

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. LVI.

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

VOL. LVI.



LONDON:

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

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1924.

LONDON:
HARRISON AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY,
ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

PREFACE.

IN choosing a site for a Garden City special care is taken to test beforehand the quality and quantity of the available water-supply, inasmuch as the prosperity of any ordered settlement depends in a large degree upon the securing of favourable conditions in this vital particular.

In like manner, when estimating the prospects of the Christian faith, we are concerned, not merely with numerous Churches or a large body of Mission adherents, but also with the character of the instruction given forth from Universities, Colleges, Academies, and other centres of learning.

In days when the Early Church was being planted, the city which seemed most to correspond with modern centres of culture was Athens, where, as we know, the people were occupied with "nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing." In many quarters to-day, in like manner, the prevalent tendency is to seek after novelty—to advance theories which are interesting, ingenious and plausible, and to do so with but slight regard for such consequences as may follow upon the broadcasting of grievous errors or immature conclusions among those who are unable to judge of their truth and usefulness.

In circumstances such as those described the Victoria Institute aims at "proving all things" and "holding fast that which is good." If in papers read at its meetings novel and untried views are brought forward, an endeavour is made in subsequent discussion to put such views to the proof, so that mere guesses at truth may not be given forth without careful examination and the support of reason and judgment.

The Council of the Institute is ever mindful that, in the event of some measure of poison, moral or spiritual, reaching the stream of culture, those who attend the meetings, or who read the *Transactions*, should be warned against it, and, by means of an antidote simultaneously supplied, become protected from moral and spiritual injury.

The papers given in this volume cover a wide range of instruction and thought, and it is the confident hope of the Council that, as they are read in many lands, they may tend to stabilize Christian judgment and promote inquiry along lines that shall glorify God.

F. A. MOLONY, *Editor*,
On Behalf of the Council.

October, 1924.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1923	1
CASH STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR 1923	7
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 10TH, 1924 ...	9
EGYPT IN THE DAYS OF AKHENATEN AND TUTANKHAMEN. BY WILLIAM DALE, Esq., F.G.S., F.S.A.	11
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman	20
THE PROBLEM OF THE PENTATEUCH FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE ARCHAEOLOGIST. BY THE REV. PRESIDENT MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, U.S.A. ...	21
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Dr. J. W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Lieut.- Colonel Mackinlay, Mr. Theodore Roberts, and Mr. W. E. Leslie	34
<i>Communications</i> from Mr. G. A. Heath, Dr. A. T. Schofield, Dr. D. Anderson-Berry, the Rev. A. H. Finn	36
REFERENCE TO THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT, THE VERY REV. H. WACE, DEAN OF CANTERBURY	40
THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE BOOK OF JONAH (being the Gunning Prize Essay). BY EBENEZER J. SEWELL, Esq.	41
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. C. A. Carus-Wilson, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Mr. W. Hoste	81
<i>Communications</i> from Mr. E. Walter Maunder, Mr. A. Gregory Wilkinson, Dr. D. Anderson-Berry, Mr. G. A. King, the Rev. J. M. Turner, Rev. John Cairns, O.B.E., Mr. Albert Hiorth, C.E.	86
GEOLOGY AND ITS RELATION TO SCRIPTURE REVELATION. BY PROFESSOR GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A.	97
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. Theodore Roberts, Pastor W. Percival-Prescott	115
<i>Communications</i> from Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Mr. W. Hoste, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Rev. John Tuckwell, Mr. H. O. Weller	116

	PAGE
THE JOHANNINE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, M.A., D.D.	124
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Lieut.-Colonel Mackinlay, Mr. E. Walter Maunder, Mrs. Walter Maunder, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste	134
TELEPATHY. BY WILSON EDWARDS LESLIE, Esq.	141
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste	151
THE INFLUENCE OF JOHN CALVIN DOWN THE CENTURIES ON THE RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROTESTANT NATIONS	156
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. J. W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Lieut.-Colonel Mackinlay, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste, Dr. Alfred T. Schofield	178
THE MAKING OF MEN. BY ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.	183
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, Mr. Sidney Collett, the Rev. Charles Gardner, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Colonel Hans Hamilton, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Mrs. C. Agnes Boyd	199
DEUTERONOMY A MOSAIC BOOK. BY PROFESSOR EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A.	207
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Dr. M. Gaster, Mr. Sidney Collett, Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, Mr. Theodore Roberts	220
<i>Communications</i> from the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. A. Knox, D.D., Rev. Professor John R. Mackay, M.A., Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay	226
THE TRUE HARMONY OF MAN. BY COLONEL HARRY BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E.	232
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Major-General Sir George K. Scott-Moncrieff, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., Lieut.- Colonel G. Mackinlay, Dr. J. W. Thirtle, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Pastor W. Percival-Prescott, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. Sidney Collett	244
<i>Communications</i> from Dr. D. Anderson-Berry, Dr. A. T. Schofield, Mr. H. O. Weller	251
THE ANNUAL ADDRESS: THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERNISM. BY THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, B.A.	258
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Lieut.-Colonel Mackinlay, Mr. C. F. Hogg, Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, Pastor W. Percival- Prescott, Lieut.-Colonel Hope Biddulph, D.S.O.	272
<i>Communication</i> from Dr. Alfred T. Schofield	276
LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES	279

VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1923.

READ AT THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, MARCH 10TH, 1924.

1. *Progress of the Institute.*

The Council beg to present to the friends and supporters of the Institute their 55th Annual Report, and in doing so they are thankful to be able to give an encouraging account of the work, more so perhaps even than last year. The membership is increasing and the interest has been well sustained, as the numbers of those present at the reading of the papers and the character of the discussions testify. Some of the papers, such as those of the Rev. Charles Gardner, B.A., on the somewhat recondite subject of "Romance and Mysticism," and of the Rev. Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., on "Religious Controversy between Christians and Jews of To-day," attracted unusual attention, and the leave of the Council has been asked for the publishing of the last-named paper in separate form.

The Council greatly regret to have to refer to a heavy loss sustained by the Victoria Institute in the decease of its President, Dr. Wace, Dean of Canterbury. For very many years he had served the Institute as an active member of our Council, then as Vice-President, and lastly as President, on the death of the late Lord Halsbury, whom he succeeded. He passed away on January 9th, 1924, and was buried in Canterbury Cathedral, mourned by a large body of Christians throughout the world. He had long been a champion by voice and pen for the vital truths of Bible Christianity, so widely assailed to-day. He had contributed a number of papers to the Society, and was to have given the Presidential Address at our next Annual Meeting; but this was not to be. The problem of his successor is not an easy one, but is exercising the minds of the Council.

2. *Meetings.*

Eleven ordinary meetings were held during the year 1923. The papers were:—

"Romance and Mysticism," by the Rev. CHARLES GARDNER, B.A.

The Rev. Eric K. C. Hamilton, M.A., in the Chair.

“Is Inspiration a Quality of Holy Scripture?” by the Rev. WILFRID H. ISAACS, M.A.

Theodore Roberts, Esq., in the Chair.

“Three Peculiarities of the Pentateuch which show that the Higher Critical Theories of its Late Composition cannot be Reasonably Held,” by the Rev. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.

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

“The Forces Behind Spiritism,” by ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

Coulson Kernahan, Esq., in the Chair.

“Value and Purpose of the Study of Comparative Religion,” by the Rev. Prof. A. S. GEDEN, M.A., D.D.

George Anthony King, Esq., M.A., in the Chair.

“Relativity and Christian Philosophy,” by the Rev. J. J. B. COLES, M.A.

The Rev. Charles Gardner, B.A., in the Chair.

“Concerning Irrigation in Ancient and Modern Times, the Cultivation and Electrification of Palestine with the Mediterranean as the Source of Power,” by ALBERT HIORTH, Esq., C.E.

Major-General Sir George K. Scott-Moncrieff, K.C.B., in the Chair.

“Occultism: at the Bar of Philosophy and Religion,” by DAVID ANDERSON-BERRY, Esq., M.D., LL.D.

Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., in the Chair.

“Assyro-Babylonians and Hebrews—Likenesses and Contrasts,” by Prof. THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.

Lieut.-Col. G. Mackinlay in the Chair.

“Religious Controversy between Christians and Jews of To-day,” by the Rev. Canon A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.

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

The Annual Address: “The Two Sources of Knowledge—Science and Revelation,” by E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S.

The Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, in the Chair.

4. *Council and Officers.*

The following is the List of the Council and Officers for the year 1923:—

President.

The Very Rev. H. Wace, M.A., D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

Vice-Presidents.

Rev. Prebendary Fox, M.A.
Lieut.-Col. George Mackinlay, late R.A.
Alfred T. Schofield, Esq., M.D., *Chairman of Council.*

Council

(*In Order of Original Election.*)

Prof. T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S.	Alfred H. Burton, Esq., B.A., M.D., C.M.
Right Rev. Bishop J. E. C. Welldon, D.D.	Theodore Roberts, Esq.
Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S., F.R.A.S.	Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.
J. W. Thirtle, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.	Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A.
Alfred William Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M., <i>Deputy Chairman.</i>	W. Dale, Esq., F.S.A., F.G.S.
R. W. Dibdin, Esq., F.R.G.S.	D. Anderson-Berry, Esq., M.D., LL.D.
H. Lance Gray, Esq.	Major H. Pelham-Burn, late Rifle Brigade.
John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A.	George Anthony King, Esq., M.A.
William Hoste, Esq., B.A.	Lieut.-Col. Arthur H. D. Blach, late R.E.

Honorary Treasurer.

George Anthony King, Esq., M.A.

Honorary Editor of the Journal.

Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E.

Honorary Secretary, Papers Committee.

Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O.

Honorary Secretary.

William Hoste, Esq., B.A.

Auditor.

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

Secretary.

Mr. A. E. Montague.

5. *Election of Council and Officers.*

In accordance with the rules the following Members of the Council retire by rotation:—

The Rt. Rev. Bishop J. E. C. Welldon.
Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S.
John C. Dick, Esq., M.A.
D. Anderson-Berry, Esq., M.D., LL.D.

and all offer themselves and are nominated by the Council for re-election; also the Auditor, Mr. Luff-Smith, who, being eligible, offers himself for re-election.

The Council nominate as Vice-President, Prof. Edouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D., of Geneva University, and as a new member of Council, Wilson Edwards Leslie, Esq., whose election is recommended to the meeting for confirmation.

6. *Obituary.*

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

The Rev. Canon R. B. Girdlestone, M.A., a Vice-President, Sir Henry H. Howorth, K.C.I.E., F.R.S., a Vice-President, and Colonel C. W. R. St. John (Member of Council), Rev. Canon Berry, Miss M. Mackinlay, Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, D.D., J. Herbert Tritton, Esq., Sydney Gedge, Esq., Rev. C. F. Knight, M.A., Dr. Margaret L. A. Boileau, William E. Dyer, Esq., Thomas Fox, Esq., Joseph Howard, Esq., J.P., E. Walter Perkins, Esq., Rev. Andrew Craig Robinson, M.A., Mrs. F. W. de Shepherd, The Rt. Rev. D. S. Tuttle, Bishop of Missouri, the Rev. Prebendary Webb-Peploe, M.A., Mrs. J. H. C. Whipple.

7. *New Members and Associates.*

The following are the names of new Members and Associates elected up to the end of 1923 :—

MEMBERS.—William G. H. Cook, Esq., LL.D., M.Sc., Mrs. C. E. Cumming-Brown, W. H. Frizell, Esq., M.A., J.P., Benjamin I. Greenwood, Esq., George Andrew Heath, Esq., R. Percy Hodder-Williams, Esq., Mrs. R. Hodder-Williams, W. Hoste, Esq., B.A., Leonard W. Kern, Esq., Miss Hamilton Law, Victor G. Levett, Esq., the Rev. James M. Pollock, M.A., William Roger Rowlatt-Jones, Esq., Major Arthur F. Smith, D.S.O., M.C., Coldstream Guards, the Rev. Roland Audley Smith, M.A. (Life), Lieut.-Commander Victor L. Trumper, R.N.R. ret.

ASSOCIATES.—F. G. Adkins, Esq., George E. Ardill, Esq., George O'Brien Baker, Esq., Miss Emma M. Blackwood, Mrs. S. M. Blackwood, E. J. Cooper, Esq., Miss Marion A. F. Dashwood, the Rev. George Denyer, Dr. Rowland C. Edwards (Life), the Rev. W. M. Fouts, Th.D., Miss Elizabeth L. Goodchild, John C. Grocock, Esq., Colonel Frederick V. Jeffreys, Miss D. Johnston, Lionel E. Jose, Esq., the Rev. William V. Kelley, D.D., Prof. J. G. Machen (Life), Henry W. Mackintosh, Esq., M.A., M. E. Moore-Anderson, Esq., B.A., A.M.Inst.C.E., Delavan L. Pierson, Esq., F. W. Howard Piper, Esq., LL.B., Henry Proctor, Esq., F.R.S.L., M.R.A.S., the Rev. H. B. Richardson, the Rev. Jesse Sayer, B.D., the Rev. H. H. Skinner, M.A., Eric J. Starey, Esq., Miss Millicent Taylor, the Rev. W. F. Warren, D.D., Sydney E. Watson, Esq., C. E. Wellton, Esq., the Rev. Hugh W. White, D.D., the Rev. Prof. C. B. Williams, D.D., Frederick C. Wood, Esq., the Rev. Prof. J. B. Work, D.D., J. Inglis Wright, Esq., S. Hay-Wrightson, Esq., Mrs. Richard Young.

LIBRARY ASSOCIATES.—Drew Theological Seminary, U.S.A., Cleveland Public Library, U.S.A.

8. *Number of Members and Associates.*

The following statement shows the number of supporters of the Institute at the end of December, 1923 :—

Life Members	14
Annual Members	104
Life Associates	54
Annual Associates	277
Missionary Associates	18
Library Associates	30
				<hr/>
Total	497
				<hr/>

This shows a slight increase all along the line, except in the case of Life Associates, whose number is stationary. The aggregate increase on the year is 27 Members and Associates, which is quite encouraging. With a renewed effort this year we shall hope to be on a satisfactory basis.

9. *Special Donations.*

Anonymous (per Prof. T. G. Pinches), £100 ; R. E. W. Goodridge, Esq., £1 1s. ; J. Norman Holmes, Esq., £2 2s. ; F. T. Lewis, Esq., 18s. ; Charles H. F. Major, Esq., £5 ; Charles Miller, Esq., £1 1s. ; E. J. Sewell, Esq., £10 ; Miss C. Tindall, 10s. 6d. ; H. Temple Wills, Esq., M.A., B.Sc., £10 ; Dr. Louis E. Wood, £3 3s.

10. *Finance.*

We are glad to say that our financial position is gradually becoming more satisfactory. The efforts of the Council in exercising economy in the matter of printing are at last being crowned with success, and it is hoped that, with a further effort, the finances will be placed on a sound basis. This can only be by a sufficient increase in our membership. In the last two years this has increased by nearly 50. It is hoped that all supporters of the Society will do their best to invite their friends to come forward as candidates for election. It is also satisfactory to note that the above more satisfactory results has been obtained without any definite *appeal* to members for special contributions, though the Council are exceedingly grateful to those Members and Associates who have voluntarily sent in donations to the work and aided materially the finances of the Institute.

11. *The Gunning Prize.*

The triennial Gunning Prize of £40 fell to this year, and was offered to the best essay on "The Historical Value of the Book of Jonah."

Dr. J. W. Thirtle, Litt.D., Dr. T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., and the Rev. A. Finn, kindly undertook the somewhat onerous duties of judges. About forty essays were sent in. The successful essay proved to be by Mr. E. J. Sewell (late I.C.S.), a former Member of the Council of the Victoria Institute and late Hon. Secretary. The essay was read before the Institute on Monday, 21st January, with Dr. T. G. Pinches in the chair.

12. *In Conclusion.*

The Council feel encouraged by the testimonies that reach them from other lands of the high appreciation of the work of the Institute. Thus one who is taking a prominent part in the Antipodes in apologetic work, the Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A., of New Zealand, editor of the *Biblical Recorder*, writes: "It is a great joy to read the splendid papers in the volumes. I hope to be the means of adding publicity to the great work of the Institute in this new land."

It was felt by all who listened to the learned paper by the Rev. Andrew Craig Robinson, M.A., who has already given us other papers, whose death we all deplored, on the "Peculiarities of the Pentateuch" as disproving the higher critical theories, as to the late date of the Mosaic books, was a contribution to the problems of the Pentateuch which demands serious consideration from those who follow Wellhausen. It is to be regretted that no one of this school was present to defend their point of view and refute the arguments of the learned lecturer. Silence in presence of arguments, though not always giving consent, is sometimes an eloquent testimony to their validity. The Council are of opinion that the production of such papers year by year, by men of cultured mind and sound judgment, is doing a much needed work of positive edification of the faith in these days of unsettlement and destructive criticism.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, M.D.,
Chairman.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

OF THE

VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MARCH 10TH, 1924, AT
3.45 P.M.

ALFRED W. OKE, ESQ., B.A., LL.M., VICE-CHAIRMAN OF
COUNCIL, TOOK THE CHAIR.

After the notice convening the Meeting had been read, the Minutes of the previous Business Meeting were read and signed.

The CHAIRMAN called on Mr. E. Luff-Smith, the Auditor, to make a few remarks on the financial position of the Society.

It was moved by Mr. W. HOSTE and seconded by Lieut.-Colonel MOLONY, O.B.E. :

“That the Right Rev. Bishop Welldon, Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S., John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A., D. Anderson-Berry, Esq., M.D., LL.D., retiring Members of Council, be re-elected, and that Wilson Edwards Leslie, Esq., be elected on the Council, and Prof. E. Naville, D.C.L., of Geneva, be elected a Vice-President, and also that Mr. E. Luff-Smith, incorporated accountant, be re-elected as Auditor at a fee of three guineas.”

This was passed unanimously.

It was moved by Pastor H. A. HALL and seconded by the Rev. JAMES M. POLLOCK, M.A. :

“That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1923 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."

It was moved by Mr. H. LANCE-GRAY and seconded by Mr. W. H. FRIZELL, M.A., J.P.:

"That the cordial thanks of this Meeting be passed to Mr. A. W. Oke for his efficient and expeditious presidency at the Meeting."

This was also passed unanimously.

The Meeting was then declared closed.

658TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 10TH, 1923,
AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL G. MACKINLAY, IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the Hon. Secretary announced the following Elections:—As Associates: Mrs. S. M. Blackwood, E. J. Cooper, Esq., Miss Millicent Taylor, and Frederick C. Wood, Esq. As Library Associate, Cleveland Public Library, U.S.A.

The CHAIRMAN introduced the lecturer as a well-known archæologist, a Member of our Council, and one who had already helped the Victoria Institute by reading two or three valuable papers before the Members. One of them was of special interest, on the "Christian Roman Remains in England," and it attracted much attention.

EGYPT IN THE DAYS OF AKHENATEN AND TUT- ANKHAMEN. By WILLIAM DALE, Esq., F.G.S., F.S.A.

*(Illustrated by special lantern slides kindly lent by a well-known
Egyptian explorer.)*

THE discovery by the late Earl of Carnarvon of the last resting place of Tutankhamen has created an interest which has been world-wide. This interest has, undoubtedly been largely increased by the fact that we have hitherto known but little of this shadowy king and further, that the XVIIIth dynasty of Egyptian rulers among whom he figures was a period of the greatest interest in the long life of that country, the golden age of Egypt. Moreover, though there is much difference of opinion concerning the chronology of Egypt before this epoch, yet up to the time of the XVIIIth dynasty we are on safe ground and are able to correlate it with some of the events recorded in the Bible, the stories familiar to us from childhood, charming in their simplicity, too faithful to human nature not to be true.

It has been my privilege during the past season to deal with this subject as occasional guide lecturer at the British Museum, and I have been both pleased and surprised to find among the very mixed crowds with which I have had to deal that the one

question that has been uppermost is, "What connection has this discovery with Bible history? What can we learn from it?" So it is in this spirit I approach the subject on the present occasion and feel I need make no apology for so doing as it is not a feature usually dwelt upon by those who have lectured on the subject. I am well aware my remarks may provoke criticism and controversy among the distinguished Orientalists we number amongst our ranks. But I ask for the forbearance of such. I am not an Egyptologist nor one versed in Oriental lore. I wish simply to impart to you the same pleasure the subject has given me and that you may gain instruction and help by looking at the whole story with the eyes of those who believe in the historicity of the Bible and appreciate its spiritual lessons. The chronology I adopt, and to which I adhere, is that of Professor Breasted. It is that which has been adopted by the appointed Guide Lecturers at the British Museum and commends itself to me as that most likely to be true.

First of all permit me to remind you briefly of the nature of the discovery which has awakened so much interest. In that part of the Nile Valley known as the Valley of the Kings is a wonderful series of tombs which are the last resting places of Egypt's great ones. A belief in a future life and a more perfect state of existence held a foremost place in their religion. To this end care was taken to preserve the natural body under the belief that in the underworld the various parts, split up by death, would be re-united, and the body revived. But the journey thence was long and its various stages marked by delay. The present life to them was but a sojourn. The tomb was the house of the soul. Food was placed in it, and magical figures in great number. Accompanying the mummy there was also a guide book of the underworld known as the "Book of the Dead," in which every incident was depicted that would take place in the spirit world, including the time when, before the judgment seat of Osiris, the heart of the departed was weighed in the sacred balance which determined the hereafter. Behind the throne of this dread God sat the hideous tripartite monster whose office it was to devour the soul of the condemned one who was weighed in the balance and found wanting. It is in this valley that a series of death chambers has been found, provided for, and inscribed with the name of Tutankhamen who died about the year 1360 B.C. The first chamber was filled with furniture and other objects, jewellery, clothing, offerings of food and flowers,

some of them of great beauty, much of which material still awaits examination. Statues to represent his Ka or spirit form were also there. The second chamber was almost filled with a marvellous tabernacle or shrine in which is either the mummy itself or the canopic jars containing such parts of the body as were removed in the process of embalmment. The third chamber, not yet opened, we trust may reveal more information concerning an interesting personality of whom we have at present but meagre knowledge. The chambers already opened had previously been entered and spoiled by robbers in dynastic times in search of gold and other portable wealth. What remained was, however, of surpassing interest. The furniture with which the first chamber was closely packed astonishes us by its beauty and is a revelation of the great pitch of excellence in art and of the wealth which marked the XVIIIth dynasty and was but just passing away in the days of Tutankhamen. No other discovery in Egypt has given us so complete a picture of the domestic life of its great and noble lords.

At this stage I will trouble you with a few particulars of the XVIIIth dynasty which began with Ahmes I, about the year 1580 B.C. It was he who drove from Egypt the Semitic rulers known as the Shepherd Kings under whom Jacob went down to Egypt and Joseph rose to eminence. This was the new dynasty which "knew not Joseph."

Some eighty years after Ahmes I, Thothmes I sat on the throne. He had two daughters, one known by the name of Hatshepset who at one time bore absolute rule and became one of the most famous women monarchs that ever sat upon a throne. Of her more anon. Another who added glory to the dynasty was Thothmes III, a great builder, a successful warrior, and one who amassed such wealth for the country as to make his dynasty the golden age of Egypt. Two of the great obelisks he erected now stand in English-speaking lands and look across the Atlantic at each other, the one in New York City, the other on the Thames Embankment. Two hundred years after the days of this king there passed away Amenhotep III with whom the power and prestige of the country declined. The heretic King Akhenaten began to rule and brought political disaster on Egypt. He was succeeded by Tutankhamen whose last resting place has just been found.

Who was Tutankhamen? We do not know. Perhaps he was not of Royal blood but only obtained the throne because he

married the third daughter of Akhenaten, the heretic king, and bore rule when the kingdom was falling to pieces. Of Akhenaten we do know more, and the story, wrapped as it is in mystery, clothed with details giving full play to the imagination, makes him one of the most fascinating personalities of the old world. His mother was the great Queen Thi, wife of Amenhotep III, a Mittanian princess, beautiful and intelligent. His wife was Nefertiti, who also appears to have been not of Egyptian origin. Her portrait bust, discovered at Akhenaten's own city and, unfortunately, now at Berlin, shows her to have been singularly beautiful. Concerning the bust itself, Professor Peet has said that no age or country has ever produced a finer work of art.

Akhenaten is known as the heretic king because he broke away from the old religion of Egypt with its 2,000 deities and its powerful hierarchy of priests. To escape them he left Thebes and founded a new city nearly 300 miles away, which he planned himself, fixed its boundaries, hewed out chambers in the rock, built a palace for himself and made a temple for the God that he worshipped, Aten, the Sun God. This city was never finished. Here I quote from an article which appeared in the "Times": "Physically a weakling, almost deformed, gentle hearted, devoted to his wife and family, a lover of all created things, a poet and a dreamer, he deserted the religion of his Fathers, dethroned the great God Amen and all the Pantheon, and in their stead set up the worship of the one God Aten, beneficial and omnipresent. For the purposes of worship, Aten was personified by the Sun, but the king himself struggled to make it plain that the true Deity was not the sun itself, but the vital force residing in the Sun's creative warmth, and it is difficult not to believe that he himself saw further than this. In elaborating the new religion he built up the fabric of a faith which in many things foreshadowed Christianity with extraordinary closeness. In its entirety Aten worship was infinitely more beautiful and spiritual than any religion held by man of which we have knowledge at so early a date. He lived in his new capital engrossed in religion, and under him grew up a new school of art to which we owe the incomparable beauty of the objects discovered in the tomb of Tutankhamen." The article from which I quote concludes with the following words: "The gentleness of Akhenaten spelt wreckage. He left no son. Eight years of chaos followed, in which the names of three usurpers appear, one of whom was he whose tomb has just been discovered, of whom all we know is

that he undid the work of Akhenaten, destroyed the pure worship he had set up and reverted to the old religion of Amen, dominated by a powerful and numerous priestly caste."

Tutankhamen's motive in thus acting may have been to spare the country from political ruin and to restore it to somewhat of its former power and glory.

The task of equating the period in question with the events recorded in Exodus is not an easy one. It is universally acknowledged that the entry of Joseph and Jacob into Egypt took place during the reign of the Shepherd Kings and the date of 1580 B.C. for the accession of Ahmes I, who expelled these rulers, is not contraverted. More difficulty arises in fixing the date of the Exodus, and opinions on this point are divided fairly equally. By many the Pharaoh of the oppression is considered to be Rameses II and the Pharaoh of the Exodus Meneptah, in the second year of whose reign, 1233 B.C., the event is said to have taken place. If we accept this, we remove the occurrence into the next, or XIXth dynasty, and are far away from the days of Akhenaten and Tutankhamen.

The difficulty of fixing the date of the Exodus arises from the uncertainty which hangs round the duration of the period of the sojourning of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt. In Exodus xii, 40, we are told that the "sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was 430 years." The Septuagint and the Samaritan versions add "and in the land of Canaan." The two versions differ as to the position of this insertion and by many it is considered as a gloss. If, however, we accept this explanation and give a total of about 200 years for the lives of the patriarchs we can shorten the sojourn by half. Again, in Genesis xv, 13, 16, we read, and the passage is quoted by Stephen in his address to the Sanhedrim, "Thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them and they shall afflict them 400 years, and in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." This passage may surely be dismissed from the reckoning as affording a date for the Exodus. As the Rev. I. S. Griffiths points out,* it is manifestly contradictory. A generation is not of a hundred years' duration. The figures have evidently been misread in transcribing and the passage may be fairly paraphrased, "They shall be slaves for a period of years and in the fourth generation they shall return." And now as to

* "The Exodus in the light of archæology."

an alternative date. In the 1st Kings vi, 1, we find the statement that the period from the Exodus to the building of the temple in the 4th year of Solomon was 480 years. Without much difficulty the 4th year of King Solomon can be fixed at 966 B.C. Counting back 480 years we come to the reign of Amenhotep II, the successor of the great warrior King Thothmes III, and the date 1446 B.C. It is argued by some that the number 480 is of an artificial character, 40 multiplied by 12 and, therefore is used, as in some other cases, not as an arithmetical expression but as a vague statement of number. Those who criticise the statement, however, point out that in Chron. v, 3, 8, twelve generations are recorded as having elapsed between the Exodus and foundation of the temple. The twelve generations may be accepted as historical, but in order to bring the Exodus into the days of Meneptah it is necessary to estimate a generation as twenty-two years, not forty. The earlier date is accepted for the purposes of this Essay and thus the departure of Israel is brought into the XVIIIth dynasty and before the days of Akhenaten and Tutankhamen. There is yet a third possible date for the Exodus, which is very fascinating, favoured by the well-known Egyptologist, Mr. Arthur Weigall, in an interesting article on Tutankhamen in the "Empire Review" for May last. In the passage from Chronicles just referred to, if we estimate the twelve generations at less than forty for each or at about three to a century, we are brought to a date between 1360 and 1330 B.C. and to the days of Tutankhamen. Admitting this interpretation, Mr. Weigall supposes Moses to have been born in the reign of Amanhotep III, that he fled to Midian in the reign of Akhenaten, that Akhenaten's death is referred to in Exodus ii, 23. "It came to pass in process of time, the King of Egypt died" and that Tutankhamen was the Pharaoh under whom Moses returned to Egypt and organised the exodus of his enslaved countrymen. The arguments by which Mr. Weigall supports his theory are reasonable but not convincing.

I have briefly stated the reasons for placing the Exodus in the reign of Amenhotep II and for accepting the date of 1446 B.C. We are attracted to this view because it enables us to place the birth and education of Moses in that period which we know now, more than ever we knew before, represents the highest period of Egypt's culture and refinement and the highest pitch she attained in the development of art. Moreover, we can best realise, as we contemplate the enormous wealth of the country, how when

Israel departed, they went not empty-handed but took from those with whom they sojourned, jewels of gold and silver and spoiled the Egyptians. As we look into the open tomb of Tutankhamen and behold its treasures, despoiled and robbed though they were in dynastic times, the words of Holy Writ come home to us with peculiar force: "By faith Moses when he was come to years refused to be called the Son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of Sin for a season, esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt, for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward."

Who was Pharaoh's daughter who saw, among the paper reeds of the Nile's brink, the cot which contained Israel's future lawgiver? It is satisfactory to know that if we accept the chronology we have adopted it was Queen Hatshepsut, daughter of Thothmes I, married to her half-brother; reigning apparently at one time by herself and in part with Thothmes III she figured as one of the most remarkable queens of history. The record of her life and talents, her learning and prowess, makes it possible for us to say that no better woman could in the order of God's providence have been chosen to make Moses "Learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and mighty in word and in deed." The temple at Der-al-Bahri remains as a monument of her genius, and still standing at Karnak is one of the magnificent obelisks she erected, a monolith 97 feet high and weighing 350 tons. Equally interesting it is to speculate as to where Akhenaten, the heretic king, acquired the wonderful religion he practised. We cannot admit the possibility that it was evolved out of his own consciousness. He has been called a man a thousand years before his time. The worship he set up and strove to maintain was really monotheistic. Nearly half a century had elapsed since the departure of Israel and any attempt to connect his belief with their sojourn cannot be very successful. Yet surely in some way we are tempted to associate the two and to picture to ourselves the poet king, the dreamer and the visionary living in his own capital, far away from the old worship he had set at nought, inheriting in part the great religious truths made known to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and practised by the race when they sojourned in Egypt. Among the literary remains of Akhenaten is a Nature poem, which Professor Breasted prints with parallel passages from the 104th Psalm. The mother of Akhenaten, as we have said, was Queen Thi, wife of Amenhotep III,

a Mittanian princess, beautiful and learned. His wife was Nefertiti who, if we may judge from her portrait bust, was also not an Egyptian. In the paintings that adorn the walls of Akhenaten's own palace, these two women figure largely and may have shared his religious views and perhaps in some way was responsible for them.

Passing to Tutankhamen, the one act by which he is known is the restoration by him of the Old Amen worship and the reinstatement of the powerful priestly machinery which ruled and engineered it. At this religion we may afford to give a glance. To describe it would require a more capable pen than mine. It is fairly well summarised by the apostle Paul when he speaks in the Epistle to the Romans of those who "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man and to birds and four-footed creatures and creeping things." Dominated by magic the priestly caste held the keys of death and of the hereafter. In the tomb of Princess Set Hathor, Petrie found an alabaster vase on which was an inscription that the priests had endowed it with magical powers and anything the Princess required in the tomb or the underworld if she put her hand in the vase she would find it there. Let me on this subject quote Professor Breasted*: "This magic which the priests were supposed to work ruled everything in the after life which in most respects was a reflection of the present. Lentils and wheat grew in the fields of Yaru but the Lords of the empire escaped all personal labour in the happy fields. Ushebti figures, inscribed with a potent charm, performed these duties for them. These figures were placed in the tombs by scores and hundreds. This means of obtaining material good was transferred to the moral world to secure exemption from the consequences of an evil life. A sacred beetle, cut from stone and inscribed with a charm beginning with the words, 'Oh, my heart, rise not up against me as a witness,' was laid on the breast of the mummy and was so powerful that when the guilty soul stands in the judgment hall in the awful presence of Osiris, the accusing voice of the heart is silenced and the great God does not perceive the evil. Likewise in the book of the dead, besides all the other charms, the welcome verdict of acquittal was sold by priestly scribes to any one with the means to buy. The purchaser's name was inserted in the blanks left for the purpose, securing to

* "History of Egypt," chap. xiii.

himself the certainty of such a verdict. However vicious a man's life may have been, exemption in the hereafter could be purchased at any time from the priest."

In all this we note that the poor and the common folk had no share. The most elaborate process of embalment cost about £250—of our money. For the poor there was no house of the dead, with its paintings, with its food, its magic charms and ushebti figures. The middle classes could only rent from the priests a great common tomb where the mummies were piled up like cordwood. The toiling millions could only bury their dead in the gravel and sand of the desert margin for the sun to mummify, looking longingly at the luxury enjoyed by the rich, sometimes with a touching pathos burying, at the door of some great man's tomb, a rude statuette of their lost one in the hope that he might gain a few crumbs from the rich man's mortuary table.

It would hardly be right for me to conclude this paper without stating that I am aware that a school of criticism exists which dismisses in a summary manner the Biblical events I have tried to correlate with the days of the XVIIIth dynasty. According to such the stories of the Pentateuch are not contemporary history and contain only a bare substratum of facts. The plagues of Egypt were only such visitations as that land is ordinarily subject to, magnified into miraculous proportions, together with all the other incidents of the sojourn in Egypt, to bring glory and prominence to the Hebrew race. Even the Exodus was only of minor importance but was swollen to the proportions in which it is recorded for the same purpose.

It is even stated that writing was not known in the time of Moses, ignoring altogether the evidence of the Tel el Amarna tablets and the Code of Hammurabi. So we are carried on many centuries until the return from the captivity for the compilation of the earlier books of the Bible and are asked to believe that as history they have but little more value than the traditional lore of other nations.

Professor Eric Peet, in his recently published book "Egypt and the Old Testament," says: "In other words our present Pentateuch was compiled not earlier than the fifth century B.C. and contains no material written down earlier than the ninth century except possibly certain laws and a few fragments such as the song of Deborah. It follows at once from this that practically the whole contents of these books as we have them

were written down only long after the times at which they were enacted."

It is satisfactory to know that Sir Flinders Petrie, reviewing this book in the October part of "Ancient Egypt," writes: "It is to be regretted that the valuable constructive work which the author wrote on Italy fourteen years ago has been succeeded by a devotion to the barren field of destructive criticism. This obsession of the Biblical critics depends on verbal questions rather than matters of fact and is too often accompanied by facile mis-statement. On page 98 the marriage of Joseph into the family of a priest of Ra, is 'a later colouring' because 'all we know of the Hyksos occupation of Egypt makes such an admission very difficult.' What we do know is that Apepa II favoured the Egyptian worship by making columns and gates of copper to adorn the temple of Bubastis. Priests were then by no means out of fashion. It is said that the Biblical narrative states that Pharaoh was drowned. No such statement appears in the narrative."

We cherish the hope that some day the records of this wonderful country will yield confirmation in an overwhelming manner to the Bible narratives. Meanwhile we hold fast to their historicity and value them for this as well as for the spiritual truths they convey.

DISCUSSION.

On the conclusion of the reading of the paper, the CHAIRMAN proposed a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Dale, which was heartily responded to, with applause.

The lights were then turned down, and Mr. DALE explained a large number of very interesting views of Egyptian excavations and objects of art; these attracted very much interest.

The CHAIRMAN again thanked Mr. Dale, and referring to the large numbers present, he mentioned how Mr. Dale had helped the Victoria Institute by taking a subject of present-day interest which had attracted such a large audience, who were evidently much interested. He also said what a very good beginning had been made in the programme of lectures for this session; he welcomed the many visitors who were present, and invited them to apply to become Members or Associates.

THE 659TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, JANUARY 7TH, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

JAMES W. THIRTLE, ESQ., LL.D., M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HONORARY SECRETARY announced the following elections:—

Life Associate: W. Wardle Sales, Esq. Associates: Mrs. Maude Stokes, R. G. Lundy, Esq., I.S.O., Miss Ellen Rouse, Rev. Lucy T. Ayres, Rev. Thomas Coyle, Rev. Stanley White, B.D., Rev. C. W. Norwood, B.D., Rev. G. W. Ridout, D.D., F.R.G.S., Rev. Charles Boutflower, M.A., and the Rev. Prof. J. H. Webster, D.D.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. President M. G. Kyle, D.D., LL.D., to read his paper on "The Problem of the Pentateuch from the Standpoint of the Archæologist."

*THE PROBLEM OF THE PENTATEUCH FROM THE
STANDPOINT OF THE ARCHÆOLOGIST.* By Presi-
dent MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological
Seminary, St. Louis, U.S.A.

ANY adequate consideration of the problem of the Pentateuch must do two things, must define the exact limits of the problem and must present a satisfactory solution of the problem. The old law of rhetoric that the first step in argument is to define the terms has never been abrogated, though it has fallen too much into desuetude. Much waste energy of controversy over the problem of the Pentateuch and other Biblical problems of to-day is due to the fact that the disputants are not disputing about exactly the same things. So, exact definition of the limits of the problem of the Pentateuch is a necessary preliminary to its adequate consideration.

Then, any consideration of the problem of the Pentateuch that falls short of a satisfactory solution of the problem does not get us on very far. Controversial literature has its uses, but they are rather limited in scope; limited defence operations that protect one's own position, and offensive operations that meet the enemy and perhaps vanquish him, but both fall short of any work of reconstruction. A life of controversy, merely

slaying giants, may leave the victor master of the field, but with the original problem over which the conflict was raged still unsolved. The archæologist is a man ever seeking, not simply to discuss problems nor to vanquish opponents, but to solve problems. And so the consideration of the problem of the Pentateuch from the standpoint of the archæologist must find a satisfactory solution of the problem.

I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM.

The standpoint of the archæologist before a problem is that of the diagnostician; he takes things exactly as he finds them and studies the case as it presents itself to him, especially in all its peculiarities. He analyses and classifies, and then, when the induction and classification is complete, draws his conclusion from the facts and finds no greater value in the conclusion than is shown in the evidence. If there be striking and puzzling peculiarities in the ruin—there a tower, here a pit, and yonder a beautiful decoration—he notes these at the outset, that he may take them especially into account in the induction and classification.

So the problem of the Pentateuch from the standpoint of the archæologist is the problem of the Pentateuch *as it is*, especially the problem presented by its striking and puzzling peculiarities. The Pentateuch is a part of the literary remains of antiquity, and, according to archæological methods, these remains must be viewed, as they now are, in the form in which they have come to us. The archæologist always reverses the historical method: he begins his work at the top of the mound, the surface, and goes down to the bottom; he begins at the present goal which history has reached and traces the history back over the course to its starting-point. Thus, he accepts the Pentateuchal literature as a finished product; analyses and classifies its elements, and from these elements and their inter-relation attempts to learn how the literature came into its present form.

Most of the controversy over the problem of the Pentateuch has been concerning its authorship and the time and method of its composition. These things are very important; it may, perhaps, be conceded that they are most important, but it does not follow from this that the immediate consideration of them is the best way to seek the solution of the problem of the Penta-

teuch. The porch is not the most important part of a house, but it is the most convenient way of approach to enter and examine the house. So, some questions other than of authorship and time of composition may afford us a better, and more convenient, form of approach to enter into a solution of the problem of the Pentateuch. And these other questions are concerning just those puzzling peculiarities of the Pentateuch which stand out when, from the standpoint of the archæologists, we pause before these remains of the literature of antiquity *as it is*.

In the Pentateuch we have an interesting narrative and a most remarkable collection of laws, and, strange to say, the narrative and the laws are mingled together; in fact, the laws are inserted in the narrative in such fashion that they might be entirely lifted out and the story itself would suffer no break. That is a peculiar arrangement; laws and narrative are not usually so mingled together. Then the laws are fragmentary; there are some large groups and many small groups, and little fragments of law turning up most unexpectedly in the midst of the story at any point. Some of the laws, also, are repeated and inserted at different places, both among the laws and in the course of the narrative. Sometimes the repetition is in about the same words, and sometimes it is considerably altered. The laws also themselves seem at times indiscriminately mixed; a law assessing the penalty of criminal conduct comes in the midst of ritual directions for worship, or a rubric is found in the midst of criminal laws. Where else in all literature do we find laws mingled together in such fashion?

The style also is very different in different parts of the Pentateuch. Some have made much of this fact and deduced from it alone the solution of the whole problem, and others have strangely resented the very suggestion of different styles. But certainly no one can read the Ten Commandments and the list of judgments following, so judicial and sententious, then read the most verbose directions for the detection of leprosy and, last of all, the incitement to patriotism in the speeches of Deuteronomy, and say that they are all in the same style! We cannot help exclaiming here that they *ought not to be in the same style*, even though from the same author; but it is the fact only that we need to notice now.

Last of all, there are historical peculiarities, not to say difficulties, that attract attention and demand explanation. It

would not be possible, as it will not be found necessary, in this study to enter upon a detailed discussion of all these peculiarities. But the enumeration of the puzzling peculiarities of the Pentateuch would not be complete at this point without taking note of these historical difficulties.

Now, the problem of the Pentateuch from the standpoint of the archæologist is this Pentateuch *as it is to-day*, with all its puzzling peculiarities. How did it get into this form? The Pentateuchal question is thus not primarily when? or where? or by whom? but why? and how? Approaching this subject with these questions, we shall, perhaps, find at last the answer to when? and where? and by whom?

II. THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

The solution of the problem of the Pentateuch from the standpoint of the archæologist begins, not with theory at all, but with facts found, sorted out, and classified. Then, from the closest scrutiny of these facts we will learn their significance. The result of our investigation will thus be a conclusion drawn from facts. The only theory the archæological method knows is theory which is the result of research, not mere hypothesis, theory that is but the instrument of research.

(1) The solution of the problem of the Pentateuch now to be presented arises from a strict application of this archæological method to the peculiarities of the law as literary remains of antiquity. This solution appeared in the course of an original analysis of the materials of the books of the law for classes in Biblical Theology in Xenia Theological Seminary some years ago. The ultimate result was as unexpected and startling to the author as it may be to anyone who reads it.

A. In the course of the investigation it very soon appeared that there are general terms for law or laws—in fact, any kind of a law—and these are used throughout the books of the law. *Torah*, usually translated “law,” is so used 55 times; *Debarim*, “words,” 32 times; *Aduth*, “testimony,” 34 times; *Mitzoth*, “commandments,” a general term for any kind of a command of God, is so used 46 times. These most obvious facts do not advance the investigation very far; in fact, they do little more than furnish a background and basis of comparison for the discoveries which follow.

B. In marked contrast to these general terms for law of any kind, there were discovered certain technical terms for

specific kinds of laws, and these are clearly shown to be technical terms by their definitive meanings, their clear differentiation, and the exactly discriminating use made of them.

One of these is *Mishpatim*, usually translated "judgments," literally "judgings"—*i.e.*, decisions of judges which have been fixed by precedent and which, approved of God, were written down in the laws of Israel. These are laws concerning matters "one with another," as the Hebrew phrase is—things which were the subject of controversy between one person and another or between a person and the State. Thus, the "judgments" were civil and criminal laws, usually concerning things wrong in themselves, *Mala in se*, and always to be tried in the courts. The citation of a few judgments by name will make clear their distinctive character. Beginning in Exodus xxi, verse 1, we have: 2-6, manumission of servants and their families; 7-11, redemption of a maidservant; 12-14, homicide in different degrees; 15, assault on a parent; 16, kidnapping; 17, cursing of father and mother, etc.—to xxiii, 19. The judgments are invariably of this character. Wherever it is said, "These are the judgments," such laws and no other are found in the lists given.

Khuqquim, usually translated "statutes," denote a very different kind of laws. The word means "directions," from the gesture of throwing out the hand to give guidance to some one. The laws called "statutes" are exactly of this character: they are "directions" about things not right or wrong in themselves, *mala in se*, but only so because of the statutes, *mala prohibita*; not matters of controversy "one with another," but matters of mere direction by the statute, and that especially in the functions of religion. So these statutes were administered, not by the magistrates, but by the priests. A few of these may be cited also, to indicate clearly their character. Exodus, chapters xxv to xl, describe the tabernacle and give directions for its construction. In Leviticus i, 3-17, the Law of the Burned Offering; ii, 1-3, the Law of the Meat Offering; ii, 4-16, the Law of Oblations; iii, 1-17, Oblation of the Sacrifice of the Peace Offering; iv, 1-12, Law of Sin Offering of Ignorance, of the individual; iv, 13-21, Law of Sin Offering, of the whole congregation, etc., etc. Wherever this title "statutes" is given to a group of laws, such laws and no other are invariably found in that group.

C. A third technical term, *Mitzoth*, "Commandments," is used. In addition to its general use for any kind of command

of God, this word is also used in a technical sense to denote specifically the Decalogue. Its use in this technical sense is not very frequent, its general use for any kind of a law is very frequent. Thus, the technical use of the word is not so easily distinguished from the general use, and yet, upon a careful examination, this use is perfectly clear. When used in connection with "judgments" and "statutes" as titles for groups of laws, it is found to refer to the laws of the Decalogue. Thus, when so used as a title there will always be found some of these commandments in the list of laws so entitled. It is to be noted that absolute uniformity in use is not necessary in order that a term may be a technical term. There is only needed its prevailing use and its use in such connections as call for technical terms. Many of the technical terms of science and law to-day have also a common use, and so are not invariably used technically. Thus, the argument here from technical terms only requires that it be shown that these words have prevailingly a technical use, and not that there are no exceptions. It is, then, only the more interesting, not to say surprising, to find that there do not seem to be any exceptions whatever in the use of these technical terms, aside from what has been already noted, that *Mitsoth* has also a frequent use as a general term. Wherever it is said these are the "judgments" or "statutes," only "judgments" or "statutes" will be found in that list, and such will always be found in that list, but no commandments will be found there. If it is said these are the "judgments" and "commandments," or the "statutes" and "commandments," or "judgments and statutes and commandments," then in every case just those kinds of laws mentioned and no other will be found in that list. To such extremes of exactness is this use carried that certain circumlocutions are devised in order to designate peculiar laws. A special law concerning the establishment of some new "judgment," as in the case of the inheritance of Zelophehad's daughters, and in the arrangement for the Cities of Refuge, is given a special name. Since these laws were "judgments," because they concern matters "one with another," and yet were also not "judgings," decisions of judges, but were new laws and thus of the nature of "statutes" or directions, they were specifically called "statutes of judgment" — a most exact discrimination in accordance with the technical meaning of the two words.

A later investigation into the use of these words throughout

the whole extent of the Hebrew Bible shows that this discriminating use of the technical terms continued throughout the period of the Judges and was carried into the time of David and Solomon, but fell into complete disregard in the times of corruption and apostacy and then, at the reformation and the return from exile, was revived again.

C. The next discovery of the archæologist in pursuit of his method of dealing with the problem of the Pentateuch as literary remains of antiquity is that these various kinds of laws were put to quite different uses according to their character, and that these various uses to which the various kinds of laws were to be put naturally and necessarily resulted in quite different literary forms of expression.

Some laws were intended to be memorized; indeed their proper use required that they be memorized. The Decalogue was to be taught to the children, as, indeed, it is taught to all Bible-taught children to this day. The "judgments" also must be kept constantly in mind by magistrates so as to render judgment promptly without consulting written laws, as is still expected of the ordinary magistrate in the administration of law. The commandments and the judgments are, in fact, in mnemonic form; they are short, terse, and explicit, expressed in verbs and nouns with almost no adverbs and adjectives, and, like many common laws, are in something approaching poetic form. There is rhythm and parallelism of a kind that is easily observable even in the English translation of these lists:—

“ And he that killeth any man,
Shall surely be put to death.

And he that killeth a beast,
Shall make it good: beast for beast.

And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour;
As he hath done, so shall it be done to him.”

The statutes were new directions given, or, in the case of ritual forms, freed from all idolatrous characteristics and given a new spiritual content. Moreover, they were not for the immediate instruction of all the people, but were to be administered by the priests, the educated class, ministering constantly at the altar and directing the people in the service. Description was necessary to the proper understanding in these statutes, and thus a descriptive style was inevitable, no matter who might

be the author. The statutes are quite markedly in this descriptive style, filled with adjectives and adverbs and prolix explanations and repetitions. These characteristics are very noticeable in the directions given for the building of the tabernacle, or for the making of the vestments, and especially for the detection of leprosy.

Then, again, the demands which the necessity for popular persuasion lay upon a speaker inevitably bring out a hortatory style, and this, also, regardless of the person of the author. The same person would naturally give decision from the bench in a pungent style suited to the occasion, and would make an address on the same subject to a class in a law school in the appropriate descriptive and explanatory language, and would certainly be expected to deliver an oration on some national holiday in impassioned language suited to that occasion. So, the speeches of Moses in Deuteronomy treating of the same laws so pungently and simply spoken from the mount or written down in the books of the law, present now similar subject-matter in all the fervour of the impassioned orator. Such change in expression of laws as are often attributed to different authors is thus naturally demanded by the different circumstances of the utterance.

D. A detailed analysis and classification having now been finished, examination and comparison is now in order. Certain narrative portions naturally and properly belong as introduction or comment to the various groups of laws; likewise also to various uses of laws: for example, the narrative introduction to the Decalogue and to the description of the tabernacle, and to the speeches of Deuteronomy. It is to be noted also that the commandments and the judgments are in the same style, and so in any consideration of style they may be grouped together.

If now we collect together the various groups of commandments and judgments with the narrative portions properly belonging to them, and the various groups of statutes with the narrative portions belonging to them, and note that the speeches of Moses in Deuteronomy with their subjoined narrative portions make another distinct portion, we have thus three natural segments of the law books from Exodus to Deuteronomy. If then we note the mnemonic laws and the narrative portions naturally belonging to them, and the descriptive laws with their narrative portions, with Deuteronomy again a complete whole by itself, we have thus also again a threefold division of the

law books of the Pentateuch. But since the mnemonic laws are the commandments and judgments, and the descriptive laws are the statutes, and Deuteronomy is always Deuteronomy, it appears at once that these two separate divisions of the law books into three portions are identical.

E. Recalling now that the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch makes also three general divisions, comparison is at once suggested between divisions according to *kinds* and *uses* of laws and the divisions according to the Documentary Theory. Here the surprise of the investigation awaits us. The mnemonic laws, the commandments and the judgments, with the narrative belonging to them, are discovered to be identical with the J-E Document (with the fragments of J and E still pointed out) of the Documentary Theory; the descriptive laws, the statutes, with the narrative portions belonging to them, are exactly the same as the P Document; and Deuteronomy, of course, is Deuteronomy in each case. This identification is not merely in a general way accurate, but is startlingly exact, with no more variation than the slight margin of phrases and verses occasionally found to be difficult of assignment by either system of partition.

Thus, the kinds and uses of laws discovered account for most of the peculiarities of the Pentateuch, the puzzling things that attract the attention of one who scrutinizes the Pentateuch as it is, and this it does without the adventitious supposition of unknown authors and unmentioned documents. The laws of the introduction of evidence require that suppositions shall not be admitted when not necessary—that is, when the whole case is explained by the known and observed facts. As these facts of the Pentateuch itself account for these peculiar phenomena, a theory that explains them by a supposition of unknown persons and things is ruled out by the laws of evidence.

III. THE METHOD OF COMPOSITION.

One question yet remains: the method of composition of the Pentateuch, and with that is linked the time and place and probable author. The composition of the Pentateuch from the standpoint of the archæologist is logically and inevitably from the standpoint of the historical imagination. The archæologist, after collecting and classifying the facts found, becomes, then, the historian to reconstruct out of these materials, as far as it may be possible to do so, the history of the times represented by

the things discovered, the order of events exactly as they appeared at the time. The special problem presented to the archæologist here is that, when he has collected and classified the facts as we have done, he is confronted with the Pentateuch *as it is*, with its various elements arranged in a most peculiar way, presenting all the puzzling peculiarities which we have pointed out, the fragmentariness of the codes, the repetition of the laws, and the distribution of all throughout a running narrative. To reconstruct aright the historical events which brought about these strange results is the real problem of the Pentateuch. Did it grow into this form in a journalistic way throughout the extent of the history represented in the Pentateuch, or was it constructed in this form by persons not connected with the events ?

The method of the archæologist requires us, then, to visualize exactly what is required by each of these views of the method of composition, and so judge which is most in accord with the facts as they are before us in the Pentateuch as it is. According to the Documentary Theory the final Redactor—or Redactors, as many prefer to think of them—have in hand three great documents. There was the J-E Document, containing narrative and civil and criminal laws and constituting a complete and harmonious and self-consistent document ; there was also the P Document, containing also much narrative and another code of laws or directions of a totally different character from the laws of the J-E Document, being religious ritual and ceremonial laws and directions concerning the construction of a building in the wilderness for religious purposes. These laws were not civil and criminal laws, but ecclesiastical laws, also quite harmonious and self-consistent as a code. There was also before the Redactors a D Document, containing a very little narrative as binding material and four addresses on laws of both ecclesiastical and civil and criminal kind, though chiefly of civil and criminal laws.

The Redactors, with all these various documents before them, took the civil and criminal code of laws out of the J-E Document and broke them up into fragments, a few large fragments and many smaller ones. They took also the ecclesiastical laws out of the P Document and likewise broke them up into fragments, a few large fragments and many smaller ones. They then mixed these fragments of various kinds of laws, self-consistent and harmonious in themselves, all together indiscriminately ; they even put occasionally one or two civil and criminal laws

into the midst of a group of ecclesiastical laws, and here and there one or two ecclesiastical laws into the midst of a group of civil or criminal laws. Still the Redactors were not satisfied: they took some of the individual laws, repeated them two or three times and inserted them at different places among the various fragments of the codes of laws. The narrative portions of both the J-E and the P Document were then broken up, and the fragments, some from each, pieced together so as to make a continuous narrative. And yet this strange proceeding is not complete; this continuous story is now spread out and the fragments of laws inserted in the openings, the narrative being adapted, or a few words written in by the Redactor, to make the narrative at times introduce the fragments of laws. There was thus produced a long portion of the Pentateuch which is now called Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; the D Document was then appended to the end as Deuteronomy and, presto, the work was finished!

It is, indeed, said that all this was not done in a day or at a sitting, but that it was a work that progressed over some considerable time; but however little or much time the work may be made to cover, the various steps of the progress are here correctly given and the actual process correctly described. If the whole process, when thus set out, seems absurd, it is so because the various steps in it are absurd, however much they may have been spread out over a long time and among many succeeding persons.

Now it may be frankly admitted that the Pentateuch might have been written in this way. It is physically quite possible to break up literary documents and piece them together in such fashion. Children may often be seen doing this at their play; it is questionable if anyone has ever seen a serious proceeding of this kind. In fact, it seems simply impossible to believe that any person, or any number of persons, would ever make law books in this fashion. If any lawyer to-day should be found at such a work, his friends would tap their foreheads meaningly and consult about the advisability of getting a nurse for him.

Let us now endeavour to visualize what the facts of the wilderness journey disclose. It appears at once that Moses was, first of all, a speaking prophet; the well-known formula is, "God spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the people saying." This is exactly what the wilderness journey requires. Though

writing was well known and doubtless many could both write and read, writing materials in the wilderness among the refuges and writing facilities for producing sufficient books for the instruction of the people would be impossible. Also, no very considerable number of the people could be addressed at one time in such oral instruction in the laws, and, besides, the children of Israel were "Shepherds in the Wilderness." The nature of that region as a pasture-land requires that the flocks must be scattered far and wide, and so the shepherds scattered with them. Only representatives from each tribe were kept about the tabernacle as a guard, and doubtless changed from time to time. In any case, Moses' audience must have been very different at different times.

Some laws also needed reiteration. Even a modern preacher has been known to preach on the same subject more than once, especially such subjects as Sabbath-keeping and the treatment of servants; these needed then, as now, frequently to be pressed upon the conscience of the people. It is hardly necessary to point out that it is exactly such laws as these that are repeated in the Pentateuchal codes.

It is to be noted again that Moses was also a writing prophet; he is expressly directed in one place to write these things in a book (Ex. xvii, 14). Eight times at least in the Pentateuch writing is attributed to Moses. One patent fact of the Pentateuch *as it is*, from Exodus on, is that it is journalistic in form. Such expressions as "They journey from here," "After these things," "On the morrow," are quite frequent; they are the passing notices of a journey.

With these facts before us it is easy to visualize what was taking place during the wilderness journey. The cloud rested and the tents were pitched; they tarried for a time, and certain events took place. All these things were written down in order. Then Moses "spake unto the people saying," and what he said was, in its substance, written down in this place; sometimes he spake on civil and criminal laws and sometimes on ecclesiastical laws, and sometimes upon both kinds. Sometimes the laws mentioned were very few in number, and sometimes a long list of laws was expounded or even promulgated. In all cases they were written down in order in their place. Sometimes, as on the occasion of a feast or some other public occasion, when the wandering shepherds came in, repetition of important laws already announced was made. All these things, both laws and

events, were written down in order as they occurred. Thus time went on, and the journey went on, and the book grew, until at last they came to the plains of Moab, and there Moses gathered the host for a great national assembly for the stirring of patriotism. He delivered four great addresses, each of which was written down, together with the intervening events. Moses died, and this also was noted by the scribe, quite in accord with the Egyptian literary biographical method of the time, which even allowed a man to speak in the first person on his tombstone. So the journey was finished and the book was finished. Thus, in the most natural, simple way, in exact accord with the conditions of the wilderness life and journey, are all the peculiarities of the composition of the Pentateuch accounted for, and that without any supposition.

The history preceding the books of the law, now known under the name of Genesis, the "beginning," was prepared probably in part from documents, for there are sufficient library marks in it, and certainly partly by revelation, for no man was present at creation to leave a record. This book was added as a preface to the books of the law. It is to be noted that according to the Documentary Theory the style of Genesis is largely that of the P Document, *i.e.*, the descriptive style, and indeed is distinctively so designated (Kautzsch, *Lit. O.T.*, p. 109). This is exactly what the style ought to be, for it represents the style of the author of the descriptive portions of the books of the law. The judgments, being well-known decisions of judges, were not in the style of the author, but in the conventional style of usage. The commandments were given of God. Only the narrative and the statutes represent immediately the style of the author of the Pentateuch, and thus it is descriptive style that we should expect to find in Genesis, and do find there.

The divine names also, in their discriminative use, are in exact harmony with this explanation of the problem of the Pentateuch drawn from the *kinds* and *uses* of laws. In a court of law to-day we hear the general name for the Deity, God, or the Almighty, very frequently, but seldom the covenant names, Redeemer, Saviour, or Christ. But in an ecclesiastical court, while we may sometimes hear the name God, or the Almighty, the covenant names, Redeemer and Saviour and Christ, are used much more frequently. In like manner exactly, we find *Elohim* used almost exclusively in the civil and criminal law portions of the Pentateuch, the so-called J-E Document, and the name

Jehovah used almost exclusively in the statute portions, the P Document ; though in either case, in modern courts or in these ancient documents, these various words may be used interchangeably.

The limits of this paper will not permit examination in detail of all the historical and other difficulties ; for discussion of them I must refer to the complete publication of all the evidence, passing in review every verse of the books of the law from the beginning of the law to the close of Deuteronomy, published under the title *The Problem of the Pentateuch ; a New Solution by Archæological Facts and Methods.*

The sum of the evidence goes to show that the facts of the Pentateuch itself and the correlated facts of the wilderness journey clearly account for all the peculiarities of the problem of the Pentateuch and point to the wilderness journey as the time of composition and Moses, either in person or—more probably—through the use of scribes, as the responsible author.

DISCUSSION.

In moving that the thanks of the meeting be given to President Kyle, the CHAIRMAN observed that the Paper as read answered quite admirably to the claims made by its author. On the basis of facts that were beyond dispute, the Paper presented a case which stood in no need of speculative theorising. Dr. Kyle had shown himself to be a sound Biblical scholar, with the equipment of a lawyer, and a keen scent for journalistic proprieties as they might be understood to find representation in Israel in ancient times. To those who had lost confidence in the Documentary Theory, he commended the conclusion of Dr. Kyle, that the peculiarities of the Pentateuch, so far as they related to its composition, were explained by the wilderness life and journeyings of the children of Israel. The issue was a vindication of the Five Books as the work of Moses the Lawgiver, and the process of proof was at once scientific and convincing.

Lieut.-Col. G. MACKINLAY said: Dr. Kyle has referred to the elaborate directions for the construction of the tabernacle. The same elaboration and full numerical exactness are devoted in the Book of Numbers to describing the position of the tribes around the ark, so that it has been easy to construct drawings and models of both the camp and the tabernacle. Do not these facts point to the truth of the long received ancient dates ? Is it likely that a

writer, long afterwards, would mention so many figures? If a more recent writer had edited the record of the number of soldiers in each tribe, would he not, most probably, have edited the account with something more attractive than the present somewhat dull account of the exact numbers of fighting men? On the other hand, the unedited roll calls of the Jewish hosts were necessary at the time, and point to the survival of the true records.

The truth and inspiration of all parts of scripture are well worth demonstrating and insisting upon. The Pentateuch is specially valuable, as it contains many early prophecies and foregleams of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and much of it has been quoted by Him and so is specially precious.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS congratulated the audience with having so distinguished an American to read a paper, who though unknown by face, was known to him by his writings, which he had read with interest and profit, instancing "Moses and the monuments."

He thought the lecturer's theory that the Pentateuch to a large extent was compiled journalistically of great importance as showing it must be a truthful witness. He believed the real reason for the Higher Critics' denial of the Mosaic authorship was that that authorship being that of an eye-witness involved the admission of the miraculous in the events recorded.

With reference to Mr. Heath's communication, he would suggest that the reason for the disregard in the Hebrew Bible of discrimination in the use of technical terms in the times of corruption and apostasy was the desire to make the divine communication intelligible to the hearers.

He recalled the intentional *reductio ad absurdum* of an essay which appeared some years ago, splitting up Paul's Epistle to the Romans (which no one questioned was a monograph) into different authors in accordance with the different names used of Christ. The essay showed that a different aspect of our salvation was connected with each name, as the Higher Critics pointed out the different names of the Deity corresponded with a differing treatment of the story. No doubt in both cases the names were varied of purpose.

If Professor Naville's suggestion held good, that the Pentateuch was written under Moses' direction in Babylonian cuneiform and translated by Ezra into the present Hebrew text, the whole basis

of the critic's theory of distinguishing the authors by their language vanished into thin air.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT referred to the argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch deducible from the following facts.

Jerusalem is never mentioned. There is no mention of sacred song. The expression "Lord of Hosts" is never used.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said the paper is valuable because it attempts an explanation of the complicated phenomena of the Pentateuch instead of simply criticising the "results" of the destructive school. It is too often forgotten that these phenomena exist and must be faced by all honest and competent students.

The extension of Dr. Kyle's analysis to the narratives suggests a difficulty. Does it not, in so far as it coincides with that of the destructive school, lie open to the very damaging criticism to which the latter has been subjected from the conservative side?

Adverting to a statement by Mr. Roberts, the Chairman explained that the volume in which the Epistle to the Romans was subjected to analysis was entitled *Romans Dissected*. It was published over thirty years ago, both in the English and German languages, being the work of an American scholar, Dr. Charles Marsh Mead. It was, in reality, a *jeu d'esprit*, designed to discredit the method of the Higher Criticism; and the motive of the author was well indicated by the fact that he gave his book to the world under the pseudonym of E. D. McRealsam, a striking anagram of his own name.

GEORGE ANDREW HEATH, Esq., writes: "In calling attention to the scrupulously exact use of words in the Hebrew Bible, Dr. Kyle mentions on page 27 that this accuracy continued into the time of David and Solomon, but lapsed during the period of 'corruption and apostasy, and then on the Reformation and return from Exile, was revived again.'

"At first sight, to those who hold that the very *Words* of Scripture are inspired, this would seem to suggest that the 'Holy Men of God' who prophesied through the times of 'corruption and apostasy' were less inspired than those during the Mosaic and Revival periods.

"This, however, need not be the deduction formed from this peculiarity, for may we not assume that the language used in the times of apostasy, with its apparent disregard for discrimination in the use of the technical terms referred to, was chosen to reflect

the state of 'corruption and apostasy' during which these men spoke, and forms in itself an indictment against this period; and thus those who would *carefully* study the God-sent messages of their time would understand how they had fallen from the pure standards set up in the Pentateuch, by the very use of the *words* themselves."

Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD writes: "For many years the clearness of the Americans has much impressed me. At Harley Street, if I had an American patient I got an intelligible and orderly statement of symptoms, quite different from any English sufferer. To what to attribute this valuable characteristic, so marked in the able paper to-day, I know not. Whether it is due to the clarity of the atmosphere, producing a corresponding clearness of mental vision, or whether it springs from some more recondite source, I know not. Of its charm and value there is happily no doubt."

"It will be remembered that Our Lord in His temptation used the Book of Deuteronomy. Three times over did the 'It is written' refer to this book, and to this book alone, written by Moses as a coherent whole on the Plains of Moab."

"It is delightful to find as I do week by week the most valuable and quite new testimony coming from America on Bible subjects of the first importance, and proving by quiet argument the authenticity and accuracy of Holy Writ, in refreshing contrast to the *ex parte* and unbalanced statements subversive of Scripture, heard here in such unwearied repetition."

Dr. ANDERSON-BERRY writes: "President Kyle's paper is instructive, thought-inspiring and worthy of all praise. I consider it has perfectly explained many points. I have always considered Astruc's divisions of the sacred text as childish. By me I have a book of prayers by one whom I knew. Take one of them, in it he addresses the Great Being, to whom he prays as 'Almighty God,' 'Heavenly Father,' 'Holy Father' and 'Lord.' Are we to consider that this is a composite prayer made by different authors? Surely not, for it clearly appears that as the epithets vary, so do the petitions and expressions that follow vary also. In fact, the names he uses are keynotes to the thoughts that follow. We need never again be troubled by the destructive criticism based on Jean Astruc's childish so-called discovery."

The Rev. A. H. FINN writes : " In Exod. xxi to xxiii, 19, there is a group of laws of which it is explicitly stated ' these are the judgments (*Mishpatim*). ' Most of these clearly deal with matters of controversy which would come before a judge, though there are a few (xxii, 28-31 : xxiii, 10-19) of a different nature. Also in Leviticus the phrase ' This is the law (*Torah*) ' occurs several times, but there is no well-marked group defined by ' These are the *Toroth*, ' nor are there groups of ' statutes (*Chukkim*) ' or of ' commandments (*Mitzvoth*). ' For determining the significance of these words we are largely dependent on their etymology.

" *Mishpatim* (from *shaphat*, to judge) undoubtedly means judgments, judicial decisions, but what authority is there for saying that they were ' fixed by precedent ' p. 25) ? There does not appear to have been any judicial system in Israel until Jethro suggested it to Moses (Exod. xviii), and that would not leave much room for precedent before the *Mishpatim* of chapter xxi. Inasmuch as it was the Lord who said (Exod. xx, 22) unto Moses, " These are the judgments which thou shalt set before them, ' it is more in accordance with the Biblical account to regard these as decisions of the Supreme ' Judge of all the earth, ' given to be the precedents for human judges to follow.

" *Chukkim*, the definition ' directions, from the gesture of throwing out the hand to give guidance to someone ' (p. 25) belongs to *Toroth* (from *Yarah*, to point out, and hence to teach) and not to *Chukkim*. It is usual to connect this word with *Chakak*, to decree (hence *Mechokek* ruler, Gen. xlix, 10), but a deeper meaning is suggested by the cognate Arabic *Hhak*, Right, Truth. Among Arabs it is usual to assent to a statement in the phrase ' *Hhak ma'ak*, ' the truth is with thee. According to this *Chok* would mean a precept laying down that which is right and true in itself, not relating to matters of controversy ; such a precept as ' Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. ' The special term ' a statute of judgment ' (*Chukkath Mishpat*, Num. xxvii, 11 : xxxv, 29) is applied to the laws of female inheritance and the provision of refuge cities because these involve principles of essential justice on which the judicial *Mishpat* should be based.

" *Mitzvoth*, commandments (from *Tsavah*, to command) in a general sense applies to all God's injunctions. As distinguished from other words it may fairly be taken to refer to regulations about matters

more or less indifferent in themselves (*i.e.* not essentially right and true, nor matters of judicial right and wrong) but made obligatory by direct Divine commands. Under this heading may be classed the instructions about the Tabernacle and the high-priestly robes.

“*Torah*, the general word for law, is applied in a narrower sense to matters in which guidance was needed. Thus it is definitely used for the laws relating to offerings in Lev. vi, 9, 14 (Heb. ii, 7) and vii, 37 : for the law of leprosy, Lev. xiv, 57, and the law of uncleanness, Lev. xv., 33.

“*Debarim*, ‘words,’ may include promises, threatenings, or doctrinal statements (such as, ‘The Lord our God is one Lord’) as well as injunctions or prohibitions. It (and not *Mitzvoth*) is specially applied to the Decalogue, ‘the ten words,’ in Exod. xxxiv, 28, Deut. iv, 13, and by the Jews in general at the present day, because of that it is said ‘God spake all these words.’

“The assertion (p. 27) that ‘The commandments and judgments are, in fact, in mnemonic form : they are short, terse, and explicit’ is questionable. Some of the judgments, like the three actually quoted, are no doubt in this form, but by no means all. Some of them run to several verses, *e.g.*, manumission of servants, Exod. xxi, 2-6 ; redemption of maid-servant, xxi, 7-11 ; dangerous ox, xxi, 28-32 ; things left in trust, xxii, 7-13.

“Although it appears to me that the classification of the laws in this paper is open to question, the general trend of the argument is forcible, and especially the argument (pp. 30-33) that the present arrangement of laws and history in the Pentateuch is such as no sane ‘Redactors’ would have produced, while it does fit exactly with what the circumstances in the Wilderness would require.”

THE 660TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, JANUARY 21ST, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

At the beginning of the proceedings the CHAIRMAN announced that we met under the shadow of a great bereavement, the death of the President, Dean Wace of Canterbury, and called upon the Hon. Secretary to propose a Resolution already drafted by the Council :

“ This Meeting of Members and Associates of the Victoria Institute hereby expresses its profound sorrow at the death of Dean Wace, President and Trustee of the Institute. For a long period of years the Dean was a tower of strength to the Institute and held in honour by all its supporters. In common with the entire Evangelical world, this Meeting expresses its deep sense of loss, and places on record its sincere sympathy with Mrs. Wace and other relatives who have been so sorely bereaved.”

This was put to the Meeting and passed *nem. con.*, Members signifying their assent by rising from their seats.

The business of the Meeting was then begun by the reading and signing of the Minutes of the previous Meeting, and the Hon. Secretary announced the Election of the following :—William C. Edwards, Esq., as a Member ; and Mrs. Charlotte A. Boyd, Mrs. Mary L. Gough Griffiths, the Rev. D. M. McIntyre and W. R. Lane, Esq., as Associates.

Then, in the absence of the Gunning Prize Essayist, Mr. E. J. Sewell, the HON. SECRETARY was called upon to read the essay on “ The Historical Value of the Book of Jonah.”

GUNNING PRIZE ESSAY.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE BOOK OF JONAH.

By E. J. SEWELL, Esq.

THE Book of Jonah purports to relate facts. It is a narrative of an episode in the life of a known man, Jonah-ben-Amittai of Gath-hepher, who was a prophet of the northern Kingdom in the reign of Jeroboam II, King of Israel (781-740 B.C.).*

(2) But many Biblical critics deny that the book is a real history of facts or was meant to be such a history. They regard it as a Haggādah, or edifying story—"a narrative with a purpose, homily." Such haggādoth form a large part of Rabbinical literature; they are usually attached to historical names and events, but their value lies, not in the facts which they relate, but in the ideas which they embody. They are a branch of "Midrash."

(3) Other advanced Biblical critics describe the book in various ways, as an allegory, a prose poem, an actual poem written in metre, as a mixture of "Midrash" folklore and allegory, a narrative founded upon historical incidents, but greatly altered, and, finally, as pure fiction.

Conservative Biblical critics regard it as genuine history, containing miraculous events, but not, on that account, incredible.

* Many different dates are given for Jeroboam's reign: e.g. G. A. Cooke, in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary* (ii, 583 b), gives 790-749 B.C.; Cheyne, in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, p. 2406, gives 782-743 B.C.; Driver, in *Authority and Archeology*, assigns the reign to c. 786-746 B.C.; and so on. Dr. Sanday, in his *Bampton Lectures on Inspiration*, appends a table of dates representing "so much of the conclusions of criticism as he feels that he can honestly and fairly assimilate." I have, in the text, taken the date given by him in this "Table," p. 450.

Clearly, then, there is room for difference of opinion, and we are at liberty to form our own conclusion on the evidence.

(4) It seems to the writer that there can be little doubt that the very general unwillingness to accept the story as history, arises, to a great extent, from the miracles described in it.

Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Perowne says :—* “The question whether this book is not rather to be regarded as an allegory or parable or romance . . . than as a history of what actually happened, really (it can hardly be doubted) owes its origin to the miraculous character of the book. Among the principal advocates of the non-historical theory of the book are those who deny the possibility of miracles.” . . . “But” (he continues) “may not even the most devout Christian hold the book to be a divinely-originated parable or allegory? Even in this form, many would consider that the question is really suggested by the miracles with which this book abounds. . . . But for them, it may well be doubted whether anyone would ever have taken the Book of Jonah to be anything but history.” But this was written in 1893. Since that date advanced Biblical critics have gone much further in describing as fiction, or mostly fiction, what has usually been regarded as history.

(5) One may, perhaps, even now, go so far as to say that if the narrative had been told without the miraculous events (the “swallowing” by the “great fish” and Jonah’s escape alive and uninjured, and the events connected with the “gourd”) there would not have been so general a hesitation in accepting the narrative as history, nor would the other reasons put forward for doubting its “historicity” receive so much attention.

(6) However, such reasons are alleged. It is said that it is certain, from linguistic evidence, that the book cannot have been written in the 8th century B.C., when Jonah lived and prophesied, but must have come into existence in the 3rd or 4th century B.C. after the return from the Exile to Babylon. It is also said that the language used in the book about Nineveh shows that the writer of the book lived long after the date

* *Introduction to the Book of Jonah* in the Cambridge Bible (1893), cap. ii, paras. 2 and 4. See also on the general question, Dr. Gore in *Belief in God*, p. 173.

(607 or 608 B.C.)* when that city was destroyed, for he speaks of it as fabulously great, implying that his readers (in 300 or 400 B.C.) did not know much about the city.

Other instances, of less importance, are also put forward as showing that the story rests upon imagination rather than fact.

(7) The writer proposes to discuss these questions before taking into consideration the miraculous element in the book. For, if it can be shown that the book was written at some date, varying from 350 to 450 years, after the time when Jonah lived, there could be little reason to think that the narratives of the book owed their origin, either directly or indirectly, to Jonah himself. But most of the details of those narratives could only have been known to Jonah himself. That he was "swallowed" by a "great fish" might be known to the sailors who threw him into the sea and saw what followed, but that he remained alive inside the "fish" for "three days and three nights," and was not only alive but conscious, so as to compose the Psalm in chapter II, and that he was thrown up alive and uninjured on the sea-shore: these facts, together with some of the details about the "gourd," as well as the divine communications received by the prophet from time to time, could only have been known to Jonah himself. If we have not got them on his testimony, the evidence for them, as far as we are concerned, is very weak, and taken solely by itself is insufficient to warrant belief in such stupendous miracles. (But see, on this, paras. 49-53 *seq.*)

(8) The question of the date of the book becomes, therefore, of considerable (or even vital) importance in weighing its claim to be historical. The writer will, consequently, begin by scrutinizing the evidence put forward to justify the conclusions set out in para. 6 above and also in para. 11 following.

But here he is met by a grave difficulty. These conclusions deal with the usages of the Hebrew language and are urged by very eminent Hebrew scholars, while the writer does not possess, and does not claim to possess, more than a very moderate knowledge of Hebrew, acquired, late in life, in the course of the

* This has hitherto been the accepted date for the fall of Nineveh. But the writer has to thank Mr. Harold Wiener for a reference to a recent book by Mr. C. J. Gadd—*The Fall of Nineveh*—which shows, on the evidence of a newly-discovered Babylonian chronicle, that the true date was 612 B.C.

endeavour to understand and weigh the arguments put forward and the conclusions arrived at by advanced Biblical critics.

The question may well suggest itself: Is the writer justified in attempting to weigh the evidence and arrive at conclusions on points on which very eminent Hebrew scholars have agreed in pronouncing decisions expressed in confident language? Is it not presumptuous on his part to do so, and ought he not "with bated breath and whispering humbleness" to accept those decisions as beyond his competence to question?

(9) He thinks his action not presumptuous, and for the following reasons:—

- (a) These eminent Hebraists are by no means agreed on many points relating to the language of the Book of Jonah. They differ widely, and in some cases go so far as flatly to contradict one another. In such cases some of them must be right and some wrong. But it is essential to know which are right and which wrong. How can this be decided except by weighing against one another the grounds which they themselves urge in support of their assertions?
- (b) The writer does not suggest that any weight be given to anything which he puts forward unless it is supported by the evidence adduced, and by valid reasoning based on that evidence. Even great Biblical critics must yield to results obtained by strictly valid reasoning based on facts well established. The writer has done his best to obtain full evidence and to deal with that evidence with strict attention to the laws of reasoning, and to be absolutely fair and impartial in deciding. He gives his reasons; if he is mistaken in his facts, it is easy to point out the mistake; if his reasons are inconclusive, that also can be made to appear.
- (c) The writer is encouraged by such opinions as that stated by Dr. Gore (*Belief in God*, p. 2). "The only satisfactory way for a man to save his own soul or to become capable of helping others is freely to use his own real judgment in the fullest light that he can come by."

- (d) The writer has adopted the Horatian motto,
 “ Si quid novisti rectius istis,
 Candidus imperti ! si non his utere mecum.”
 and he hopes to be allowed to act on it.

(10) He will, therefore, proceed to discuss the linguistic evidence put forward as to the date of the Book of Jonah.

(11) There are, among many others, five advanced Biblical critics of recent date, all also eminent Hebraists, who have expressed in very strong language their decision as to the date of the language of the Book of Jonah. They are Driver, Cheyne, König, Cornill and Bewer.

*Driver says :—“ The Book of Jonah *cannot*† have been written until long after the life-time of Jonah himself. This appears from the style which has several . . . marks of a later age.”

‡ Cheyne says :—“ The phase of Hebrew which meets us in the Book of Jonah is not that of the 8th century . . . such words and forms as the following are *conclusive* as to the post-exilic date of the book.”

The other three, König,§ Cornill|| and Bewer¶ use language quite as confident and to the same effect. All five give lists of words and constructions in the Hebrew of the book which they consider bear out their opinion. They by no means agree in these lists. A full and candid consideration of their arguments would require an examination of all the words detailed by any one of them. This would mean the full and careful discussion of fourteen Hebrew words. The writer has made such an examination, but, in this Essay, he is strictly limited as to space and cannot find room for the whole discussion. He can only deal with three typical cases, and then state the conclusion to which a similar examination of all the cases has led him.

But, before dealing with these three cases separately, it seems requisite to say a little about considerations of linguistic style used to fix the date at which a book was written.

* Driver, *Intro. L.O.T.*, p. 322.

† The italics are the writer's.

‡ See Cheyne ; *Encycl. Bib.*, p. 2566 (1).

§ König, *Einleitung*, Sec. 77 (3), p. 880 ; also *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, pp. 745-753.

|| Cornill ; *Introduction to the Historical Books of the O.T.*, translated by Canon Box (1907), p. 337.

¶ Bewer ; *International Critical Commentary : Jonah*.

(12) There are (at least) three distinct elements of linguistic style. The first is that which may be called the idiosyncrasy of the author. *Le style c'est l'homme*, and every man who writes with any freedom and emphasis has his own peculiar characteristics.

The author of this book is no exception to this rule. Short though the book is, certain peculiarities of style are very marked in it. The narrative is characterized by great brevity. The author omits everything that does not bear directly on the purpose of his story. Notice, in this connection, the abrupt beginning and the even more abrupt close of the book. The author scorns to record the obvious, and entirely refrains from drawing any moral, still more from enforcing one. His language is vivid. God hurled (הִטִּיל הַיָּם *hēṭil, i, 4*) a storm upon the sea; that sea will sink to a whisper (יִשָּׁתֵק *yis^e tōq, i, 11*); the rowers dig at their oars (יִחַתְרוּ *yaht^e rū, i, 13*); Jonah does well to be angry "even to death" (עַד־מָוֶת *'ad māvet, iv, 9*); in speaking of the "gourd" he says: "Which existed the son of a night, and perished the son of a night" שֶׁבַּן־לַיְלָה הָיָה וּבֶן־לַיְלָה אָבָד (*s^ebbin-lay^elāh hāyāh ūbin-lay^elāh 'ābād, iv, 10*), and so on. He is very dramatic and seems to preserve the actual words used by the Phœnician sailors in conversation with him and one another, and the words used by the King in Nineveh.

He uses, in the 48 verses of his short book, four Hebrew words used by no other Biblical writer (קְרִיאָה *s^efināh, i, 5*; קְרִיאָה *q^eri'āh, iii, 2*; קִיָּאֹן *qīqāyōn, iv, 6*; and חַרְשִׁית *ḥarisit, iv, 8*).

The second element of style depends on the character of the work, *e.g.* prose narrative, as distinguished from impassioned prophecy in rhythmical prose or in metre. This difference somewhat invalidates any comparison between the Book of Jonah and the prophecies of the 8th century prophet, Hosea.

The third element of style depends upon the country and epoch of the writer. Here, again, Hosea, though he prophesied about Israel in the 8th century, wrote in Jerusalem. A prophet of Northern Israel in the 8th century B.C. would write differently from a writer of narrative (or pious fiction) in Palestine of the 3rd or 4th century B.C. Compare the "memoirs of Ezra" with the "prophetic" narratives in the Books of Kings.

(13) Bearing these things in mind, as we are bound to do,

we come to consider some of the words used in the book which are cited as *conclusively* showing its post-exilic date.

The first I will take is the word סְפִינָה s^efīnāh, used in Jonah i, 5, for a ship. Driver and Cornill say, very decisively, that the use of this word in the 8th century B.C. is "on linguistic grounds quite impossible." Now it is to be noted that Cheyne is not of this opinion. He says: * "We need not lay stress on סְפִינָה s^efīnāh which, though more Aramaic than Hebrew, might perhaps have been used by the non-maritime Israelites before the Exile."† And Beyer‡ goes much further, saying: ". . . סְפִינָה s^efīnāh, which occurs only here in the Old Testament," has "been regarded as an Aramaism. But סְפִינָה s^efīnāh means here evidently" (mark *evidently*) "the lower deck, and is derived from the good Hebrew root סָפַן sāfan." König, in his article in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, omits this word סְפִינָה s^efīnāh from his list, and the omission seems to be deliberate and significant, for in discussing the word in his Introduction (Einleitung, *Jona*, p. 78) he speaks of the word as properly used instead of אֲנִיָּה 'anīyyāh, to indicate a ship which was decked and covered in. It is to be remembered that the ship on which Jonah embarked was a "Tarshish ship," *i.e.* a large vessel intended for long sea-voyages in rough weather and therefore certain to be decked.

The preponderance of authority of advanced Biblical critics is therefore to the effect that the word סְפִינָה s^efīnāh, instead of being an instance of late Hebrew which goes to prove decisively that the book of Jonah could not have been written in the 8th century, is "formed from a good Hebrew root," and is rightly used here to describe the particular kind of ship on which Jonah embarked, a detail which is necessary for the understanding of what follows in the narrative. Not only does it fail to show that the language of the book decisively stamps it as post-exilic, but

* *Encyclopædia Biblica*, ii, col. 2566.

† Cheyne cites Siegfried and Stade as reading סְפִינֹת s^efīnôt instead of שְׂכִיּוֹת s^ekiyôt,* (so also Canon G. H. Box), in Isaiah ii, 16, a reading which corresponds with the LXX translation και ἐπὶ πᾶσαν θέαν πλοίων κάλλους. It would seem to follow that these two eminent Hebraists did not regard סְפִינָה s^efīnāh as stamping the book in which it occurred as post-exilic.

‡ *Intern. Crit. Comm.: Jonah*, p. 12.

does, in fact, go some way to show exactly the opposite. That it is not used by early Hebrew writers is probably due to the fact that the Hebrews had very little to do with ships either decked or undecked.

And it is to be noted, in passing, that such Hebraists as Driver and Cornill may be entirely wrong in the inference they draw from the use of the word in Hebrew, so that one may take courage and have one's own opinion even on such subjects.

(14) Another word cited by Cheyne, König and Bewer, as proving a late date for the book, is רִבּוֹ *ribbô*, for ten thousand (Jonah iv, 11). Driver and Cornill do not include it in their lists; it may, perhaps, be inferred that they do not regard it as furnishing evidence of a late date (see para. (15) following). Bewer describes רִבּוֹ *ribbô* as "used in late literature for the earlier רִבְבָה *rēbābāh*"* (p. 12), implying, of course, that if the author of the Book of Jonah had written in the 8th century B.C. he would have used רִבְבָה *rēbābāh*.†

If, however, the sixteen instances‡ in which the word רִבְבָה *rē ā āh* is used in the Old Testament be examined, it will be seen that in all of them (with the possible exception of Judges xx, 10) the word is used (like "myriad" in English) for a very large indefinite number. Take, for example, Gen. xxiv, 60, where Rebekah's mother and brother express, on her approaching marriage, the wish for her—be thou the mother of thousands of ten thousands!—לְאַלְפֵי רִבְבָה *l'alfê rē ābāh*. In all the other cases the word is used in a similar way.

* The wording of this statement is a little misleading. It implies that רִבְבָה *rēbābāh* is used in early literature and רִבּוֹ *ribbô* in late literature. But רִבְבָה *rēbābāh* is used in late literature as well as in early. (See Cant. v, 10; Ezek. xvi, 7; and, if you like, Lev. xxvi, 8.)

† The word רִבּוֹ *ribbô* does occur once in the consonantal text of a book of the 8th century, viz.: Hos. viii, 12. But the Masorites propose a different pointing in Hos. viii, 12, reading רִבּ *rubbê*. And it is possible that they are right.

‡ They are:—Gen. xxiv, 60; Lev. xxvi, 8; Num. x, 36; Deut. xxxii, 30; xxxiii, 2, 17; Judges xx, 10; 1 Sam. xviii, 7 and 8; 1 Sam. xxi, 11 (12); xxix, 5; Ps. iii, 6 (7); xci, 7; Cant. v, 10; Ezek. xvi, 7; Mic. vi, 7.

Note that רִבְבָה *rēbābāh* is used by late writers as well as by early ones. If its use was a matter of date there was nothing to prevent the author of Jonah from using it, even though he wrote in the 3rd and 4th century B.C. But it appears to be a matter of meaning not of date.

On the other hand, the word רבו *ribbô*, which occurs elsewhere nine times in Hebrew (once in the Aramaic of Daniel),* in the Old Testament is nearly always (two exceptions) used for a definite number, ten thousand. Take, for example, Neh. vii, 66: "The whole congregation together was forty and two thousand three hundred and three score," where רבוא ארבע רבוא 'ar^eba' ribbô, etc., stands for the definite number forty thousand. In the other six cases the word is used in the same way.

(15) This distinction between the use of רבבה *r^ebābāh* and רבו *ribbô* is not specifically mentioned in the *Oxford Hebrew Dictionary* nor, as far as the writer knows, anywhere else. However, the passages are all given (see notes † on p. 48 and * below), and anyone who has a Hebrew concordance and will look at it can see for himself whether the distinction exists or does not. It plainly does. But the author of the Book of Jonah clearly meant in iv, 11, to give the actual number of the inhabitants of Nineveh who could not discern between their right hand and their left hand.† He gives it as more than sixscore thousand persons (literally more than twelve ten-thousand), רבו אדם משהים עשרה רבוא har^ebēh mis^etēm-^ees^erēh ribbô 'ādām. רבו *ribbô* was, therefore, exactly the right word to use; if the author had used רבבה *r^ebābāh* he would have run the risk of conveying the idea of a large indefinite number which clearly was not his intention. It follows that the use of רבו *ribbô* here is no certain sign of late date.

(16) The writer has only room to refer to one other word. That is the word טעם *ta'am* (iii, 7) given as part of the language of the King in Nineveh as describing the "decree" of himself and his grandees.

* They are:—1 Chron. xxix, 7; Ezra ii, 64, 69; Neh. vii, 66; vii, 72; Dan. xi, 12; Hos. viii, 12; Neh. vii, 7 (pl.); Ps. lxxviii, 17 (18) (pl); and in the Aramaic of Dan. vii, 10. In this Aramaic it is a large indefinite number, *not* as it is used in Jonah.

† The advanced critics treat this as only referring to children, and children under three years of age. This is by no means certain. Many adult Orientals do not use the distinction, and in consequence children much older than three years of age would not be taught it. Of course, *all* children have to be taught it.

In the Old Testament this word only occurs, elsewhere in the sense of "decree" in passages written in Aramaic. It is therefore treated by all the five advanced Bible critics mentioned above (para. (11)) as a decisive proof of the late date of the book.

But there seems good reason to think that the word טַעַם ta'am is an Assyrian word. A word תַּאמַר ta'amu = command, rule, but written with ט t (= tau) not ט t (= teth), is given in Mr. L. W. King's glossary to his *First Steps in Assyrian*. I also learn from the eminent Assyriologist, Mr. T. G. Pinches, that there is an Assyrian noun tēmu, meaning, among other things, "command." Mr. Pinches says,* in comparing Hebrew words with Assyrian:—"The occurrence of the form tēmu, is due to the phonetic rule that ayin changes into a mere breathing or even disappears altogether, whilst the vowels accompanying it are usually e e, or a contraction into a single vowel ê." Thus an Assyrian noun tēmu would seem to correspond to the Hebrew noun טַעַם ta'am used by the author of the Book of Jonah.

The word טַעַם tēem is used many times in the Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel for "decrees" of Cyrus, Darius, Artaxerxes and Belshazzar made in Babylon. It would seem, therefore, that the Jews brought home the word on their return from the Babylonian Exile. But the ascription of the word to the King in Nineveh in the 8th century B.C. may well be taken as a report by Jonah of the actual language used by the King in announcing his "decree" for fasting, mourning and prayer. At all events, it is, in the circumstances, no proof at all of a post-exilic date for the book.

(17) There are other words like these, such as מִנְהָה minnāh, the Piel of מָנַח, עֲמַל, שָׁתַק, mānāh, 'āmal, sātaq and others. The writer thinks it possible to show that all these were used in Hebrew which some advanced Biblical critics allow to have been early. But to do so would require far more room than the writer can use, for this purpose, in this essay. It is, however, true that these words are used very seldom in early Hebrew, and frequently in late Hebrew. But it must be remembered that the occurrence of a few (say three or four) words of this description is not sufficient ground for assigning a late date to the Hebrew in which they occur, especially if the Hebrew is that of a writer of Northern Israel.

* In a letter *penes me*.

(18) In the days of Ahab-ben-Omri (877–855 B.C.), who married a Tyrian* princess, Jezebel, there must have been many Phœnician-speaking people in the Court of Samaria, and Phœnician is an Aramaic language. The relations between Syria and the Northern Kingdom were frequent and close; there must have often been embassies from Damascus to Samaria and from Samaria to Damascus, and much intercourse in periods of alliance between Syria and Israel. The language of Syria, of course, was typical Aramaic. That all this must have had a considerable linguistic influence is clear: attention is drawn to the fact by Driver (*L.O.T.*, p. 188 *n.*) where he says of the *narratives* of Kings: "These narratives are written mostly in a bright and chaste Hebrew style, though some of them exhibit slight peculiarities of diction," and he appends in a note twelve examples, "due doubtless in part to their North Israelitish origin. Their authors were, in all probability, prophets—in most cases prophets belonging to the Northern Kingdom. . ."

This passage, read with what Driver says (p. 322) about the language of the Book of Jonah, shows that his very strongly worded assertion as to the date of that book rests upon the instances quoted by him "taken as a whole." If the eight instances quoted by him are reduced to three or four, themselves somewhat doubtful, there is reason to suppose that he would have greatly modified his language. This may also be gathered from what he says about the Book of Ruth, p. 454 and note †, and in the passages, pp. 455 and 459. In speaking of Aramaisms and late expressions, he says:—"It may be remembered that words with Aramaic or late Hebrew affinities occur, at least, sporadically in passages admittedly of early date . . . it is possible that the book," *i.e.* the Book of Ruth, ". . . was written in the Northern Kingdom and preserves words current there dialectically," p. 455. And on p. 449 he says, speaking of Northern Israel, "where there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Judah."

The result of all this is that, in the writer's opinion, not one of the words and phrases adduced can be regarded as *decisive* of a late date for the Book of Jonah.

(19) But there is another side to the argument based on linguistic considerations. The Book of Jonah is assigned by different advanced Biblical critics to different post-exilic dates

* Or Zidonian.

from about 450 B.C. to about 300 B.C. Most seem to favour a date in the 4th century B.C. How do the words and idioms in the book fit *that* date? There are abundant means of judging. The Books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah and the Book of Esther are, like the Book of Jonah, narratives, and are written at various times after the Exile. They often rest on older documents incorporated in them. Now they are *full* of words and idioms used only by very late writers. There is no need to dwell very much on this. It will be universally admitted. Driver, dealing with the Books of Chronicles, catalogues (pp. 535-539) forty-six instances of such linguistic usage and says the list is not exhaustive. Indeed, he adds many more on pp. 539 and 540, and gives on pp. 505 and 553 a description of the style of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Nothing in the least resembling all this is to be found in the Book of Jonah, and, speaking generally, nothing could be found more unlike the linguistic style of these books than the style of the Book of Jonah. Driver himself says:—"The diction" of the Book of Jonah "is, however, purer generally than that of Esther or the Chronicles."* It appears to the writer, in view of the facts just noted, that this should be expressed in much stronger language.

How, then, can the Book of Jonah have been written at any time when the development of the Hebrew language had reached such a stage as to make the style of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles and Esther the natural form for a narrative to take? Such a supposition is opposed to the history of the course of development of Hebrew.

(20) The conclusion to which all these considerations point is that, as far as its linguistic style goes, it is highly improbable that the Book of Jonah was written at any date after the Exile, and not at all improbable that it may have been written at some such date as 750 or 760 B.C. when Jonah was alive and prophesying.

(21) But it is quite possible to go one step further. Many critics, both conservative and advanced (*e.g.* Perowne, Ellicott, Driver, Cornill, Budde), have noticed the resemblance "in form and content" between the Book of Jonah and the "prophetic narratives" of the Books of Kings. It appears to the writer that a similar resemblance exists between the vocabulary

* See also Cheyne, *Encycl. Bib.*, col. 2566, to the same effect.

and phrases of the two. There are about 260 different Hebrew words used in the Book of Jonah. Of these there are only 30 which are not used in the Books of Samuel and those of Kings. And if it be remembered that these 30 words include the four words (mentioned in para. (12)) which occur nowhere else in the Old Testament, as well as a number of poetical words in the Psalm in chapter ii, 2 (3); 9 (10) which could hardly occur in prose narratives, it will be seen that the 30 words are reduced to about 20. No doubt many of these 260 words, like דָּג, גְּדוֹל, עֵיר, יָם, נָתַן, נֶפֶשׁ, dāg, gādōl, 'ir, yām, nātan, nefes, and very many others, are common words, to be found in the books of all Hebrew writers of every age. But there are others not of this kind, *e.g.* סֶעַר sō'er (Jonah i, 11; 2 Kings vi, 11), סוּף sūf (Jonah ii, 6; 1 Kings ix, 26); נָקִיא nāqī' (Jonah i, 14; 1 Kings xv, 22); קָדָם qādām (Jonah iv, 2; 2 Kings xix, 32); אֲדַרְתָּ 'adderet (Jonah iii, 6; 1 Kings xix, 13, etc.); קֶשֶׁב qeseb (Jonah ii, 7; 1 Kings vii, 37) and others, quae nunc perscribere longum est.

Then, too, there are a good number of phrases and forms not in universal use in Hebrew, but common to Jonah and the Books of Samuel and Kings. Among these are the following:—

1. אָנִי 'anī (5 t.) and אֲנֹכִי 'anôkī (2 t.) side by side. In Kings the proportion is 44·5, but אֲנֹכִי anôkī is hardly to be found in late narrative.
2. אוּלַי 'ūlay (Jonah i, 6; 9 t. in Sam. and Kings, but very seldom in post-exilic writers.
3. מַאֵין mē 'ayin (Jonah i, 8; 2 Kings v, 25, etc.), but very seldom in undoubtedly later writers.
4. אֵי מִצֶּה תָבוּא 'ê mizzeh tāb'ō (Jonah i, 8; 2 Sam. i, 3, etc.). In no late writer except Job ii, 2.
5. מֵאוּמָה m'ūmah (Jonah iii, 7; Sam. and Kings 14 t.; a few times in Num. (P); 2 Chron. and Eccles., but not apparently common.
6. עֲבָרִי 'ib' rī (Jonah i, 9; often in 1 Sam., later only Jer. 3 t.).
7. Perhaps מִנְגֵד min-neged (Jonah ii, 5), Sam. and Kings 5 t.; rather infrequent.
8. There is also the phrase אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ 'īs 'el-rē'ehū (Jonah i, 7; 1 Sam. x, 11, etc.; 2 Kings vii, 3, etc.).

This list might no doubt be extended.

This resemblance between the linguistic phenomena of the Book of Jonah and those of the Books of Samuel and Kings seems to the writer striking. He does not wish to press the argument too far lest he is being misled by an insufficient knowledge of Hebrew language and idiom. But he cannot think that he is altogether wrong.

(22) The next point to be considered is the relegation to a late date of the Book of Jonah based upon the references in it to Nineveh. The first of these is that the tense of the Hebrew verb used in chap. iii, 3, about Nineveh הָיְתָה (hāy^etāh) shows that that city had ceased to exist when the Book of Jonah was written. König emphatically says this, and Cheyne (p. 2566, sec. 1, 5) and Bewer (pp. 13 and 53) follow him. The latter says (p. 53), "The perfect הָיְתָה hāy^etāh shows* that Nineveh is a thing of the past to the narrator."

This language can only be justified if such a signification is inherent in the perfect tense of הָיָה hāyāh. And of this the writer will, with due respect but quite confidently, affirm that it is not the case. And this confidence is due to the fact that he can support his denial on the clear statements of eminent Hebrew grammarians, on very numerous examples taken from the Hebrew writers of the Bible in books of all ages, and on other evidence.

It is, of course, true that if a narrator is speaking of something long past, the perfect tense is an appropriate one to use. There is, in Hebrew, no pluperfect tense, and so, if the author of the book intended to say, Now Nineveh *had been* an extraordinarily great city, הָיְתָה hāy^etāh would be a suitable word to use.

But this is not the argument at all. The argument is that the word הָיְתָה hāy^etāh of itself conveys that meaning and could not be used without conveying it. This is, beyond all doubt, not true.

Gesenius (Heb. Gram., sec. 106, 1, d.) says :—" More particularly the use of the perfect may be distinguished as follows : . . . (d) as a simple *tempus historicum* (corresponding to the Greek aorist) in narrating past events " (all the facts of the Book of Jonah were, of course, past when its story was told). He gives examples, but the

* The italics are mine.

following is more to my point:—Gen. iii, 1 ; וְהַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוּם מִכָּל הַחַיָּה הַשָּׂדֶה, w^e hannaḥas hāyāh ‘ārūm mikkōl ḥa-yyat, &c., “Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field,” &c. Does this mean that in the opinion of the Jews, when this was written, the serpent was more subtil in the Garden of Eden, but had long ceased to be so ?

Gesenius goes on to say (sec. 106, 1, d., remark):—“As the above examples indicate, the perfect of *narration* occurs especially at the head of an entire narrative—or of an independent sentence—but in co-ordinate sentences, as a rule, only when the verb is separated from the copulative ו waw by one or more words. In other cases, the narrative is continued by the imperfect consecutive according to sec. iii (a).” The section iii (a) mentioned runs:—“. . . as a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with ו waw consecutive, e.g. Gen. iii, 1.” This exactly describes the Hebrew of Jonah iii, 3 (following). The co-ordinate sentence begins:—“וַיִּקַּם יוֹנָה . . . וַיִּנְיָהּ . . . וַיִּקְרָא . . . וַיִּהְיֶה . . . וַיִּהְיֶה עִיר־גְּדֹלָהּ . . . וַיִּהְיֶה . . . וַיִּקְרָא . . . w^eNin^weh hay^etāh (perfect) ‘īr g^edōlāh . . . wayyāḥel (imperfect with ו waw) . . . wayyiq^{rā} (imperfect with ו waw) . . .”

See to the same effect Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, ii, 8, 9, 10 and 12,* and Robertson's translation of Müller's *Hebrew Syntax* (I, i, 1).

Examples can be quoted by the dozen from the Old Testament writers of all ages of the use of the perfect of הָיָה hāyāh without any implication of something long past which had ceased to be. The following are a few such cases:—Gen. xviii, 12; xxxvi, 12; Exod. xvi, 24; Deut. iii, 4; Exod. xvi, 13; xxxvi, 7; Judges xxi, 3, 5; Ruth i, 7; 1 Sam. iv, 7, 17; v, 11; xiv, 20; xiv, 38; 2 Sam. xiv, 27; 1 Kings ii, 15; Mal. i, 9; Eccles. vi, 3; Esther ii, 20; Ezra viii, 31; and there are many others.

(23) These authorities seem to the writer conclusively to establish that there is nothing in the use of the perfect tense of הָיָה hāyāh in Jonah iii, 3, which goes to show that, in the view of the

* Driver has exhaustively scrutinised the use of the tenses in Hebrew and thrown great light on their exact meaning. It is to be noted that though he thinks the language of the Book of Jonah points to a date after the Exile, he does not use the tense of הָיָה hāyāh as in any way supporting that opinion.

narrator, Nineveh had long ceased to exist. If this meaning is to be fastened upon the words used it must be got from the description of Nineveh as an exceeding great city of three days' journey (or walk = מַהְלָךְ *mahaḥlāk*, chap. iii, 3); or from the language about it ascribed to the Deity:—"Nineveh that great city; wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle" (Jonah iv, 11).*

As regards the first of these descriptions, König insists in the most magisterial way that the "three days' walk" must be the diameter (*durchmesser*) [Einleitung, sec. 77; 2 (p. 380)], and not the circumference of the city. He assigns no reason for this decision, but simply says that Schrader, who held the opposite view, is wrong.†

The *Oxford Dictionary*, to a certain extent confirms König's view, for it speaks of מַהְלָךְ *mahaḥlāk* as meaning a journey in "diameter or length," *i.e.*, I suppose, that the movement indicated is progressive and not circular.

It seems to the writer that there is no sufficient reason for saying at all positively what the "three days' walk" stands for, whether "measure through" or along the straight sides, or something else. All that we can be really certain of is that it was used to indicate an area of large size. But as Jonah's task evidently was to make known to all the persons to whom the doom was threatened the fate that awaited them, it would seem only reasonable to suppose that the "three days' walk" described the amount of walking necessary to bring the knowledge of the message to all whom it was likely to affect. This is the deliberate opinion of Commander Jones, who made a trigonometrical survey of the district. He says (*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. xv, p. 315) that this language describes "the character of the Ninevite abodes, separate yet contiguous to each other; for the term 'journey' . . . implies a going out from one to the other, for the necessary visitation demanded by the mission of the prophet." And he further records (p. 315, note (1)) :—From Nineveh "to Nimrūd in

* The advanced critics treat this as only referring to children, and children under three years of age. This is by no means certain. Many adult Orientals do not use the distinction, and in consequence children much older than three years of age would not be taught it. Of course, *all* children have to be taught it. (See note, p. 49.)

† See also Cheyne, *Encycl. Bib.*, col. 2566, to the same effect.

round numbers is 18 miles ; thence to Khorsabad about 28, and back to Nineveh by the road 14 miles." The total of these distances is just 60 miles, or three days' journey.

The whole area governed by these cities he gives as 350 square miles which, as he says, could easily accommodate 600,000 people, together with great herds of sheep and cattle. The area of Greater London is said to be 315 square miles.

(24) The advanced Biblical critics appear to insist that anyone writing or speaking of Nineveh in the 8th century B.C. *must* be taken to refer to the fortified area surrounded by a wall. This area is shown by Commander Jones's survey to have been 1,800 acres, rather less, that is, than three square miles. This area corresponds accurately with the circumference of the walled city spoken of in Sennacherib's inscriptions (see Cuneiform Tablets from the British Museum, L. W. King). This is about half the area of the Rome surrounded by a wall by the Emperor Aurelian in the end of the 3rd century, A.D. It would indicate a population of about 100,000, to say nothing of much cattle, and could under no circumstances be described as a phenomenally large city. And, further, this fortified area did not exist until after 705 B.C., the year of Sennacherib's accession to the throne of Assyria. He tells us expressly that his predecessors had not walled in Nineveh, but that *he* built the walls, taking in some of the surrounding country.

Anyone who before 705 B.C. referred to this walled area would be convicted of ante-dating the building of the walls.

(24A) The question therefore, is this. Could anyone writing in the 8th century B.C. speak of Nineveh as of huge size ? As to this we have evidence. Gen. x, 11, is part of the document known to Biblical critics as J. The dates assigned to it by different Biblical critics vary from the reign of Solomon (977-937 B.C.) to about 760 or 750 B.C. At all events, no one puts it later than 750 B.C.*

In or before 750 B.C., therefore, it was stated (Gen. x, 11 and 12), "Out of that land" (*i.e.* Shinar) "he" (*i.e.* Nimrod) "went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh and Rehoboth-Ir and Calah and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city)." הָעִיר הַגְּדֹלָה Hū' hā'ir haggē'dōlāh are the Hebrew words used, and they are the exact words used three times in the Book of Jonah (i, 2 ; iii, 2 ; iv, 11). It is quite probable that the words were taken from J.

* Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, pp. 67, 73 and 74.

(25) We come next to the prophecy of Nahum. It is agreed by Biblical critics of all schools that the part of this prophecy which relates to Nineveh (ii, 1, 3—end) was delivered in the latter half of the 7th century B.C. The point with which we are concerned is that all Nahum's references to Nineveh describe it as a city of great size and importance. Nineveh is expressly compared to No-Ammon, the Egyptian Thebes (Nahum iii, 8), which was renowned for its size, the magnificence of its buildings and the multitude of its inhabitants.* The fortresses of Nineveh are spoken of (iii, 12 and 14), and she is said to have "multiplied her merchants above the stars of heaven," and the inhabitants are compared to the countless numbers of a locust swarm [*The International Critical Commentary on Nahum* says, on p. 15:—"The prophet now turns . . . towards the almost innumerable mass of the population within Nineveh"] . . . while the "crowned" are said to be "like locusts" (iii, 17) and the marshals (or scribes) like swarms of grasshoppers (*ibid.*).

(26) All this language is impossible as regards the fortified citadel of Nineveh, comprising 1,800 acres. It seems plainly to refer to the fortified cities (or fortresses) of Nineveh, Nimrūd, Khorsabad, etc., with the population and herds of cattle of the territory between them.

The nature of the proclamation itself supports this meaning. Nineveh was to be "overthrown." Critics have noted that the word and conjugation are the same as that used in Gen. xix, 29 (P entirely dependent on J), of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. It was to be some universal catastrophe, earthquake, subterranean fires, pestilence, or the act of a devastating invader. None of these could be confined to a small part of the area known as Nineveh and not extend to the others also.

It was, therefore, quite possible, both before and after Jonah lived and prophesied, to speak of Nineveh as of very great size and with a very numerous population. So to speak of it does not require that the Book of Jonah should be relegated to a date when it may be supposed that all real remembrance of it had faded out of men's minds. Such a description might very well have been written in the middle of the 8th century B.C.

* *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xxvi, 740 (b). See also Cheyne, *Encycl. Bib.*, col. 3428. See also Pusey, *Minor Prophets* (1906), vol. v, pp. 299-309. The passage is too long to quote, but it ought to be read to realize what the comparison implied.

(27) The result of what has been advanced in paras. 12-22 and then in paras. 22-26 seems to the writer to establish that neither the linguistic style of the book, nor the size ascribed in it to Nineveh, at all require that we should carry the date when the book was written down to the 3rd or 4th century B.C. On the other hand, they are quite consistent with a date in the 8th century B.C.

(28) It is open to us, therefore, to look at the book with fresh eyes and to consider how its details appear if it be assumed to be a work of Jonah's time.

This has not been done by any of the critics mentioned in para. 11, nor, as far as the writer knows, by any other advanced Biblical critic who has treated of the book. Starting with the assumption that the book must be post-exilic, they seem to the writer to have overlooked or failed to notice many important indications.

(29) Let us begin with Jonah's embarkation on a "ship of Tarshish" and the account of the storm which soon followed.

The references in Ezek. xxvii as well as those in 1 Kings ix, 26, and x, 22, and in Psalm xlviii, 7, indicate that "ships of Tarshish" meant large, well-appointed ships, fitted for undertaking long sea-voyages and manned and navigated by Phœnician sailors. The long dissertation on the "Ships of the Ancients" in Mr. Smith of Jordanhill's volume on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* is still the chief source of information on the subject. It is, of course, true that the ships there chiefly dealt with were Alexandrian corn-ships of many hundred years later than the 8th century B.C. But the information obtained since he wrote, though scanty, goes to show that the "Tarshish ships" were of the same general type. They were of from 700 to 1,000 tons burden, and were rigged with one chief mast with a very long yard and one large sail, and were steered by two great oars, one on each side, at the stern.

The rig of one mast and one large sail threw a great strain on the planking of the ship, so that, in a heavy sea and with a strong wind, the planks were apt to open and the ship to go to pieces and founder. This was what was feared in the case of the ship on which Jonah had embarked. It was anticipated that she would break up (i, 4, הִשָּׁבֵר הַשִּׁבְרִי *hissābēr, LXX συντριβήραι*).

They had apparently started with a favourable wind; their course to pass between Sicily and Africa was about W. by N., so that their wind must have been east of N.* A frequent

* Since it is believed that they could not sail nearer the wind than about 7 points.

wind in the Eastern Mediterranean is E.N.E. With such a wind they could sail seven knots an hour, and the narrative suggests that they had gone some five or ten miles, as they afterwards attempted to row back to shore against the wind and sea. Then the Lord "hurled" a great wind upon the sea. The word used for the resulting tempest רָעַר (sa'ar) and its cognates are often translated "whirlwind" (see especially 2 Kings ii, 1), so that the storm was probably a cyclone, for cyclones are frequent in the Eastern Mediterranean (see *Encycl. Britan.*, 11th edn., vol. 10, 68 (c)). The narrative contains not a single detail unconnected with the main purpose of the story, but it dwells very much upon the "tempestuous" character of the sea and the lightening of the ship (by throwing overboard the spare gear and deck cargo), and implies that they had little or no hope of saving the ship; then in v. 13 we find the ship no longer under sail and heading for the shore. It can hardly be doubted that what happened was that the great sail had been either furled or blown to ribbons by the wind. Having very little way on her, the ship would be difficult to steer and, if kept before the wind, would be in danger of being "pooped," as the following seas would travel faster than she did and break over her stern. The ship was, therefore, brought head to wind so that she might ride over the great seas and was being rowed against the wind to give her steerage way.

(30) This, then, is the background of the picture: the sky dark with cloud, the wind blowing not less than a whole gale, and screaming through the rigging, the ship rolling and pitching furiously in a tremendous head-sea which every now and then rose high over the bows and poured down tons of water upon the deck, washing away everything and everybody not securely fastened, and the excited and panic-stricken sailors gathered round Jonah, who proclaimed himself a Hebrew who worshipped Jehovah,* God of Heaven (the storm came from the sky), but was fleeing from His face in disobedience to His command.

* The writer is aware that Jehovah is no word at all, being the consonants of one word and the vowels of another. The ugly and unfamiliar words Yahweh, or Yahwè, or Jahve, etc., are commonly used by advanced Biblical critics apparently as representing what is generally believed to be a probable pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. But the same critics invariably use the forms Jesus, John and Jacob. Yet these words were both written and pronounced Yēshū' in Aramaic and Ἰησοῦς, pronounced Yēssōos, in Greek, Yōhānān in Aramaic and Yōannēs or Yōanēs in Greek, while Jacob is always written Ya'aqōb in Hebrew. Yet these forms are never used, no doubt because the ordinary forms are familiar to us all from their use in English. That same reason seems quite sufficient to justify the use of the name Jehovah.

(31) The criticisms on this part of the narrative of various German advanced critics such as Müller, Kohler, Bohme, Budde, Kleiner, Winckler, Eichhorn, Sievers, Kuenen, Erbt and Schmidt [recorded by Bewer (sec. 5, pp. 13-21)], seem to the writer (he can find no other words) very wooden and unimaginative.

They find fault with the language, grammar and logical arrangement of the questions of the sailors, apparently forgetting who the men were (Phœnician sailors) and the situation as described above. That a mob of excited and angry sailors gathered round Jonah and feeling themselves in danger of being drowned and of losing their ship, through his fault, should one put one question and another another, not in strict logical sequence and not expressed in accurate literary grammar, and not logically following one upon another, is a "difficulty" that could hardly have occurred to anyone but a German professor who had, perhaps, never had any experience of a great storm at sea.

(32) Further, there seems a good reason why when Phœnician sailors heard that Jehovah, God of Heaven, had cause of displeasure with them, they *should* be "exceedingly afraid" (v. 10). Assuming that Jonah's voyage was somewhere about the middle of the 8th century, the wonderful scene on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii), when Elijah, in the presence of King Ahab and all Israel, put the rival claims of Jehovah and the Phœnician Baal to the test, and was answered by fire sent by Jehovah from heaven, with the subsequent slaughter of 450 Phœnician prophets of Baal, and the furious anger of the Zidonian (or Tyrian) princess, Jezebel, must have lived long in the memory of the Phœnicians of Tyre, and would hardly fail to paint itself in vivid colours on their minds.

(33) As regards the story of Elijah and Mount Carmel. The writer is, of course, aware that advanced critics regard the whole narrative as mere legend. Their choragus, De Wette, speaks of it repeatedly as mythical [Einleitung, sec. 184 (b), pp. 243 and 244] and Cornill (*Hist. of Israel, Eng. Tr.*, p. 102) calls it "pure legend." The writer does not accept this judgment, but for the purpose of his contention it need not be questioned. For that it is enough, if the sailors on the Tarshish ship had heard the story and thought that it might be true. Sailors are apt to be superstitious, and anyone who likes may put their belief down to that. The point is that they were not at all sure that it did not happen, and that a god who sent down fire from heaven might very well be pursuing a disobedient servant of his with a

tremendous storm from the same place. The phrase, God of Heaven, occurs, but is not common, in the Old Testament. Perhaps the reason why its use on this occasion is recorded arises out of what was in the sailors' minds as to the events on Mount Carmel. The advanced critics have not failed to object to the phrase as uncommon and therefore unlikely in the mouth of Jonah.

(34) The sailors, we are told, found themselves unable to make any way by rowing against the wind and the tremendous and rising seas. They were, therefore, compelled reluctantly to follow the advice of Jonah and throw him overboard. Of them we hear nothing more at that time; their action as regards the story having come to an end, they are, according to the author's manner, dismissed from the narrative without another word.*

(35) Jonah, then, was thrown into the raging sea; whether he could swim or not would not make the least difference. In such a sea no swimmer could live, and he must have expected that he would be drowned immediately. This brings us to the account of the "swallowing" of Jonah by the "great fish" and what followed.

(36) The words used (בָּלַע *bāla'* = Greek *καταπιεῖν*), (רָמַע *me'eh*, *κοιλία*) can only mean that Jonah was swallowed up and entered the intestines of the "fish." If this is taken in its strict literal sense, we have here to do with a miracle utterly inexplicable and entirely at variance with any known natural process. Sea animals are known which could swallow a man, but none in which a man who had been swallowed could remain alive and conscious for more than a minute or two. So considered, the narrative is either a pure fiction or the account of a miracle of the most stupendous character; there is nothing else to be said about it. But it appears to the writer that, granted a reasonable latitude in regard to the words "swallow" and "belly," what happened can be explained in strict accordance with the statements contained in two monographs on the Cetacea, written from a scientific standpoint by men of recognized standing as anatomists and physiologists. The first is *A Book of Whales*, by F. E. Beddard, M.A., F.R.S., and is a volume in the Progressive Science Series. The second is by A. W. Scott, M.A., and is entitled *Mammalia, Recent and Extinct*, Sec. B, Cetacea. These are the best and most recent scientific authorities on the structure and habits of whales that the writer can find. Reference is also

* Except that they offered sacrifices and made vows.

made to vol. vii of the *Naturalist's Library*, by Sir W. Jardine, F.R.S.E., dealing with Cetacea.

(37) Resting his statements down to the most minute detail upon the information contained in these works, the following is an outline of what the writer believes to have happened. Jonah when thrown overboard was washed by the rush of the storm waves into the open mouth of a huge Cetacean, one of the whalebone whales known to exist in the Mediterranean. These animals obtain their food by swimming slowly on or near the surface of the water with their jaws open; the water containing great numbers of small crustacea, medusae; etc., washes into their mouth. This is possible because the screen of whalebone opens inwards and admits solid objects to the animal's mouth. But the screen of whalebone is very fine and does not allow the egress of any solid matter but only of the water. The gullet of the animal is very small, from two to six inches in diameter, and does not allow any but very small objects to pass. Jonah was therefore imprisoned in the animal's mouth. It could not swallow him, and his egress was rendered impossible by the whalebone screen. While the whale moved with its jaws open the sea-water rushed in over Jonah and then out again through the whalebone, but at frequent intervals the whale closed its great overlapping lips, excluding the water and outer air, and "sounded," *i.e.* it settled slowly down in a horizontal position, or dived head downwards even to the bottom of the sea. The whale is an air-breathing, warm-blooded animal and could only dive in this way because of the reservoir of air in its gigantic mouth. When this air becomes unfit to breathe the animal must, and does, rise to the surface and get a fresh supply of air. As long as the diving whale had in its mouth air to breathe, Jonah, of course, had it also. During these periods he was in perfect darkness, but was warm and dry. When the whale rose to the surface he had fresh air and light, but was washed over by the sea-water which in the Mediterranean is fairly warm. These alternations of light and darkness, etc., soon showed him that he was not in danger of immediate death, though he had no water to drink and very little food that he could eat. But his faith in God, who had so wonderfully preserved him so far, gave him confidence that he was not intended ultimately to perish, and these feelings led him to utter the Psalm in chapter 2, where his physical position is exactly described, and his thanks to God and hopes for his future

alternate with one another, and are expressed in religious phraseology used by all pious Hebrews.

There is no natural reason why the situation should ever come to an end, except by the death by thirst of Jonah, or the death and stranding of the whale. But the story says that God commanded the fish (וַיֹּמֶר יְיָ לַדָּג וַיִּבֹרֶךְ) wayyō'mer Y" laḏ(dāg) and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land.

This seems to the writer a reasonable and consistent account. As usual with the author of Jonah, there is not a word more about the "fish." Whether it died, as stranded whales often do,* or slid back into deep water is not told. As it had nothing further to do with the purpose of the story, there is not another word about it.

(38) The writer will now give his authorities for all the assertions made in the last paragraph.

Whales are not only the largest of living mammals, but the largest of all animals, mammalian or otherwise, which have ever existed (Beddard, p. 2). The accounts of their length vary. Beddard, who is very careful to avoid the possibility of exaggeration, allows a length of 85 feet to *Balænoptera Sibbaldii* (Beddard, p. 1). This is a Mediterranean whale (Scott, p. 121), so is *Balæna Australis* (Beddard, p. 124). Scott (p. 121) and Jardine (p. 137) contend for a measured length of 102 feet and 105 feet. The length is important because the length of the head is given as a fraction of the whole length. That length varies from one-third in the case of *Balæna*, to two-sevenths or one-quarter in the case of *Balænoptera*. If we take a length of 85 feet and a mouth of one-quarter the length, we obtain a length for the mouth from back to front of 21 feet. The height of the mouth, when open, is obtained from the length of the whalebone, which varies from 15 feet to 10½ feet in *Balæna*, and 8 to 10 feet in *Balænoptera Sibbaldii*. The breadth of the mouth is given (Jardine, p. 77) as 10 to 12 feet. Taking all the smallest figures, we have for the dimensions of the mouth 21 feet × 8 feet × 10 feet. Of course, this space is not rectangular, and room has to be allowed for the gigantic, almost immobile (Jardine, p. 81; Scott, p. 132) tongue. But the empty space cannot

* A whale's body is from 36 to 40 feet in circumference. It would therefore require over 12 feet of water to float in; to eject Jonah on to dry land it must approach a sandy shore in much less than 12 feet, and would therefore have been stranded.

well be less than 1,000 cubic feet. The body of a man weighing $11\frac{1}{2}$ stone occupies about $2\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet. It is, therefore, no exaggeration when Scott states (p. 132) that the whale's mouth is "capable of containing a ship's jolly-boat full of men."

In Sir Michael Foster's handbook of physiology (chap. ii, p. 581) it is stated that a man requires 2,000 litres of fresh air an hour for breathing. Two thousand litres would measure two cubic metres or $70\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet. The ordinary time a whale remains under water is 10 minutes (Beddard, p. 128), but it may extend to an hour. Even in that case, the presence of a man helping to consume the air in the mouth would make no appreciable difference. Attempts made to swim across the Channel have often failed owing to the chilling of the swimmer's body by long continued immersion in the cold water of that part of the sea. But the mean surface temperature of the water of the Eastern Mediterranean is over 70° F. (*Encycl. Brit.*, edn. 11, vol. 18, p. 68 (c)), while the blood temperature of whales is very high, viz., 104° F. (Jardine, p. 52).* This would be the temperature of the air in a whale's mouth when the animal was under water. The temperature, therefore, would be quite consistent with a man's existence, even though often immersed in water.

(39) The following description of the whalebone and the manner in which whales feed is taken from Scott (pp. 132, 133 and 134). It relates to the *Balæna Mysticetus* or Right Whale, but Beddard (pp. 6 and 135; see also pp. 124, 127, 129, 131) points out that the differences between it and *Balæna Australis* are very slight. The differences between it and *Balænoptera Sibbaldii* are small and structural only, so the following description applies to them as much as to *Balæna Mysticetus*, about which it was written [see also *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. 5; 771 (b)].

Scott says (p. 60):—"The blood of all Cetaceans is warm, and consequently they are compelled to breathe the atmospheric air by means of true lungs, placed within the cavity of the chest, and have to rise periodically to the surface of the water in order to respire; should any accident frustrate this indispensable requirement they would literally be drowned."

Beddard says:—"This whale . . . swims slowly, usually at the rate of four miles an hour; but when diving they reach a velocity of seven to nine miles. This velocity is so great that

* See also the figures in *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. v, p. 770 (c), which are slightly lower.

whales have been found to dive to the bottom of water a mile in depth and to break the lower jaw by the violence of the impact [pp. 127 and 128. (See also the Badminton Library volume on *Sea Fishing*, pp. 481 and 491.)].

Scott says, speaking of *Balæna Mysticetus* (p. 132):—"The plates of baleen" (*i.e.* whalebone) "proceed from each side of the narrow upper jaw, and, spreading outwards, enclose at their lower ends the huge, soft, immovable tongue, presenting an ideal resemblance to the canvas falling from a tent-pole over a monster feather-bed."

(40) Two more extracts must suffice:—"The small marine animals on which these Cetaceans feed cover in the aggregate" (*i.e.* in the Arctic Ocean alone) "some 20,000 square miles of the surface of the open ocean. They are also very abundant elsewhere. . . . In feeding, the lower jaw is let down and the rate of speed increased; the huge cavity thus urged along secures, like a fisherman's net, a rich harvest of insect game. This operation being often repeated, the combined proceeds of the several hauls serve at length to satisfy the capacious maw of the monster" (Scott, p. 133.)

The structure and action of the whalebone is thus (pp. 132 and 133) described by Beddard:—"The length and delicate structure of the baleen provides an efficient strainer or hair sieve, by which the water can be drained off . . . the long slender brush-like ends of the whalebone blades, when the mouth is closed, fold back, the front ones passing below the hinder ones in a channel lying between the tongue and the bone of the lower jaw. When the mouth is opened, their elasticity causes them to straighten out like a bow that is unbent, so that at whatever distance the jaws are separated, the strainer remains in perfect action, filling the whole of the interval; the mechanical perfection of the arrangement is completed by the great development of the lower lip, which rises stiffly above the jaw-bone, and prevents the long, slender, flexible ends of the baleen being carried outwards by the rush of water from the mouth, when its cavity is being diminished by the closure of the jaws and raising of the tongue.

"The food thus filtered off by the action of the whalebone and the raising of the tongue and shutting of the jaws is left stranded upon the gigantic tongue and then swallowed down the narrow throat. It is accordingly not advantageous that this tongue should be mobile and muscular; it is, as a matter of

fact, mainly formed of a mass of spongy fat intermixed with sinewy flesh."

(41) There is one other detail which, comparatively unimportant in itself, acquires great importance from a verse in the Psalm in chap. ii, viz., v. 5, which runs: "The deep was round about me; the weeds were wrapped about my head."

All the critics find this line very difficult. Cheyne calls it "odd and certainly corrupt" (*Studia Biblica* (Jonah)), and proposes, as his manner is, to alter nearly all the Hebrew words. But it appears to the writer that the following observations of a naturalist on the food of the whale furnish a simple and appropriate explanation.

The American naturalist, Dr. Gray, says of a great whale which he calls *Megaptera Americana* . . . "they feed much upon grass (*Zostera*) growing at the bottom of the sea; in their great bag of maw he found two or three hogsheads of a greenish grassy matter" (Scott, p. 130), and Scott himself says:—"These huge Cetaceans derive their sustenance by preying upon the vast hordes of small beings of diversified natures congregated within and around the large area of Gulfweed (*Sargassum bacciferum*) collected midway in the Atlantic (p. 129) . . . (p. 130) by feeding upon the sea-wrack (note: *Zosteraceæ* seen at low water on the rocks of all countries in the world) or may be upon the floating Gulfweed itself. . . ." Scott is, of course, correct in speaking of the "floating Gulfweed" as the food of any whale. That, like other vegetation, requires light and could not grow "at the bottom of the sea." Nor could any whale feed upon anything "at the bottom of the sea." It has to keep its mouth shut tight when under water.

But there is no reason to doubt Dr. Gray's observation, though his explanation is not correct in its details. And both *Zostera marina* and *Sargassum bacciferum* are abundant in the Mediterranean [see *Encycl. Brit.*, art. Malta, vol. 17, p. 508 (b)].

The observation, of course, only refers to a whale of the genus *Megaptera*. But Beddard says that *Megaptera*, which is one of the *Balænopteridæ*, is not widely removed in its structural character from *Balænoptera* (p. 162), and the details which he gives about it (pp. 162-168) give no reason to suppose that it differs from *Balænoptera Sibbaldü* or even *Balæna Australis* in its feeding. The only difference is likely to be in the quantity of gulf-weed swallowed by a whale living on the outskirts of

the Sargasso Sea, which would probably be larger in amount than that which would be carried into the mouth of a whale in the Mediterranean, where the weed would be floating in smaller patches. But it would be quite likely to be taken into the whale's mouth for the reason assigned above by Scott, and when so taken in would be certain to settle on or near the head of a man almost submerged in the sea-water in which the "weed" was floated in.

(42) The very great difficulty found by all the critics in explaining this line makes it the height of improbability that such a detail should be introduced by anyone who had not undergone the experience.

(43) We are now ready to apply all these facts to the narrative and especially to the Psalm in chap. ii. When Jonah was thrown overboard into the raging sea, he must have expected to be drowned immediately (see para. (35)). He found himself instead swept inside a huge "fish" where he would soon realize that he was no longer in danger of drowning. The sailors on board the ship saw him disappear into "the fish" and never at that time reappear. Neither they nor he need be credited with any knowledge of anatomy; it cannot be surprising that they, and even he, thought, and perhaps said, that he had been "swallowed." As the whale moved along with its mouth open the water came rushing over him in torrents and rushed out again; but the whalebone screen kept him from going out with the water, and the whale's gullet being very small, two to four or six inches wide, he could not be swallowed.

This situation closely fits the verse (ii, 3):—

“For Thou didst cast me into the depth, in the heart of
the seas,
And the flood [literally the stream (נָהָר *nāhār*)] was round
about me;
All Thy waves and Thy billows passed over me.”

The word נָהָר *nāhār* accurately describes the inflow and out-flow of the sea-water. The words used for wave (מִשְׁבָּר *mis̄bār*) and billow (גַּל *gal*) are specially used of the billows of the sea (*Oxford Heb. Dict.*, s.v.).

All this time, however, Jonah was in the fresh air and light. Then the whale "sounded"; its great lips closed tight, the light and outer air was shut out with the water and Jonah felt himself sinking, sinking down, possibly to the very bottom of the sea.

He would estimate the depth by the time taken in sinking and possibly by the whale's grounding on the sea-floor. Now שְׁאוֹל s'ôl, to the Jews, was the underworld of darkness.

“Out of the belly of Sheol, cried I,
And Thou heardest my voice.” (v. 2.)

and again—

“The abyss (תְּהוֹם t'hôm) was round about me.” (v. 5.)

“I went down to the bottoms (clefts) of the mountains;
Yet hast Thou brought up my life from the pit, O Lord
my God.” (v. 6.)

Bewer says (p. 46):—“The Hebrews believed that the earth was founded upon the subterranean ocean (Ps. xxiv, 2) and that the ends of the mountains, the pillars of the earth, went deep down to its foundations” (cf. Ps. xviii, 16).

And then the whale rose again to the surface and the fresh air and light flowed in:—

“I called by reason of my affliction unto the Lord,
And He answered me.” (v. 2.)

“When my life fainted within me,
I remembered the Lord:
And my prayers came in unto Thee,
Into Thine Holy Temple” (v. 7.)

And so the hours and even days went on and the prophet realized his wonderful deliverance and merciful preservation, and how useless it was to attempt to escape from Jehovah, who had his messengers in the storm from heaven, the waves of the sea and the monstrous sea-animal. But so great a deliverance made his faith strong that he would not be left to perish. The psalm ends on the key-note of faith and gratitude on which it began.

“I called by reason of mine affliction unto the Lord,
And He answered me” (in v. 1).

and the close and sum of all is:—

“But I will sacrifice unto Thee with the voice of thanksgiving,
I will pay that which I have vowed.”

(The critics complain that he has not told us that he has vowed anything!)

“Salvation is of the LORD.”

(44) Now let us hear the advanced critics. This psalm, they say, is one of thanksgiving, but thanks are quite inappro-

priate "in the belly of the fish" before Jonah was cast up on dry land. Possibly the writer of the book did not write any psalm, or if he did, he inserted it in the wrong place. If he did not write it, some one else saw that some thanksgiving was required by the story and he composed the Psalm (a mere cento from other late Psalms), but he, too, put it in the wrong place. It must be shifted to follow verse 10.

These writers call on us for gratitude because they enable us to understand the Bible better.

Let the reader judge!

It seems necessary here to say a little more about the Psalm. It contains some short Hebrew phrases which are also to be found in other Psalms. These are stated by advanced Biblical critics to be all post-exilic.

If this dating is correct—which is assuming a great deal, since the dating of the great majority of the Psalms as post-exilic rests upon very flimsy and subjective grounds—then, since the references in Jonah's psalm clearly fit the specific circumstances in which he found himself in the whale's mouth, his must be the original and the other psalms must be taken to be quotations from Jonah's psalm.

If, on the other hand, some of them (as seems probable to the writer) were before Jonah's psalm, what more likely than that Jonah, struck by the correspondence of phrases in them to his own wonderful experience, should clothe his own thoughts in their familiar and sacred phraseology. It has been the practice of pious men in all ages.

(45) There are several Psalms which strongly suggest that the author had Jonah's psalm in mind when writing. To bring out the resemblance would require a detailed comparison of words which the space allotted for this Essay renders impossible. The writer will only mention Ps. cvii, 23-31, where the thoughts are very similar, and there are 14 Hebrew words which correspond.

Other instances are Ps. lv, 6-8; cxxxix, 9; and cxlviii, 8. They are only mentioned as showing the impression made upon the minds of Hebrew poets by the narrative in the Book of Jonah.

(46) There remains the incident of the "gourd" (קִיקְיֹן *qiqyôn*) in the fourth chapter. No one really knows what the name קִיקְיֹן *qiqyôn* means. It is explained in the margin of the R.V. as the Palma Christi, botanically *Ricinus Communis* or Castor-oil plant. The grounds of this identification are chiefly

philological, seem very weak, and are rejected by Dr. Post, the writer of the article "Gourd" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. He believes that קִיקְיֹן *qiqyôn* meant a vine of some kind, and identifies it with the bottle-gourd, *Cucurbita lagenaria*, "which," he says, "it is quite customary to plant by . . . booths. It grows very rapidly and its broad leaves form an excellent shade." (See also *Encycl. Bib.*, art. "Gourd.") But this suggestion hardly satisfies the conditions. The description of the plant is given in words attributed to Jehovah. They are הָיָה שֶׁבִּין לַיְלָה וְבִין לַיְלָה הָיָה (= which existed the son of a night) וְבִין לַיְלָה אָבָד (= and perished the son of a night). The question is what this phrase בִּין לַיְלָה *bin-lay^elâh* means. Bewer says (p. 64) that it is idiomatic and translates it, as the R.V. does, "which had grown (or came up) in one night and in another night it perished." But this does not fit the facts of the story. Verse 7 says that the "worm" which God had prepared when the morning rose killed the plant which ceased to afford shade to Jonah when the sun grew hot. The "perishing," therefore, was between sunrise and mid-day and had nothing to do with the night. If, then, the word בִּין לַיְלָה *bin-lay^elâh* in the second half of the phrase does not mean that the plant perished in the night, as it obviously did not, there does not seem any reason for supposing that in the first half of the phrase it meant that the plant grew up in the night. *And, in fact, plants do not grow in the night-time. The circulation of water, beginning with its absorption from the soil by the roots to its expiration by the stomata of the leaves, and the chemical changes which it causes in the protoplasm, only take place under the influence of the sun's light. The growth of the plant at all in the night, and still more its growth so as to cover the roof of the hut and shade it, in one single night, are quite opposed to any natural process. If we are to accept them it must be as an absolute and inexplicable "miracle." But the narrative (apart from the idiomatic phrase) does not require any miracle. The point of this incident in the story does not depend in any way upon any *sudden growth* of the plant. It is simply that the grateful relief given to the prophet by the leafy covering of the hut was suddenly and unexpectedly snatched away from him. He had been very grateful to GOD

* See Mr. E. J. Sewell's general answer in the discussion.

for the relief, and was deeply moved by the sudden and, as it seemed, gratuitous removal.

It seems, therefore, to the writer that the metrical and antithetic form of the description allows us to suppose that the phrase was a quotation or a well-known saying, and that the words meant that the relief was sudden and unexpected, and that its withdrawal was equally sudden and unexpected.

If, on the other hand, there was a miracle in the growth of the plant in one night, it is a miracle for the working of which no reason can be assigned either in fact or on the supposition that the story was a pious fiction.

This interpretation of what occurred is borne out by the use in this fourth chapter of the word יָמַן y^eman=prepared or appointed, three times, *i.e.* of the "gourd," the "worm" and the "sultry wind." When used about the whale, the word appeared to indicate that the whale was a natural object and acted as whales usually do. The point was that God brought it there at the necessary time and place. So, here, the "worm" and the "sultry wind" were natural objects functioning in their usual way. The point with them also is, that God brought them there to perform their natural functions at the necessary time and place. So when it is said that God "prepared" a gourd, the meaning seems to be that it grew up there in a natural way, and all that was "prepared" was that it should shade the prophet's hut just when that relief was required at that place.

(47) This brings us, therefore, to the general question of miracles.

That miracles are not *à priori* impossible is emphatically stated by Huxley (*Essays*, vol. v, p. 135 *et al.*) and acknowledged by Mill. Huxley, speaking as an expert in biological science, and as a philosophical thinker, condemns the definition of a miracle as a transgression or violation of the laws of Nature. "That definition," he says, "is self-contradictory" (*Men of Letters Series: Hume*, p. 133). And Mill, from the point of view of inductive logic, comes to the conclusion that miracles cannot be regarded as impossible.

The *à priori* possibility of miracles may, Huxley insists, be regarded as a closed question. The same conclusion is stated by a profound modern thinker, Dr. J. R. Illingworth. Speaking of the attempt to account for the universe by a process of purely material evolution, he says:—"And those who nowadays hold miracles suspect represent a survival of this opinion which is already," in 1915, "somewhat out of date, while the philosophy

which made it logical has been generally abandoned" (*The Gospel Miracles*, p. 165).

The space at the writer's disposal for this Essay is strictly limited, and the general question of miracles is somewhat beside the mark (see para. 50 *seq.*), but he cannot omit calling attention to this whole chapter (Miracles and Modern Thought) as well as to the argument in chapter viii, that man knows himself to be free to choose what he will do, and that *à fortiori* God cannot be anything else than free to decide what He will do. He would also like to call attention to Dr. Gore's statement of the same argument in his *Belief in God* (pp. 234-238).

(48) The writer will nevertheless dwell a little upon the opinions of Mill and Huxley on the principle of Cicero's legal dictum, "Habemus optimum testimonium confitentem reum." But we must carefully note what these two "accused" do "confess." It is that it cannot be asserted *à priori* that miracles are impossible, but, a miracle being defined as "a wonderful event transcending or contradicting ordinary experience," the evidence that it did occur must be strong in proportion to the quantity and frequency of the experience which it transcends or contradicts. In particular, both writers emphatically assert that there is no known alleged miracle which is supported by evidence sufficient to establish the fact of its occurrence. This assertion, of course, includes, and is intended to include, the Resurrection of our Lord.

(49) It follows that the ground is shifted from the possibility to the credibility of miracles. What we have to consider is the evidence on which any miracle and therefore all miracles ought to be believed. But the grounds for belief taken into account must be *all* the grounds for belief. This is where Huxley's argument seems seriously misleading and insufficient. He says (*Hume*, p. 134): "If a man assured me that he saw a centaur trotting down Piccadilly, I should emphatically decline to credit his statement," and then after considering some kinds of evidence of such a statement that might be adduced, he continues: "Indeed I hardly know what testimony would satisfy me of the existence of a live centaur."

It is to be observed that the instance taken is that of an isolated fact, a sort of laboratory experiment, entirely disconnected from anything that preceded or followed. And, further, it is to be noted that it ignores the case in which Huxley himself should have seen the centaur, closely examined it

live, feed, and act in his company over an extended period of time, and had learnt a long history as to how so unusual an animal came to exist.

To take this instance, so limited, as a typical specimen of a miracle is to ignore the facts. The Resurrection, for instance, cannot be separated from the history of the Jewish nation which led up to it, and the history of the church for nearly two thousand years up to the present day, which has followed it. The subject is a very tempting one, but, as will be pointed out, is apart from the special subject of this paper.

(50) Miracles have been divided by De Quincey (vol. vii, *Wks.*, 1862, pp. 231-237) into three classes. The first two of these are (1) Constituent Miracles which are bound up with Christianity, such as the Incarnation and Resurrection, and (2) Evidential Miracles which simply *prove* Christianity. To those who witnessed them their evidential character was absolute. The blind man whose eyes were opened, or the leper who was instantaneously cured, were as certain of the miracles as they were of the fact that they had been blind and leprous. To us, however, their evidential character is complicated by considerations as to the reliance which can be placed on the testimony on which we receive them.

The miracles narrated in the Book of Jonah belong to De Quincey's third class, which he names Internal Miracles, miracles for the individual, which go on within the consciousness of each separate man.

With regard to these miracles, it must be noted that while to those to whom they are vouchsafed their certainty is as great as in the case of the blind man whose eyes were opened, that certainty is absolutely incommunicable. It is of their essence to be so incommunicable. But that does not defeat their purpose. They are "meant for the private forum of each man's consciousness," and when they have served him they have discharged their whole purpose. Of this kind is the miracle detailed in the first verse of the Book of Jonah:—"The word of the Lord came unto Jonah, . . . saying, 'Arise, go to Nineveh, . . . and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before Me.'"

There can be no doubt that this is an explicit announcement of a miraculous communication; but its truth could only be known to Jonah himself.

(51) The distinction so drawn holds of the other miraculous

events narrated in the Book of Jonah. They were not evidential and, in that sense, were not meant for us, for they rest upon the evidence of the prophet himself (either direct or communicated to another) and his certainty that they occurred cannot be transferred to us, nor are we explicitly told that the narrative comes from him. They were meant for the prophet himself, to make him certain of his message and unfaltering in delivering it. For it seems often to be overlooked that the outcome of delivering such a message must have appeared to Jonah to be a certain cruel death, as certain as death appeared to be when he was thrown by the sailors into the leaping waves of the sea in a violent storm. They were also intended to lead up to and exemplify the character of Jehovah in that He was, not only for His chosen people, the Jews, but for all the nations of the world, the Ninevites among them, "a gracious God, and full of compassion, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy," and One who repented Him of the evil.

It is one instance of the way in which the author of the book "scorns the obvious" that he says not a word about his own repentance of his fault in trying to evade God's command and escape from the duty laid upon him. The narrative, he thought, should make that quite plain. It has not done so, however, to some advanced Biblical critics, who blame the author for the omission.

(52) One part, and a very great part, of the "Historical value of the Book of Jonah" is that the glorious revelation about God contained in it was the starting point and keynote of all written prophecy; it was for that generation and many that followed it a ground for belief in the truth that the description of God just given represented the real character of Jehovah, the God of Israel.

That such a revelation should be authenticated to the prophet by "wonderful events transcending all ordinary experience" seems to the writer not at all improbable. He has endeavoured to explain those events by reference to known facts and processes of nature, so that what is miraculous was merely the coming together of these facts and processes at the exact time and place necessary to bring about the result.

(53) There is one further aspect of the Book of Jonah which must now be considered. According to the first Gospel, our Lord referred to the "three days and three nights" spent by Jonah "in the whale's belly" as a sign, a prophetic adumbration, of His "three days and three nights" in "the heart of the earth" between His death and Resurrection.

(54) The first question that arises is : Did our Lord say any such thing ? It is contended by Allen (*Internl. Critic. Com.*, Matthew, p. 139) that He did not. Allen's account of the composition of the first Gospel is that it had three sources. The first was the second Gospel, very much as we have it ; the second was a document, probably in Aramaic, containing chiefly sayings of our Lord, but with some connected narrative ; the third and final hand was that of an unknown editor (probably Palestinian) who added other "tradition," written and oral, and combined all three into the Gospel much as we have it. The Aramaic document was probably by the Apostle Matthew, and this accounts for the whole Gospel being attributed to him. This document, called Q, was also used by the Evangelist Luke. This being so, Allen says of the reference in the first Gospel to Jonah "in the whale's belly" that it was due to the final editor who, wishing to make clear the "parallelism of Jonah as a sign . . . because of his remarkable experience recorded in Jonah . . . and the Son of Man as a sign in virtue of His remarkable life's history from beginning to end" has done so "by *illustrating** it from one particular event in the life-history of Jonah in which there was *as it seemed to him** a striking coincidence.* Christ foretold that He would rise again on the third day. It might, therefore, be said that He lay in the grave for three days. The final editor of the first Gospel turned to the Book of Jonah in the LXX version and found (in chap. ii, 1) the words : *καὶ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας*. Here was material for a *comparison*.* Jonah's wonderful story of guidance and preservation culminated in his sojourn in the belly of the sea-monster, followed by his miraculous deliverance . . . The life-history of the Son of Man culminated in His sojourn in the grave, followed by His miraculous resurrection. This, as illustrating His whole life of wonder and marvel, constituted him a sign to the men of that generation. *Mathew has, of course, rather forced the analogy.*"*

(55) The writer is unable to understand this explanation except on the supposition that Christ did not Himself make any reference to Jonah's sojourn in the whale's belly, but that it was introduced by the final editor of the first Gospel as an appropriate illustration of the mention of Jonah as a "sign." It is quite incorrect, in speaking of that experience, to describe it as the culmination of Jonah's wonderful story of guidance and preservation. It is the whole story of his guidance and preservation,

* The italics are the writer's.

and it is not the culmination of the book but the introduction to it. In fact, Bewer describes it as merely the device adopted by the framer of the story for getting Jonah out of the ship and the storm safely on to dry land, and he points out that the author might easily have adopted another device for the purpose, which was, in fact, used in another similar story.

(56) How, then, are we to look upon Allen's account (in para. 54 above) of the reference made (in teaching attributed to Our Lord) to Jonah's wonderful deliverance? It is a very serious matter if the editor put his own words and thoughts into Our Lord's mouth, and one which cannot fail greatly to influence our judgment as to the value for us of the first Gospel. If it is a fact, we must, in all honesty, face the facts. But, before accepting a conclusion so serious and so far-reaching, we are entitled to demand evidence which shall establish it as a real fact, beyond any reasonable question. Now the evidence for it does not appear to the writer even to approach this degree of cogency. How, for instance, can it be known that the reference to the three days and three nights, etc., was due to the final editor and was not found in Q, the record of our Lord's sayings? Being a saying and a very emphatic saying, that would appear to be the most natural source to which it should be attributed. The only reason, rather hinted at than put forward, for supposing that this saying was not in Q is that St. Luke, who also had Q before him, does not mention it in his account of what took place at the time when the first Gospel gives it as having been spoken. But this is a very precarious inference. St. Luke had before him the second Gospel in which the solemn words of Christ when He instituted the Holy Eucharist are given (Mark xiv, 24 and 25). Yet in his own account (Luke xxii, 20) he varies v. 24, and omits v. 25. And there are many similar cases.* It is certain, therefore, that St. Luke in many cases, no doubt for reasons connected with the purpose he had in view in writing his Gospel, omitted words of our Lord's which he did not really doubt were spoken by Him.

(57) There is consequently no ground for accepting Allen's account of the way in which these words came to form part of the first Gospel. This conclusion is strengthened by the comment of Plummer on Luke xi, 16, and xi, 29-32 (*Int. Crit. Comm.*, St. Luke, pp. 306 and 307). Plummer points out that the words *δοθήσεται* "will be given," and *ἔσται* "the Son of

* e.g. Luke vi, 5, compared with Mark ii, 27. Luke omits the whole of Mark vi, 45-47, 9, which the first Gospel has taken from Mark.

Man *will* be a token, etc.," require that the sign announced would be something then future, and could not refer to His own life and teaching, which were past and present.

(58) Assuming, then, that our Lord did say what is ascribed to Him in the first Gospel, what did He mean by those words? Do they not convey this? God, who inspired the prophets to utter His illuminating and revealing Word, also guided and controlled them in recording facts in the history of Israel which had a significance far beyond anything that could be learnt from them at the time when they occurred? These facts were part of a picture which, being imperfect, did not by itself convey its full meaning. When the course of history came to complete the picture, it displayed its full meaning* as a glorious manifestation of the purpose of the Almighty Creator from the beginning of the world. The facts were really an acted prophecy of

"That one, far off, divine Event
To which the whole Creation moved."

(59) We are now ready to answer the question implied in the title of this Essay, viz., What is the historical value of the Book of Jonah?

One part of the answer has already been given in para. (52).

In the second place, being a true narrative, it furnished a foundation of fact for the poet who wrote the 139th Psalm.

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there:
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold Thou art there.
If I take the wings of the morning
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there shall Thy hand lead me,
And Thy right hand shall hold me."

Of this part of this psalm Briggs says (vol. ii, p. 493) that "the doctrine of the Divine Spirit is in advance of anything" (? else) "in the Old Testament" and compares it with Amos ix, 2-3† "which probably was in the mind of the author."

In the third place, the book gave to the nation of the Jews not the imagination of a pious Jew, but a story of absolute fact, showing the compassion and loving-kindness of God to penitent wrong-doers, and that, in that respect, he was not the God of the Jews only, but of all other nations also.

* So that the narrative was said to be "fulfilled."

† Amos was contemporary with Jonah.

And its chief and final value is that it exemplifies the words of the Apostle James spoken to the Apostles and Presbyters of the nascent Church assembled at Jerusalem.

“ Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world.”

The book narrated a fact which had no special meaning to those who first read it, nor to its readers for hundreds of years ; its meaning in the counsels of the Creator of the World we learn from Him who was the Truth, the Way and the Life. It was a prophetic adumbration, an acted prophecy, of His Resurrection from the dead by which, as St. Paul tells us, “ He was decisively proved to be the Son of God ” (Rom. i, 4).

To Him bear all the prophets witness and, among them, the prophet Jonah.

(60) So this Essay may fitly close with the fine verses written by Shelley at the age of 30, nearly two years before his untimely death :—

“ A power from the unknown God ;
 A Promethean conquerer came ;
 Like a triumphant path he trod
 The thorns of death and shame.
 A mortal shape to him
 Was like the vapour dim
 Which the orient planet animates with light ;
 Hell, Sin, and Slavery came,
 Like bloodhounds mild and tame,
 Nor preyed until their Lord had taken flight.
 Swift as the radiant shapes of sleep,
 From one whose dreams are paradise,
 Fly, when the fond wretch wakes to weep,
 And day peers forth with her blank eyes ;
 So fleet, so faint, so fair,
 The powers of earth and air
 Fled from the folding star of Bethlehem :
 Apollo, Pan, and Love,
 And even Olympian Jove
 Grew weak, for killing Truth had glared on them ;
 . . . The moon of Mahomet
 Arose and it shall set :
 While blazoned high on heaven’s immortal noon
 The Cross leads generations on.”

The scheme adopted in this Essay for the transliteration of Hebrew words and letters is as given below. It is that approved and recommended by the Royal Asiatic Society, with a few trifling alterations.

ז	'	ז	z
כּ	h	ח	q
בּ	b	ר	r
גּ	g	שׁ	s
דּ	g	שׂ	s
הּ	d	תּ	t
וּ	d	תּוּ	t
ז	h	וּ׃	= ^e (or <u>o</u>)
ח	h (or hh)	וּ׃	ā
ט	v	וּ׃	ē
י	z	וּ׃	é
כ	h	וּ׃	î
ל	t	וּ׃	ō
מ	y	וּ׃	ū
נ	h	וּ׃	a
ס	k	וּ׃	e
ע	k	וּ׃	i
פּ	l	וּ׃	o
צ	m	וּ׃	u
ק	n	וּ׃	o
ר	s	וּ׃	o
שׁ	'	וּ׃	o
שׂ	f	וּ׃	o
תּ	p	וּ׃	= ^o
					Dagges forte = double letter

DISCUSSION.

MR. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: I recall reading many years ago, in Thomson's *Land and the Book*, some very interesting remarks on this subject. I do not remember ever having seen those remarks referred to by any recent writers on the subject of Jonah.

Mr. Thomson quotes from Pliny's *Natural History*. Now Pliny's period was A.D. 23 to A.D. 79, and his evidence seems to me to have some importance.

Pliny is, I think, *one* of our authorities for the great antiquity of the port of Joppa.

Pliny tells us that from this place there came some bones of a monster which was more than 40 feet long and had ribs higher than the Indian elephant. Well, I have ridden upon Indian elephants that were at least 9 feet high.

On the way to this meeting I called at a public library and got out the classic, and will read to you some extracts before sitting down.

Strabo, who wrote about 60 B.C., was possibly one of the sources of some of Pliny's information about Joppa. Strabo writes (Book XVI, chap. 11, s. 28): "Then Joppa—in this place, according to some writers, Andromeda—was exposed to the sea monster."

Ovid (died A.D. 18), Book IV, concerning the rescue of Andromeda by Perseus, has lines on the same subject of this monster and the death of same:—

"The mounting billows tumbled to the shore,
Above the waves a monster raised his head."

NOTE.—I cannot help thinking that some of Ovid's metamorphoses had their origin in tales told to the poet by Jews who narrated events taken from the Bible, e.g. the story of Baucis and Philemon seems to me to have had its source in the history of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Josephus does not give much information, except (*Ant.*, Book IX, chap. 10, s. 1) where he tells us that Jonah prophesied in the reign of Jeroboam II (son of Joash), say, 783 to 743 B.C.

Pliny's *Natural History*:—

"Joppe—a city of the Phœnicians, which existed, it is said, before the deluge of the earth" (Book V, chap. 14).

"Turranus—speaks of a monster that was thrown up on the shore at Gades (presumably Gibraltar), the distance between the two fins at the end of the tail of which was sixteen cubits, and its teeth one

hundred and twenty in number; the largest being nine, and the smallest six, inches in length."

NOTE.—Cuvier is inclined to think that the cachelot whale, *Physeter macrocephalus* of Linnæus, is the animal here alluded to.

"M. Scaurus, in his ædileship, exhibited in Rome, among other wonderful things, the bones of the monster to which Andromeda was said to have been exposed, and which he brought from Joppa, a city of Judæa.

"These bones exceeded forty feet in length, and the ribs were higher than those of the Indian elephant, while the backbone was a foot and a half in thickness."

NOTE.—Cuvier says that there can be little doubt that the bones represented to have been those to which Andromeda was exposed, were the bones, and more especially the lower jaws, of the whale.

Frank T. Bullen, in *The Cruise of the "Cachalot"* (Ch. VIII), writes:—

"When dying (the mate told me), the cachalot always ejected the contents of his stomach—and that he believed the stuff to be portions of big cuttle fish. . . . Sticking a boat-hook into the lump I drew it alongside.

"It was at once evident that it was a massive fragment of cuttle fish—tentacle or arm—as thick as a stout man's body.

"For the first time, it was possible to understand that, contrary to the usual notion of a whale's being unable to swallow a herring, here was a kind of whale that could swallow—well, a block four or five feet square, apparently; who lived upon creatures as large as himself."

NOTE.—The mention of these bones by Pliny reminds me that many years ago in Wartburg Castle I saw in Luther's room such a bone—a vertebra of some sea monster, presumably a whale, which was used by Luther as a footstool. If Luther got it from Rome—well, the improbable is yet possible. Visitors might do worse than inquire whether amongst the treasures of the Vatican there are any "sea monster" bones that may have more reason to be called *relics* than many of the things there shown.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: Mr. Sewell apparently starts out to defend the inspiration of the record in the Book of Jonah, and then proceeds, by a laborious argument, to account, on purely natural grounds, for things which are manifestly miraculous.

He persists, also, in speaking of a "whale," and tells us that the gullet of that animal is so small that it could not possibly swallow a

man ; and thereupon endeavours to prove that Jonah remained in the whale's *mouth*, and not, as the Scriptures declare, in fish's *belly*.

Now, seeing that the Bible never once, in this connection, speaks of a " whale," that argument falls absolutely to the ground. The word translated " whale " in Matt. xii, 40, should really be " sea monster " ; while in Jonah i, 17, we are told it was a " great fish," which " the Lord prepared."

But supposing, for the sake of argument, it had been a whale. Has Mr. Sewell never read the testimony of Frank Bullen, in his *Cruise of the " Cachalot " ?* The idea of a whale's gullet being incapable of admitting any large substance, Mr. Bullen characterizes as " a piece of crass ignorance " ! and he tells us, among other things, how, " on one occasion a shark, fifteen feet in length, had been found *in the stomach* of a sperm whale " !

But now " to the Law and to the Testimony." Four times over, in different ways, the Scriptures tell us that Jonah *was* in the fish's *belly*, not in its mouth :—

- (1) In Jonah i, 17, we read : " The Lord prepared a great fish to *swallow up* Jonah." And if " swallowed," Jonah could not have remained in the fish's mouth.
- (2) In the same verse we read, " Jonah *was* in the *belly* of the fish."
- (3) In Jonah ii, 10, we read : " It (the fish) vomited out Jonah," and to vomit is to eject the contents of the *stomach*.
- (4) Then in Matt. xii, 40, our Lord definitely declared " Jonas *was* . . . in the sea monster's *belly*."

Yet, in spite of all this, Mr. Sewell tells us definitely and repeatedly, that Jonah *was not*, and could not have been, in the fish's stomach !

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS said : As regards the " three days and three nights," he could not see how our Lord's being in the tomb from Friday to Sunday morning, one whole day and two nights, could possibly accord with His own prophecy of three days and three nights (Matt. xii, 40). He thought it clear from the Gospel of John that our Lord kept the Passover a day before the regular time, and was accordingly crucified on the Passover day, and was thus in the grave from Thursday evening until Sunday morning. He believed that this Evangelist, writing last, intended to correct

mistaken inferences from the other Gospels—not mistakes of the Evangelists, for they were divinely inspired.

Mr. C. A. CARUS-WILSON expressed the hope that the reading of this interesting paper would not give rise to the impression that the Victoria Institute were anxious to dispose of the miraculous element in the story of Jonah. It was, of course, open to us to consider wherein the miraculous element lay, and he was prepared to maintain that there was no evidence in the original account in support of the traditional view that Jonah had been kept alive for three days. Jonah was drowned, and the miracle consisted in his being brought to life again. Herein we saw the point of our Lord's reference to this event: "As Jonah . . . so shall the Son of Man." Our Lord was not kept alive in the heart of the earth, neither was Jonah kept alive. If he had been, the reference would have been meaningless.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES: The word "stupendous," as applied to a miracle, is frequent in the paper. What does it mean? Are not *all* miracles, from the human standpoint, equally stupendous, and from the Divine standpoint equally simple? Mr. Sewell's information about whales is interesting; but it is quite superfluous. It is really an attempt (common nowadays) to help the Almighty out of difficulties of our making, and to render it easy for Him to work His miracles!

Our Lord declared that, like Jonah in the whale, He would be "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." How is this to be explained if Christ died on Friday afternoon and rose on Sunday morning? The Jews, like the Romans, reckoned inclusively, *e.g.* the Roman *Nones* fell on the eighth day before the *Ides*; but they called it the ninth day. So the Jews reckoned any part of a day as a day and a night. This is plain from several passages in Scripture. Esther, for instance (chap. iv, 16), proclaims a fast for herself and others; "neither eat nor drink three days, night or day." "On the third day" the fast was over, and Esther went in to petition the King; yet the fast had lasted only two days and a half. Some expositors maintain that Christ died on Thursday; but that will not solve the difficulty, for from Thursday afternoon to Sunday morning is only two complete days and a half. Others (I suppose, to save the situation) maintain that Christ died on Wednesday. But this leaves Esther v, 1, without any explanation, as well as other passages (such as Gen. xlii, 17, 18; 2 Chron. x, 5-12).

Mr. W. HOSTE said: As regards the theory that Jonah remained in the mouth of the great fish, the question has been asked whether the Hebrew word translated "belly" will bear the meaning of "mouth." Gesenius says that *מִעֵרָה*, only used in plural *מֵעֵרִים* = (1) intestines; (2) belly—specially of womb (once used of external belly (Cant. v, 14)); (3) breast, heart; figuratively, the inmost soul; "Thy law in the midst of my bowels" (Ps. xl, 9), *i.e.* set deeply in my soul. There is apparently, then, no authority, as far as usage goes, for understanding *בְּתוֹעֵי הַדָּג* to mean "in the mouth of the fish," as Mr. Sewell suggests, or, indeed, anything else but "in its true belly."

κοιλια, often the LXX equivalent of *בֶּטֶן* = belly, here represents *מֵעֵרִים*. According to Grimm, the word seems never to have the sense of mouth.

Now we may enquire whether *בָּלַע* (= here "swallow," Jonah i, 17) can mean simply "to take into the mouth." Gesenius gives (1) to swallow *down*, so devour, with the idea of eagerness, greediness, and he refers in this sense to Jonah ii, 1 (*cf.* proverbial phrase, "not to have time to swallow down spittle" = be in a hurry). Apparently there is no ground for giving the word the sense of "retaining in the mouth." This is borne out by the LXX *καταπίειν*, which always has the sense, when employed literally, of "drinking *down*," devouring.

As for the word used in chap. ii, 10, the LXX *εμβαλλειν* might have the sense to eject, spit out, but the Hebrew word *קָאָה* is onomatopoeic and is invariably to spue or vomit.

The attempt to get rid of the great miracle of the fish "swallowing" the prophet lands us not only in a position which the Hebrew will not support, but in scarcely a less miracle. How could Jonah have got through the whalebone screen expressly contrived to keep out big objects? How could the "whale" have reconciled itself to the presence of a considerable foreign object like the body of a man in such an abnormal position in its mouth? The idea of Jonah picking up a precarious livelihood by sharing the molluscs with his host approaches bathos.

As for the general question, what impresses one when reading the "critical" judgments on the book is the extraordinary differences

of these "assured results." To quote* only one instance, Canon Cheyne writes, almost mournfully: "Unfortunately we cannot hope to find even a trace of traditional material in the Book of Jonah." The case be it noted, is hopeless for the poor "traditionalist." But in contrast with this, Konrad von Orelli, the Zurich theologian, writes: "The marvel of the fish was *certainly* received from tradition." Even König admits that "the Book of Jonah may rest upon a tradition about Jonah." But what shall we say to the following? "No doubt the materials of the narrative were supplied to the author by tradition and rest ultimately upon a basis of facts. No doubt the outlines of the narrative are historical and Jonah's preaching was actually successful at Nineveh (see Luke xi, 30-32)." Surely these must be the words of some hidebound traditionalist? No, they are Professor S. R. Driver's. May we not leave these "lean kine" to devour one another?

The same might be said† of the date, assigned to the book by the critics, which varies from Hitzig, second century B.C., back to Goldhorne, who ascribes it to Hezekiah's reign. The only thing they do not differ in is their superlative confidence that they are right in refusing it to the time of Jonah and in rejecting its historicity, in contradiction to the testimony of Him who is our Lord and Teacher (John xiii, 13).

Mr. WALTER MAUNDER writes: "I have read the Gunning Prize Essay on 'The Historical Value of the Book of Jonah' several times, and I listened to the discussion on it at the meeting. From the Essay and the discussion, it seems to me that the historical value of the book rests on two main points.

"The first is the position which the mission of Jonah to Nineveh holds in the religious history of the world. The Lord *had* revealed Himself to Moses as 'the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty' (Exod. xxxiv, 6-7). Of the subject of Jonah's preaching, we are only told that 'he cried, and said, Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.' But the result of that preaching shows clearly that

* See *Jonah's Critics Criticized*, pp. 10 and 11, monograph by present writer. Published by Bible League.

† *Idem*, p. 36.

the Ninevites recognized that their ways were evil, and their hands full of violence, and that God, who had sent a prophet to them with this warning, was full of mercy and desired that they should repent and be saved. Such a message preached by a prophet of God's chosen people, to a city of idolatrous Gentiles, was a new revelation of God's purpose toward mankind.

"The second point is the relation in the religious history of the world which Jonah's mission had to that of a 'greater than Jonah.' For when certain of the Scribes and Pharisees answered Jesus, saying, 'Master, we would see a sign from Thee,' He replied, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall be no sign given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here' (Matt. xii, 38-41).

"We are not informed whether the Ninevites knew anything of the strange experience which Jonah passed through in his attempt to flee to Tarshish. In any case he could have offered them no confirmation of the truth of his statement. Jonah, like John the Baptist, did no miracle; his preservation after he was cast into the sea was a testimony only to himself; the Ninevites saw nothing of it.

"So the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ was not seen by the Jewish nation—nor by us—but only by a few chosen witnesses.

"But the Resurrection from the dead of our Lord Jesus Christ is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and the time came when the Apostles were commissioned to preach it to the Gentiles also: 'And they glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto Life."' But from that day onwards the Jews have closed their hearts against their Messiah, for to them, as to Jonah, the acceptance of the Gentiles was abhorrent."

Mr. A. GREGORY WILKINSON writes: "Mr. Sewell writes in defence of the historicity of the Jonah narrative, maintaining that the book gave to the Jews *a story of absolute fact*, and throughout the Essay he maintains a meticulous regard for the exact meaning of the terms used. But when he comes to the crux of the whole narrative, he shies like a frightened horse, and deliberately evades the admittedly clear meaning of words.

“ I refer, of course, to his hypothesis that Jonah was retained in the *mouth* of the whale without any miracle ; that he would in such a position have abundance of air to breathe, and that he would be *warm and dry* except when occasionally washed by sea-water. The essayist gives the impression that if anyone could succeed in lodging himself in a whale’s mouth, he could spend a day or two there in moderate comfort, and if he could manage to take with him a supply of food and drink, he might stay on for an indefinite time without incurring any grave danger. This thesis certainly possesses the merit of originality, but, as such, it should be subject to criticism on its intrinsic merits.

“ I definitely dissent from it for two reasons :—

“ (1) As already pointed out, it is a deliberate evasion of the clear language of Scripture. Mr. Sewell admits that the words used for ‘ swallow up ’ and ‘ belly ’ can *only* mean that Jonah was swallowed up and entered the intestines of the ‘ fish.’ Why, then, evade their *only* meaning ? Simply to avoid a miracle. But, surely, such a shyness of miracle is one of the leading characteristics of the opponents of historicity ! Besides, a later expression must also be evaded : ‘ it vomited out Jonah ’ would have to be interpreted as ‘ it spued Jonah out of its mouth.’ Mr. Sewell contends that he is availing himself of a ‘ reasonable latitude ’ of interpretation. On that point I join issue. To my mind it is quite unreasonable latitude.

“ (2) After discussing the matter with an expert biologist, I am of opinion that Mr. Sewell’s own interpretation will not ‘ hold water.’ There are various physiological objections to the new idea which I cannot set forth in this short critique, but I am satisfied that if this view were submitted to the judgment of expert biologists, it would be turned down as impracticable.”

Dr. D. ANDERSON-BERRY writes : “ I venture to suggest that Mr. Sewell’s statements as to the possibility of Jonah being kept in a whale’s mouth are not correct.

“ (1) His measurements as to the capacity of the whale’s mouth are based on an *open* mouth. (2) Although its tongue is so fixed that it cannot be protruded, it is not so fixed that it cannot be pressed up towards the palate. Otherwise it could not swallow its food. (3) The mouth is not a reservoir of air. There is a network of large

vessels within the chest and in a region thereabouts which contains a copious supply of oxygenated blood sufficient for its requirements when 'sounding.' (4) When swimming on the surface its mouth is held widely open and is filled with water so that no one could survive whilst the whale is 'spouting.'

"On the other hand, Dr. Luther Townshend quotes from the *Literary Digest* the case of a sailor who was swallowed by a large fish and delivered alive when this fish was captured hours after.

"The case is verified by the captain of the 'Star of the East' and by the doctors of the hospital where the man was treated afterwards. Here is the case of a man *swallowed* as the Bible states, and states plainly that the prophet was in the 'belly of the fish.'

"But a miracle is a miracle and the more we can explain it the less a miracle it becomes; and certainly a great miracle is required to explain Nineveh's attitude; just as the miracle of the Church requires the miracle of Christ's resurrection!

"'Plants do not grow in the night time,' p. 30. Then how do seeds and bulbs grow in the darkness? and such plants as mushrooms?

"I remember planting bulbs 8 inches deep in the earth, and in my ignorance planting them upside down. Yet they grew, and in three or four weeks appeared above the surface of the soil, and bore flowers in due season.

"Some plants grow rapidly and darkness is no obstacle to their growth, and certainly Jonah's gourd is described as growing rapidly just as it perished rapidly.

"In fact, the more we seek to explain Biblical miracles the greater difficulties we fall into, for if they were explainable they would not be miracles!

"And the older we get and the more we face the mystery of life and death the more thankful we are that the Book that lights our path is sealed with miracles."

Mr. GEORGE ANTHONY KING said: It would be presumptuous to criticise an essay so clearly arranged and so evidently the result of careful research. I only venture to offer a single suggestion as to the point put on p. 71, "The question is what this phrase *hin-lay-lah* means." Is it not possible that the phrase is not chronological but characteristic? that it does not refer to the duration either of growth or of destruction, but to the peculiar effect of the

plant which Jonah first welcomed and then lamented when it was taken away, namely, its shade? If this is so, the conclusion drawn at the foot of p. 71 seems to be strengthened by the withdrawal of any objection based upon the supposed chronological content of the phrase.

I am not at all a scholar, but I personally feel some doubt whether the phrase could, even if it were supposed to be chronological, be rightly construed "the son of a (that is, of 'one') night." The use of the word "Son" in reference to age in other passages seems to require a numeral—but there is no *'ehād* here. The A.V. margin "*Heb. was the son of the night*" emphasises the absence of the article by its typography.

The Rev. J. M. TURNER writes: Mr. Sewell has given us weighty arguments for the early date of the Book of Jonah from the internal evidence of its language and style. He also has ably answered the critical contention that Nineveh had ceased to exist when the book was written, by his able illustration of the Hebrew tenses.

What I do emphatically protest against is Mr. Sewell's adopting the scheme of Schleiermacher, namely, endeavouring to get rid of the miraculous element in the miracle. Out of his own mouth I condemn him, for on p. 75 he admits that "He has endeavoured to explain those events by reference to known facts and processes of nature, so that what is miraculous was merely the coming together of these facts and processes at the exact time and place necessary to bring about the result." Mr. Sewell denies the miracle, but draws a decent veil over the denial. Like Schleiermacher, he throws a sop to the Cerberus of Rationalism.

Mr. Sewell wishes us to allow him to translate the word "belly" as "mouth," then he can unfold to us his unique and novel theory. We need not then discard the word "whale," as we have hitherto been most anxious to do. "Jonah," he says on p. 63, "was imprisoned in the animal's mouth. A plentiful supply of air is provided him and his quarters are roomy, warm and dry, and when Jonah is safely ensconced in these hitherto unheard of quarters the psalm can be adapted and accommodated to his position, the weeds wrapped round his head are the hogsheads of greenish grassy matter, the flood is the streams of water rushing through the whale-bone and so on. Moreover, according to Mr. Sewell, Jonah is so

ignorant of anatomy he cannot distinguish between a whale's belly and its mouth.

Would it not be much better to take the Word of God as it stands, and bend our theories to that, than to formulate our theories and make God's Word bend to them ?

Jonah prayed out of the fish's belly. His experiences in that prayer are in the past tense, therefore they are his experiences in the sea before he was swallowed by the fish.

Mr. Sewell says on p. 68, "The sailors on board the ship saw him disappear into the fish and never reappear." The Bible does not say so. As a matter of fact, Jonah sank down to the bottom of the sea, "all thy billows and thy waves passed over me," "the weeds were wrapped about my head," he went down to the bottoms of the mountains. In the sea he remembered the Lord; in the sea his heart turned towards God's holy temple. The fish was Jonah's salvation, therefore his psalm of thanksgiving from the belly of the fish and his acknowledgment that "Salvation is of the Lord."

Then came further deliverance, as is usually the case whenever God hears the voice of thanksgiving. "And the Lord spake unto the fish and it vomited Jonah upon the dry land."

The Bible stands or falls on the question of the miraculous. Miracles are given because the ruler of the supernatural world is the ruler of the natural world, and desires personal contact and communion with his rational creature man. The probability is that God, calling on men to live above nature, will reveal Himself as a God above nature. So wrote Archbishop French.

The Rev. JOHN CAIRNS, O.B.E., writes: Mr. Sewell has proved the value of reserving judgment until the case for the defence has been heard. Experts are not infrequently wrong. The essay deserves a wide circulation.

Extract from letter by Prof. A. S. GEDEN: I have read your Essay on Jonah with great interest, and with most of it I should most cordially agree. It is only in a few details perhaps that we should differ. . . . From the point of view of the Hebrew, linguistically, the text seems to me more varied than you allow. As a matter of fact, we know very little of the history of the Hebrew language; forms that are regarded as late may, in some instances, prove to be early, and *vice versa*.

Para. 15: I think "the 6,000 [? six-score thousand] persons" undoubtedly refers to the "profanum vulgus," as Horace says, not in a depreciatory sense, but simply to mark the unlettered crowds that fill the streets. The phrase has nothing to do with children. . . . הַיָּאֵה (hāyāh) is γίγνεσθαι, not εἶναι. Chap. iii, 3, הַיָּאֵה (hāyā^tāh) proved to be, *i.e.* was found to be such by the prophet when he entered it; as you rightly urge, the word does not imply a date of any kind. Hebrew writers are intensely subjective; and it is this, in part, which makes them so misunderstood by many German and English commentators. Nineveh may or may not have been destroyed at the time of writing, but the phrase used neither proves nor disproves it . . .

Mr. ALBERT HIORTH, C.E., writes: I duly received the proof of Mr. Sewell's most interesting paper, and take pleasure in sending you from my collection of cuttings [from *Evangelists Sendetene* (Gospel Messenger), Kristiania] one containing report of an event very similar to the Biblical record of Jonas. It is stated to have been recorded in *Journal des Débats*, stating that the mariner, James Bartley, of the crew of "Star of the East," was literally swallowed by a sperm-whale, and taken out by dissecting the carcass—still living, but badly "burnt" (chemically) and for a time out of his mind. The captain of "The Star of the East" and the whole crew is said to witness the fact, and the Editor (Scientific Dept.) of the *Journal des Débats* is mentioning several similar instances of whales swallowing people.

Further, it is stated that Bartley came to Liverpool, and was subsequently sent to hospital in London and recovered, though relapsing into insanity yearly the same date.

According to the witnesses of captain and crew, the (Scientific) Editor of *Journal des Débats* is reported to say that ". . . in view of this fact, I am led to believe that Jonas really came living out of the whale's belly as reported in the Holy Bible."

As this statement might be easily corroborated, I venture to send it over for any use you might deem proper. To believers in the Inspiration of our Book it is, even if corroborated, unnecessary, but still of some interest as a scientific argument to scientists opposing the Truth.

Names given in the cutting.

James Bartley, mariner, aged 35.

"Star of the East," whaling ship; harbour, Liverpool; hospital, London.

Journal des Débats, August 25, 1891 (?), quoted by *Evangelists Sendetenel* (1915), quoting the book *Kan man stole på sin Bibel?*

AUTHOR'S reply: I am requested by the Editor to make a "general reply" to the criticisms on my paper, and "to keep it as short as possible, as the whole will be larger than we expected." I will therefore ask my critics to remember this and not suppose that special points are neglected or not answered because I was *unable* to reply to them, but only because I was not allowed room for doing so. But I propose to include answers to many relevant suggestions from correspondents who did not wish their communications to be printed.

I venture to protest against the unintelligent and irrelevant criticism that I have said that a whale's "belly" meant its "mouth." I have said the opposite in the plainest words that the English language contains (p. 36). What I have suggested has been that the words "swallow" and "belly" might be interpreted according to the appearance of what happened rather than in a purely literal manner. When we read (Ps. xciii, 7) that "the world also is stablished that it cannot be moved" we do not doubt that it has a motion of many hundreds of miles an hour round its own axis, and of over 400 miles a minute in its orbit, to say nothing of its possible motion in space. It appears to be relatively at rest, as regards us, and we fully understand what the Psalmist means. So I suggest that Jonah disappeared from sight into the body of the whale and seemed to be swallowed, though in fact he was not.

In face of what I have said in paras. 50 and 52, I protest against the statement that I "deny the miracle but draw a decent veil over the denial."

Some of my correspondents (who fully accept the miraculous element in scripture) nevertheless think that the miracles narrated in the Book of Jonah are so abundant, and of such a nature, as to lead them to consider the story as a product of the imagination, like the parable of the Prodigal Son, or like Hamlet. Others say that those same miracles need no defence or explanation, and regret

that any so-called defence of them should be put forward. These critics seem to answer one another.

With regard to those critics who consider the story of Jonah's remaining alive and conscious in the belly of some sea monster as needing no defence, I can only say that they can have had very little to do with young men, by whom this is constantly put forward as one of the things that make it impossible to accept the Bible as true.

As regards those who regard the story as resembling such a narrative as that of the "Prodigal Son," I cannot but think that they have not fully thought out all that is implied in Our Lord's reference to "the sign of Jonah the prophet." Whatever may be thought as to the reference to the three days and three nights, no one can doubt that He referred to the repentance of the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah. The occasion was on a solemn appeal, before a large audience, from the Scribes and Pharisees whom He acknowledged to be the authorized religious teachers of the Jewish nation. (*Cf.*, Math. xxiii, 2; see also Luke v, 14.) He did not altogether refuse their request for a sign, but He Himself *selected* the sign of Jonah the prophet as the answer to their request. The case was not at all that of a typical example of human nature, like that of "a sower" or "the loving father of a spendthrift son." If, on the other hand, it be compared to a reference to a known work of imagination, like Hamlet, I find it impossible to believe that He, knowing the story not to be true, and knowing that His hearers thought it to be true, *selected* it as giving any answer to their demand for a sign.

But my critics must answer one another.

The criticisms of Mr. Gregory Wilkinson and Dr. Anderson Berry go to the root of my explanation of that part of the story which deals with the "great fish." Mr. Wilkinson gives no facts or reasons in support of his contention. But Dr. Berry does do so. He says my measurements of the whale's mouth are based on "an open mouth." This is simply not true. Taking the minimum measurements of a whale's open mouth as 1,680 c. ft., I have deducted 680 c. ft., leaving 1,000 c. ft. (a round number) for the dimensions of a closed mouth. He can take off another 200 or 300 c. ft. if he likes, and my argument will not be affected.

He also says that the mouth of a whale when swimming on the

surface is filled with water. Of this he has not and can have no proof. If the mouth is partly filled with water, having some air in the upper part, the conditions required by my suggestion are fully met.

What Dr. Berry speaks of as "the network of large vessels . . . containing a copious supply of oxygenated blood . . ." are described in Jardine's *Natural History*, but that is a comparatively old book (1843). Beddard's book is much more recent and deals fully with the question of the respiration of whales. He pronounces definitely upon the whales "spouting" as being an ejection of air, charged with water spray, when the whale rises to the surface after "sounding." There must be a quantity of air in the whale's lungs when it "sounds," in order that it may be ejected when it rises to the surface. And it is to be remembered that it may stay more than an hour under water.

Again, it is admitted that the water taken into the mouth when the whale is on the surface is ejected through the baleen. What can take its place but air? There is surely not a vacuum in the top of the whale's mouth.

Until these questions are answered by Dr. Berry's (imaginary) biological expert, my suggested explanation of the situation remains valid.

The statement in para. 71 beginning, "And in fact plants do not grow in the night . . ." is an undoubted blunder, as has been pointed out by a scientific friend from Cambridge, and by Mr. A. W. Sutton. Plants do increase in length in the night, but (as stated in answer to Mr. Sutton's question by the Director of Kew Gardens), "The important physiological process which ceases in the absence of light is the manufacture of organic compounds from carbonic acid gas and water (photosynthesis), hence "growth in continued darkness leads to ultimate "starvation in the case of ordinary flowering plants." It is this action of photosynthesis which would result in the formation of leaves. So that the formation of a covering shelter of large green, fleshy leaves, to shade the prophet from the burning sun, may well have taken place during those forty days which he spent in waiting to "see what would become of the city." See, on this, Mr. G. A. King's helpful suggestion as to the possible meaning of the phrase בִּין לַיְלָה (bin-lāylah).

It has been pointed out in a very kind and helpful letter by Canon Lukyn Williams that, on my theory, some explanation is required as to how Jonah escaped from his position behind the screen of whalebone. To this I would reply that it is stated (in Jonah ii, 10) that "the Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land." The phrase is וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לְדָג (vayyōmer Y" laddāg), commanded the fish, for the word אָמַר ('amar) is frequently used of commands given by God to inanimate beings and the forces of nature, as well as to men. And the baleen, though it acts as a screen to prevent the egress of solid objects from a whale's mouth, is not so rigid as to withstand force. But the act of vomiting is produced by contraction of the muscles acting upon the stomach and forcing its contents outward, often with great force, more especially in an animal weighing one or two hundred tons.

The question of the "three days and three nights" of our Lord's stay "in the heart of the earth" is a very old difficulty. My friend, Sir George Grierson, suggests that the clause was a marginal comment on Matt. xii, 40, which was afterwards, by mistake, incorporated into the text. But this is a pure supposition; there is no textual evidence for it at all. Weymouth translates the passage: "For just as 'Jonah was three days in the sea-monster's belly' (Jonah i, 17), so will the Son of Man be three days in the heart of the earth"; and in his note he says: Three days, literally "three days and three nights," a striking Hebraism. According to the *Talmud*, a day and a night together make up a night-day, and any part of such a period is counted as a whole. Thus in our Saviour's case the three "nights and days" consist of about three hours on Friday, the whole of the Saturday (reckoned in the Jewish mode from sunset to sunset) and the first half—the night—of the Sunday."

Mrs. A. S. D. Maunder has kindly supplied this reference from the *Talmud*, Moed-Katon, fol. 12, col. 2: "Part of a day is equivalent to a whole day."

661ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18TH, 1924
AT 4.30 P.M.

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

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and signed, and the Honorary Secretary announced that Pastor W. Percival-Prescott had been elected as a Member, and Major J. A. McQueen, D.S.O., the Rev. Canon F. R. Lawrence, Mr. Henry Walker, Dr. C. G. S. Baronsfeather, Miss L. C. Ord, Mr. H. C. W. Lewis, the Rev. R. J. H. McGowan, and the Rev. M. B. Ingle as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN, himself 50 years a Fellow of the Geological Society, then explained the absence of the Lecturer, Prof. G. McCready Price, and himself read the paper on "Geology and its Relation to Scripture Revelation."

GEOLOGY AND ITS RELATION TO SCRIPTURE REVELATION. By Professor GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A.

MANY English writers seem to be surprised, not to say amused, at the widespread discussion of the evolution doctrine now going on in America. This belated discussion of questions which they think were settled a generation ago seems to them but another proof of the verdant immaturity of American culture. I have no intention of trying to vindicate the culture of the people of the United States; but a closer view of the situation will show that this renewed discussion of the problems relating to the origin of things is, in reality, only the natural result of recent scientific discoveries which have come into prominence in America more than elsewhere. My friend Mr. William Jennings Bryan, with many teachers and ministers classed as "Fundamentalists," have usually been credited with reviving this discussion of ancient problems; when in reality there is a large body of scientific facts which have been the inciting cause of this renewal of the discussions of fifty years ago. Some of these scientific facts are very recent discoveries; others

are not exactly new, though they are now seen in a new light ; and it is for a consideration of these matters that I would beg to have your charitable attention for a brief period.

I wish I might say a few words of a personal nature without appearing to be too egotistical. I wish I might tell you of the geological surroundings of my childhood's home in New Brunswick, Eastern Canada, not far from the birthplace of the Hon. Bonar Law ; and of how I am still a British subject, though I have lived so many years in the United States. I wish I could take the time to tell you how, when I was invited to present this paper before the VICTORIA INSTITUTE, every nerve of my being thrilled at the honour of such an opportunity, and how my only regret was that my college duties would not permit me to present this paper in person.

But it would be too much of an imposition on your patience and good nature for me to indulge in further reminiscences, or to do more than suggest that possibly the half-dozen books which I have written along the line of my lifetime studies may be regarded as contributing to the present widespread agitation of these problems among the people of America. Rather is it in order for me to give very briefly the present status of those recent geological discoveries which have now shifted the point of interest in the problem of evolution from the biological to the geological phase. For while under the guidance of Charles Darwin the world has been exploring every nook and cranny of the field of biology for the past half-century, we are now beginning to realize that the future of this problem of origins must be worked out rather in the field of geology. The microscope, the seed-bed, and the breeding pen have been long consulted, and, seemingly, have nothing more to offer us in the way of hopeful clues regarding the great problem of origins. We must now turn to those tombstone inscriptions of the buried dead found so abundantly in the strata of every mountain side ; for these epitaphs in stone, engraved by nature herself when she was in the very act of burying these myriads, contain the true record of the physical and the organic history of our world ; and this record, when rightly translated, must throw some light on the problems we are trying to study. It was the geological problem of the fossils of South America which first started Darwin on the path of evolutionary investigation ; and to the problem of the great fossil world we must now return for the final solution of those questions which we now see can never be solved by biological studies alone.

At the outset, it is important that we keep in mind some of the fundamental principles of all scientific investigation. For only as we follow true scientific methods can we be sure of our results.

Geology, like any other science, consists of two distinct parts, facts and conclusions. The facts are the raw materials with which science works ; while the conclusions are the theories, or generalizations, by means of which the facts are organized with reference to one another, or with reference to other facts ; that is, by means of which these facts are " explained."

Thus a theory is a vital part of any science ; and there can be no science without many theories. Also, a theory is of little value unless it is to be used ; and any theory in explanation of certain facts, when used to explain other facts, becomes an hypothesis. In other words, a theory put to work becomes an hypothesis. But hypotheses are always dangerous things. We put our intellectual freedom at stake whenever we adopt an hypothesis. We can make absolutely no progress in any line of scientific investigation without using them ; yet they are more dangerous to use than dynamite. And the more we use an hypothesis, that is, the more familiar we become with its method of explaining nature, the more do we become its slaves, and the more hopelessly are we blinded to other facts all around us which may not happen to be easily understood in the light of our cherished explanation. For a cherished hypothesis always tends to blind the eyes of the observer, just as the good Book says that a gift will blind the eyes of a judge in court.

We all remember many examples of this blinding power of a brilliant theory which has long been used to explain other facts. In geological history we have the notorious onion-coat theory of Werner, which for many decades acted as a mentor to all the explorers on three continents ; for the latter all thought they ought to find the rocks always occurring in the same relative order of sequence as Werner had taught them to expect.

Ultimately, of course, examples were bound to be found in various parts of the world sufficient to convince the geologists that Werner had not been gifted with any supernatural knowledge of how the rocks might be found occurring on the other side of the globe. Unfortunately, by this time the emphasis had been cleverly transferred from the lithic or mineralogical character of the rocks to their fossil contents. And, under the guidance of Cuvier and William Smith, of Sedgwick, and Murchison, and

Lyell, the world once more set forth on the quest of new discoveries, their key this time consisting of a much more elastic time-scale based on alleged successive types of life. The relative age of any newly discovered rocks in Greenland, in Tasmania, in Florida, or in Timbuktu, could always be told with the most charming facility by merely checking up their fossils with this standard time-scale. And in the rush after new discoveries in the field, nearly a century passed by before the eager explorers paused long enough to consider the logical basis for their method. Any rocks, in any corner of the globe, could be so easily and so positively classified according to the fossils they contained; accordingly, what more was needed? Did not the perfect ease with which this hypothesis worked prove its truthfulness? Thus, for two or three generations we have been working under the unquestioned mentorship of an organic onion-coat theory, instead of a mineralogical one; and it has required some real intellectual courage on the part of some of us to look this theory squarely in the face and question its logical right to dominate the thinking of this third decade of the twentieth century.

Let us, if possible (for with some the results will be only approximate), divest our minds of all theoretical prejudices in the way of theories, and consider that we have merely the entire body of geological facts before us demanding explanation. Profound changes in land and water, also profound changes in plant and animal life, are what we find recorded in the rocks in all parts of the world. How were these changes brought about? How shall we "explain" them?

I need not remind an English audience that we have had a variety of explanations; for one might almost say that all the leading theories of geology have originated somewhere in these islands. For a similar reason I need not say that many different methods have been attempted of "harmonizing" the supposed facts of geology with the Scriptural record of the early days of our world. All of these alluring subjects would make very interesting topics for discussion; but they would delay us too long. Two alternative explanations alone will concern us here, the uniformitarian and the catastrophic. And by the latter term I do not mean that burlesque, consisting of a long series of successive catastrophes and of a corresponding series of creations on the instalment plan, which the brilliant genius of Cuvier fastened on the scientific world for nearly a generation. The hypothesis of the New Catastrophism looks at the world as a whole, the world

in which man and his contemporary plants and animals have been living. It reverses the common method of beginning at the vanishing point of the vistas of a past eternity and working up to the present ; it begins with the present world of plants and animals and works by regression back into the past as far as it can go, and it ceases to theorize when it runs out of facts. Facing the fossil world as a whole, a unit, it says that the evidence seems to indicate some great world catastrophe as the most probable general explanation of the major part, but a quite indefinite and undefinable part, of the stratified deposits. But its attitude is not dogmatic ; it is teachable and willing to learn.

Of these two hypotheses, uniformity or catastrophism, I readily confess that it is very natural to adopt the uniformitarian explanation. Perhaps slow, gradual changes, such as are now going on, would be sufficient, granting time enough, to explain the geological record. Thus Lyellism is a perfectly natural hypothesis ; just as it would be perfectly natural and scientific to assume that everybody is honest and all are good, orderly citizens when we find a dead body by the roadside. The man very probably had heart-disease, and thus died what we call a natural death.

But we might be compelled to change our minds, and to say that the man under consideration had died a violent death. It would all depend upon the evidence. Our predilections in favour of good citizenship might be very reasonable and very strong ; yet we might have to yield before overwhelming evidence. Similarly, the geological question of uniformity or catastrophism is merely a matter of evidence. Geologists are only coroners at large. And whenever the facts are all in, or are sufficiently understood from all parts of the globe, our science, if it is good for anything, ought to be capable of settling very positively whether or not the tools of nature have always worked with that quiet regular order with which they have been observed to operate since the beginning of scientific observation. And no uniformitarian prejudices ought to be allowed to hinder us from bringing in a verdict that would be true because in full accord with the evidence.

But at the outset of our investigations we are confronted with a very serious difficulty. For uniformity and the new catastrophism cannot agree as to the proper method of procedure. Uniformity forbids us to consider the fossiliferous deposits as a whole ; we are told that we must take them a few at a time, and

in a very definite and precise order. It informs us in a lofty way that only certain deposits with certain types of life were formed at a certain time, and the other deposits were formed in a long succession thereafter. This appears very reasonable for any *local* deposit, because we can see with our eyes the plain record of successive events. And clearly this order of events could be spoken of as a world-order, or true for the whole world, providing these strata or formations could be spoken of as universal around the globe. But if these formations are merely *local*, and we do not dogmatically deny the possibility of zoological provinces and districts in the long ago, how are we to erect these local records into a time-scale for the whole world? In other words, if we do not assume the onion-coat theory in its organic form, how are we to determine the precise order in which any world-series of events took place? If we find some trilobites in Newfoundland and some ammonites in Texas, how are we to be sure that the former lived long ages before the latter? If we find some coal beds in Pennsylvania, some more in Alberta equally good and equally consolidated, and some other coal-beds in Germany or in Australia, how are we to be certain that the plants represented by these various beds could not possibly have lived contemporaneously, but that while some were living in what is now Alberta, those in Pennsylvania had already been buried for millions of years, while those in Germany and Australia would not be alive for many more millions of years? In short, if we must accept this scheme offered by uniformity of a succession of life in a definite order, and must accept it entire before we can consider the fossiliferous deposits at all, may we not ask for absolute and conclusive proof of the validity of this alleged historical succession?

Obviously, then, before we can settle the case between uniformity and catastrophism, we shall have to look carefully into this matter of the geological time-scale marked off by successive groups of life.

Minds of the first order are characterized by a tendency to reduce a complex problem to its lowest terms, or to strip it of all non-essentials and to consider it in its most elementary form.

Dr. William Bateson, in his address at Toronto two years ago, an address which has already become historic, faced this problem which we are studying, and asked how we are to be sure that no mammals lived contemporary with the Paleozoic trilobites and

graptolites. He admitted it might be somewhat difficult to prove this point in the case of the animals ; but he thought that we can be absolutely sure about it in the case of the plants. He declared that the Angiosperms, or "higher" plants with protected seeds, could not have been living contemporary with the plants of the Carboniferous coal-beds ; because, if they had been contemporary, the two floras would have become intermingled in the deposits, and no clear example of this has yet been found. Hence, he argued that the Angiosperms must have appeared on earth subsequently to the existence of the Carboniferous flora.

However, so many other possible alternatives arise in the mind, that is, Dr. Bateson's conclusion is so obviously a *non sequitur*, that most of my hearers will conclude that if this is the best that can be done to prove the reality of the geological succession of life, the latter must have a very precarious foundation. But it will be worth our while to see what other men have said upon this same subject.

A careful examination of all the scientific literature of the past century or so reveals the surprising fact that only a very few writers seem ever to have thought of this problem at all. Huxley has left us what occurred to him ; but he did not find any firm foundation on which to rest this wide and far-reaching dictum of the uniformitarian geologists that there has been a succession of various types of life on the globe in a well-defined and definite order. In his essay on "Homotaxis," as it is sometimes called, he points out how impossible it would be to prove that there may *not* have been biological provinces and districts in the long ago, just as there are to-day. Thus, as he says, a Devonian fauna and flora may have been contemporary with a Silurian life in North America and with a Carboniferous life in Africa. He adds : " *All that geology can prove is local order of succession* " ; and he goes on to say that, "the moment the geologist has to do with large areas, or with completely separated deposits," it is vicious and dangerous to affirm a relative chronology for these separated beds. And he concludes with these memorable words : "In the present condition of our knowledge and of our methods, one verdict—' *not proven and not provable* '—must be recorded against all grand hypotheses of the paleontologist respecting the general succession of life on the globe."

Several decades before these words of Huxley were uttered, Herbert Spencer left on record what he had thought out regarding this same problem. In his mind also this idea of a world-series

of successive life-forms appeared to be logically indefensible, because of this prime fact that the geological formations *are local and not universal*. But he pointed out that Lyell and his contemporary geologists kept on assuming that their geological formations were universal around the globe; and I have not observed any tendency on the part of the modern followers of Lyell to discontinue this assumption. But Spencer for ever pillories this organic onion-coat theory in the following words: "Must we not say that, though the onion-coat hypothesis is dead, its spirit is traceable, under a transcendental form, even in the conclusions of its antagonists?"

Throughout the literature of the science will be found several other scanty references to this general problem of how to prove in a logical and scientific manner the reality of these successive ages of the geologist. This abstract phase of the matter is itself capable of extensive treatment, and the present writer has considered it elsewhere ("The Fundamentals of Geology," Chap. I; "The New Geology: a Textbook for Colleges," Chap. XL). Without dwelling longer on this phase of the problem, it will be in order for us to consider more concrete facts. If we study the fossiliferous deposits in all their various relations, first with reference to the rocks below themselves and to those above, and second with reference to their relations toward one another, we may be able to decide whether they always occur in the same invariable order of sequence.

I must refrain from encumbering my paper with specific references to the various authorities for all my statements. Full references will be found in the two volumes already referred to; also in a paper in the *Princeton Theological Review*, October, 1922, pp. 585-615.

A.—When we consider the external relations of the fossiliferous rocks, with reference to the rocks below and also to the surface conditions, we recognize three general facts:—

(1) Any of them—that is, beds belonging to any of the "systems," or general divisions—may be found resting directly on the Archæan or Primitive, this position being apparently sufficient evidence to justify us in saying that they may all be of the same age.

Through a considerable part of Georgia, the Cretaceous beds rest on the Archæan or old crystallines. Over much of the Rocky Mountain region, the Triassic are in this position; and these conditions extend southward over the greater part of Mexico and

Central America. In Jamaica and Cuba, again, the Cretaceous are similarly situated; while the Mesozoic quite generally occur in this position throughout Saxony and Bohemia, and it was on this account that they were formerly called the "Secondary" rocks. Throughout much of California, the Tertiary formations (Eocene and Miocene) are also found resting directly on the old granites and gneisses.

If we judge these beds solely by their position with reference to the Archæan or Primitive, which of these sets of beds is the oldest? Or can any single one be said to be older than the others? And, in view of this general fact, that any formation may be found resting on the Primitive and extending over wide areas, where are we to go to *start* the geological succession? And where shall we go to find some fossil-bearing rocks which we can prove to be really older than all others?

(2) We also find that any of the fossiliferous formations, even the so-called "youngest," may be highly metamorphosed and crystalline.

The gold-bearing Jurassic slates of the Sierra Nevada range are of this character, as are also the Tertiary of the Coast Range and of other parts of California. The Eocene schists and gneisses of the Alps and the Eocene marbles of the Himalayas are also as distinctly crystalline as any of the Paleozoic rocks. Even the Pleistocene, the so-called "youngest" of all the fossiliferous deposits, is occasionally highly consolidated, as is seen in the Nagelfluh of Salzburg, Austria, where chapels and rooms underground have continued in splendid preservation since the third century. At Lewiston, on the Niagara, is a similar deposit of Pleistocene, so hard as to require a hammer to break it.

If judged by their degree of consolidation, which of these rocks should be spoken of as the youngest? And why are not any of them just as old, in all probability, as any of the Cambrian or Silurian of Wales or Scandinavia?

(3) Any of the fossiliferous rocks may not only constitute the surface beds over wide areas; they may also consist of loose, unconsolidated materials, in this respect resembling the "late" Tertiaries or the Pleistocene.

The Cambrian beds around the Baltic are in this condition. I quote from a standard authority: "The rocks still retain their original horizontality of deposition, the muds are scarcely indurated, and the sands are still incoherent" (J. A. Howe, "Encycl. Brit.," Vol. V, p. 86). The Cambrian beds in Wisconsin

could be similarly described, as could also the Penokee series near Lake Superior, usually called Algonkian.

Similar facts occur regarding the Ordovician, rated as next in age to the Cambrian. Again I quote : " Across Northern Russia, Ordovician rocks cover a great area ; they consist of clays, bituminous and calcareous shales, sands, and marls . . . they lie flat and undisturbed . . . the sands and clays are as soft and incoherent as the similar rocks of Tertiary age in the south of England " (" Encycl. Brit.," Vol. XX, pp. 236, 237).

In Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama, the Cretaceous beds are equally unconsolidated. The list might be indefinitely extended.

Considered solely by the tests of common sense, which of these formations is the oldest ? Or why should any of them be regarded as intrinsically any older than the chalk of Kent or the Tertiary of the Thames valley ?

B.—Having now considered the various fossiliferous rocks in their external relations, with reference both to the rocks below them and to the surface conditions, let us now consider them in their internal relations, that is, with reference to one another. Do they always occur in at least the same order relative to each other ?

(1) The first principle which we find under this head is that great gaps may occur in this relative sequence, the " younger " beds resting on strata alleged to be very greatly older, but resting *conformably*, as geologists express it, that is, with no physical evidence of any such alleged gap. There has been no disturbance of the lower beds, and not even any erosion of its upper surface, before the upper set were laid down upon them.

A brief word of explanation may be appropriate here. Ordinary conformity is easily understood ; the one stratum has followed the other with only a slight interval of time intervening. In other words, real conformity between two successive strata represents substantial continuity of deposition.

But the advocates of the life-succession theory say that the cases which we are now considering are not of this nature. They look like cases of ordinary conformity ; but they tell us that this appearance is deceptive, for the fossils in the two sets of beds are very, very different. Accordingly, such cases have been given the name of " deceptive conformities." For, according to this theory, there must have been millions of years between the two beds, perhaps many millions of years, although it may look

exactly like a case of ordinary conformity. There is no difference in dip between the two sets of strata above and below this alleged "hiatus," and no erosion on the surface of the lower beds. Moreover, in many cases, also, the two sets of strata are lithically alike; that is, a limestone in the lower set of strata may be followed by a similar limestone in the upper, or a shale may be followed by a similar shale. And yet the insignificant line between them, which it takes an expert to find, may represent a time interval, we are told, of many millions of years. No wonder uniformitarian geologists call it a case of "deceptive conformity."

Let us note some specific examples.

Near Banff, Alberta, Canada, Lower Cretaceous beds are found resting on Lower Carboniferous "without any perceptible break, and the separation of the one from the other," we are told, "is rendered more difficult by the fact that the upper beds of the Carboniferous are lithologically almost precisely like those of the Cretaceous [above them]. Were it not for fossil evidence, one would naturally suppose that a single formation was being dealt with" (Canadian Annual *Report*, N.S., Vol. 2, Part A, p. 8).

And these words which I have just quoted are the more significant when we remember that they are not the words of some youthful novice, but are the pronouncement of the Hon. A. R. C. Selwyn, one of the most illustrious men who ever held the office of Director of the Geological Survey of Canada.

In this instance, the Upper Carboniferous, the Permian, the Triassic, and the Jurassic are absent.

Further north, on the Athabasca, we have a Devonian limestone succeeded by a Cretaceous limestone. This example is also of very wide extent, covering what must be several hundred square miles of area. Here the entire Carboniferous, the Permian, the Triassic, and the Jurassic are absent. Are we to suppose that after this Devonian limestone was deposited, Nature served an injunction on any further action of the elements, and everything had to continue in the *status quo* for all these uncounted millions of years, until Nature was ready to spread out another very similar limestone over the first?

Surely a theory must be very sacred that can be adhered to in the face of such facts as these.

At Louisville, Kentucky, a coral limestone, classed as Middle Devonian, rests in perfect conformity upon an almost exactly similar-looking coral limestone which, because it carries different

fossils, is classed as Middle Silurian, the hiatus representing the last third of Silurian and the first third of Devonian time. And we are told by Charles Schuchert, that "the absolute conformability of the beds can be traced for nearly a mile," and that "the parting between these two zones is like that between any two limestone beds."

At Newsom, Tennessee, 200 miles away, exactly similar rocks occur in the very same position of deceptive conformity; and it would not be at all unreasonable to suppose that the entire interval between these two outcrops, if exposed to view, would show that these conditions were continuous over all this area.

It would be tiresome to give further examples. One of the leading paleontologists of America, in a private conversation, recently told me that he thought he himself had seen a thousand examples of such deceptive conformity, some of them of sufficient area to equal one or more states.

As for other general statements, we might quote Charles Darwin to show that "many cases" of the sort were known in his day. Or we might quote A. Geikie, who says that these conditions are often "not merely local, but persistent over wide areas," and that "they occur abundantly among the European Paleozoic and secondary rocks" ("Textbook," p. 842). The latter author adds the significant words that "it is not so easy to give a satisfactory account" of these conditions—words with which we can all agree.

The late Eduard Suess speaks of "numerous examples" of this sort, where comparatively "young" rocks occur "in perfect concordance on much older beds, so that the stratigraphical relations between offer no hint of the great gap which occurs at the line of contact" ("Face of the Earth," Vol. II, p. 543). All of which, as he very pertinently expresses it, "may well be cause for astonishment."

However, the astonishment which I feel is rather directed towards the methods of reasoning adopted by these illustrious scientists in the face of these facts. We have sometimes been told that facts are stubborn things; it seems that in this case it is the theory which is the stubborn thing. How is it that a mere *theory* regarding the relative sequence in which the fossils *ought* to be found, can hold the right of way over such facts as these?

Surely, any unbiased mind, when confronted with these wide areas of strictly conformable strata—strata which are often lithically identical—must acknowledge that these long intervals

of time alleged to have intervened between them *never really existed*. If physical facts, or objective evidence, are to have the primacy over speculative theories, then surely there must be something radically wrong with that time-honoured theory which assigns successive periods of immense duration to only a *limited few* of the various plants and animals. Obviously, in the instances which we have been considering, and which are to be found literally by the thousand throughout the world, these various pairs of formations, instead of having been separated by millions of years, must have followed one another quite quickly. Probably the interval between two successive tides, or between a flow and an ebb, would be quite long enough to explain all the physical facts. At any rate, an interval much longer than this is flatly contradicted by these same physical facts. In short, if we are to take these facts for what they seem to mean, the entire theory of a definite historical value for the various groups of fossils must be given up.

(2) But another series of facts now demands our attention. For if the fossils have no intrinsic time-value, then we ought occasionally to find them in the reverse of the accustomed order. That is, we might reasonably expect to find Cambrian or Ordovician on top of Permian or Cretaceous or Tertiary. Nay, more, we might even expect to find them in this reverse order, but *conformably*, with every physical appearance of having been laid down in this "wrong" order, and in quick succession.

Do we have any such facts as these? Yes; plenty of them.

But the believers in the current theory have sought to provide beforehand for just such conditions. They warn the student to be careful, and not to trust to the physical evidence. Take the following from H. Alleyne Nicholson, the noted Scotch paleontologist: "It may even be said that in any case where there should appear to be a clear and decisive discordance between the physical and the paleontological evidence as to the age of a given series of beds, it is the former that is to be distrusted rather than the latter" ("Ancient Life History of the Earth," p. 40).

That is, the fossil evidence is to be held to, even when contradicted by plain physical facts. If we should find any similar directions in a textbook of physics, or chemistry, or astronomy, or botany, or zoology, it would not be difficult to make the author of such a statement a laughing-stock on both sides of the Atlantic. But the real humour of the situation in geology is that this rule of Nicholson's has actually been followed seriously by geologists

for over half a century, and still serves to settle all controversy about the age of any newly discovered deposits.

Substantially the same thing is given by Geikie, in telling how we can prove the reality of huge earth movements which would appear to be physically incredible. "We may even demonstrate," he says, with charming *naïveté*, "that in some mountainous ground the strata have been turned completely upside down, if we can show that the fossils in what are now the uppermost layers ought properly to lie underneath those in the beds below them" ("Textbook," p. 837, Ed. of 1903).

On another page we have a similar statement from this same illustrious leader in the science, when speaking of certain conditions in the Alps: "The strata could scarcely be supposed to have been really inverted, save for the evidence as to their true order of succession supplied by their included fossils . . . Portions of Carboniferous strata appear as if regularly interbedded among Jurassic rocks, and, indeed, could not be separated save after a study of their enclosed organic remains" ("Textbook," p. 678).

Why should I need to comment on the method of reasoning displayed in these three quotations just given? It seems to me that, if we have any faith at all in the continued progress of science, we must believe that the day will come when such statements as these two from Geikie and the former one from Nicholson will be regarded as among the literary curiosities in the history of scientific theories.

I have not the time to speak of the great numbers of minor examples of the fossils in the wrong order, where only a few formations are involved, that is, where the alleged differences in age are not very great. These cases are usually spoken of under the name of "pioneer colonies," or "recurrent faunas," or as "immigrant" groups which occur in places where they are not expected. Barrande, H. S. Williams, and E. O. Ulrich have devoted much space to such phenomena, in endeavours to maintain the scientific value of "index" fossils in spite of such conditions.

But for extreme cases, where, for example, Cambrian or Ordovician beds are found on top of Cretaceous or Tertiary, obviously some other explanation must be adopted. These extreme cases go under the name of "thrust faults," or "thrusts," or sometimes they are called "overthrust folds." Plenty of examples will be found listed in all the standard textbooks of the science, not to speak of the special monographs by such men as Heim, Lugeon,

Rothpletz, Bailey Willis, and many others. These conditions have also been discussed at some length by the present author in the two books already referred to. Here it must suffice to speak briefly of one or two examples.

We may begin with the large area involving the front ranges of the Rocky Mountains, which extends from about the middle of Montana some 500 miles north to the Yellowhead Pass in Alberta. It includes several parallel ranges of mountains, with all of the Glacier National Park, and the picturesque scenery around Banff, Alberta. On the American side of the international boundary line, the width of the area is some 30 or 40 miles, for it runs back to the Flathead River. To the north, the exact width is not well determined. But the total area would seem to be at least 20,000 square miles, perhaps more.

Throughout this whole area the underlying rocks are always Cretaceous; while the overlying rocks are classed as Algonkian or Pre-Cambrian on the American side, but to the north they are classed variously as Cambrian, Devonian, or Permo-Carboniferous, although throughout the whole area these upper rocks are strikingly uniform in their physical features and general appearance.

Over all this vast district the underlying Cretaceous beds are usually soft shales or sandstones, containing many good deposits of coal, as at the Bankhead Mines, near Banff, and at Coleman, near Crowsnest Mountain, also in the valley of the Flathead, west of the Glacier National Park. Resting on these soft Cretaceous shales are the Algonkian or other Paleozoic quartzites and crystalline limestones, while the line of contact between the two formations always exactly resembles an ordinary stratification plane. Also all the beds are approximately horizontal, with only a few disturbed points here and there. In scores of localities good exposures are shown, the border of the entire area being almost devoid of vegetation and showing these contacts most clearly, except where obscured by talus slopes. And in every single exposure that I am acquainted with throughout the entire area, the line of contact between the upper and the lower beds always resembles an ordinary stratification plane, and usually resembles a perfect example of natural conformity.

Many half-tone illustrations of these contacts will be seen in the author's "New Geology," recently published. Such picturesque outliers as Chief Mountain and Crowsnest Mountain are typical of the whole area. On the Canadian side, at about Lat. 51°,

there are some four parallel ranges of these Paleozoic mountains, made of horizontal strata, and resting in perfect conformity on the Cretaceous beds, which constitute the floors of the valleys and run under the base of the mountains, just as the soil runs under a building. Chief Mountain and the other outliers resemble Paleozoic islands floating on a Cretaceous sea.

The advocates of the prevailing theories try to explain these phenomena by assuming that these Paleozoic strata were once lifted up from enormous depths two or three miles down in the ground, and then thrust bodily forward over these soft shales, after which the upper strata were cut up by erosion into the forms as we now find them.

My contention is that all this is a quite unnecessary draft on our credulity. Why do we need to "explain" these phenomena, of Paleozoic mountains resting on Cretaceous? Why not take them at their face value, for just what they seem to mean? Is there a single valid reason why we should not do so? This in essence is the entire difference between me and the uniformitarian geologists. It is clear that either these rocks are wrong, and terribly deceiving, or the entire theory of a definite historical order of the fossils is wrong. Many geologists seem to have such faith in their theory that they can give the lie to these rocks. I prefer to treat Nature with more respect, and to distrust any theory however time-honoured, rather than say, in the face of these physical facts, that Nature's record here has been written in code and can be deciphered only by means of a key which we possess. I think we can be better employed than in attempting to decode the plain statements of Nature according to any such key, no matter if this key is a precious heirloom which has been bequeathed to us by some of the most illustrious names in the history of science. The great discoveries in chemistry and physics and astronomy were not made while adhering to any such method of reasoning.

It would be asking too much of you to listen to a detailed description of the various other areas scattered over the globe which are more or less like the one already described. We have a dozen or so in various parts of America, several of them being 200 or more miles long. One famous case occurs in the Highlands of Scotland; while the Alps give us many examples. Indeed, similar phenomena occur all over the globe wherever detailed study has been given to the rocks.

But it is now time to pause and to take a survey of our work. What have we accomplished?

We set out to find an explanation of the geological changes, that is, to decide between the uniformitarian and the catastrophic explanations. But at the very outset we were held up over a method of procedure ; for the uniformitarians refused to allow us to look at the fossil world as a whole, and said that we must examine the fossils a few at a time, according to an exact chronological system which they had worked out. This chronological time-scale had to be examined ; but we have found it wanting under scientific tests. It will not bear close scientific scrutiny. We therefore conclude that we are now at liberty to resume our original inquiry. We wish to know how the geological changes took place ; but we do not now have to take the fossiliferous deposits a few at a time ; we may look at the fossil world as a whole. On this basis, we dare not affirm that the trilobites and the graptolites lived and died before the ammonites and the belemnites ; they may all have lived contemporaneously. The dinosaurs, also, may have been contemporary with the titanotheres, the mastodons, and the mammoths, and we are sure that the last two were contemporary with man.

Now this does not mean that all the fossiliferous deposits are of the same age, or that they were all deposited simultaneously. Not by any means. All the other common-sense tests of age are still left us ; but the myth of a life-succession in a definite and precise order is now gone for ever in the mind of any person acquainted with the facts who has had enough mental training to know when a conclusion is scientifically established.

But what is the precise bearing of all this upon our prime problem of having to decide between uniformity and catastrophism ?

It may be that someone will have the courage to defend a uniformitarian interpretation of the rocks, even with the life-succession theory utterly discredited ; but I hardly think so. Just consider the problem of the extinction of those species found in the Pleistocene alone, and merely from North America. As O. P. Hay expresses it : " Genera and families, even orders, were wiped out of existence, and these included some of the noblest animals that have graced the face of the earth, the elephants, the mastodons, tapirs, many species of bison, horses, sabre-tooth cats, huge tigers and gigantic wolves " (" The Pleistocene of North America," p. 5, 1923). To these he adds also the huge ground-sloths, the glyptodons, various species of camels, and the rhinoceros. Now, if to this formidable list we have to add the

great army of the dinosaurs, with the many bizarre mammals of the Tertiary beds, who will have the courage to talk about geological uniformity, if we admit the possibility, nay the probability, that these all actually lived contemporaneously together in various parts of the ancient world? In fact, I feel that it would be a reflection on the intelligence of my audience to suppose that anyone would seriously defend a uniformitarian interpretation of the rocks, with the extinction of hundreds of species of animals, unless we allow him to arrange for these extinctions a few at a time, *à la* Cuvier and William Smith. If we find a hundred people all dead at once, it would be hard to persuade a coroner that they had all died natural deaths.

One further word in closing. I consider that some very vital parts of the uniformitarian dogma have already been disposed of by others. I consider that Sir Henry H. Howorth, one of the Vice-Presidents of this Institute, has effectually disposed of the myth of a great ice age, or, as he would prefer to call it, the "glacial nightmare." Equally conclusive is the work of Prof. Eduard Suess, of Vienna, in disposing of the long popular fable that the coasts of all the continents are constantly on the see-saw up and down, and that by projecting this imaginary exchange of land and water back into the past we can explain all the transgressions of the ocean recorded in the strata. His gigantic work, "The Face of the Earth," has settled this matter once for all. The work of the "Challenger" Expedition, with that of other subsequent similar enterprises, has also dissipated many other fables inherited from the early days of the science when the ocean was wholly unknown and the lands were only partially explored.

The days of a narrow provincialism in geology are past. Whatever explanation we adopt must be based on a knowledge of the world as a whole. We must also discard all uniformitarian prejudices and be willing to decide the matter honestly by induction alone, and according to the evidence. Above all, we must renounce all dogmatisms about the relative ages of the various "index fossils." In this way, by building only on facts, we may hope to construct a science of geology comparable somewhat in its reliability and its finality with any of the other sciences, such as chemistry, or physics, or astronomy.

Just how far backward in our world's history we may be able to go while adhering to a strict scientific method, or how large an induction we may be able to make with safety, I do not know.

But a strictly scientific system of geology is the next great advance in the physical and biological sciences. And when it is established, I am confident that it will reveal to us nothing which will be out of harmony with that sublime record of the early days of our world which has been furnished us by the only Being capable of knowing all the facts.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS considered the title of the paper a misnomer, as the scriptural account was not dealt with. The testimony of the rocks set forth God's everlasting power and divinity that men might be without excuse (Rom. i, 20), and was called by Dr. Joseph Cook, of Boston, "the oldest testament." Believers in the accuracy of the Genesis account were assured that there was no real discrepancy between this oldest testament and the Old Testament. If there was any divergence it was between the readers of the respective testaments, and he thought the readers of Genesis were not without fault, as they had usually failed to appreciate that, being written by a man, it must use human language, and adopt the standpoint of a supposed observer upon this earth in describing creation. He considered that the theories of geologists were more reliable than those of biologists, as these latter had no "oldest testament" to read.

He was glad that both the lecturer and the chairman discredited the uniformitarian theory, which was as old as those mockers who said "All things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. iii, 4), or the novelist who coined the phrase "Miracles do not happen." For himself he believed that the greatest catastrophic interference by God with the course of the present world was found in the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Pastor W. PERCIVAL-PRESCOTT said: Personally, I entirely agree with Professor McCready Price that "a strictly scientific system of Geology . . . will reveal to us nothing which will be out of harmony with the Sublime Record of the early days of our world."

It would appear from this paper that "the notorious onion-coat

theory," of orthodox geologists, was based upon a very limited examination of the earth's surface and substance. The theorists who held the view that by a process of evolution the different strata of the earth had taken millions of years to form had now to face the facts of recent stratigraphical discoveries.

It is said that Professor McCready Price, for the last twenty-six years, had travelled about the world, with pick and shovel, getting first-hand knowledge of his subject, and in his two standard books—*New Geology* and *Fundamentals of Geology*—he clearly proves that the case for uniformity cannot be sustained by mineralogical evidence. Rocks belonging to various systems or formations give us fossils in such a state of preservation that we are forced to the conclusion that they must have been swallowed up in some world-catastrophe. Then there is the evidence of a sudden change from the fossil age to the modern age.

Because Professor McCready Price had taken the view of Catastrophism against that of Uniformity someone had said that he was a geological heretic, but he (the speaker) would remind the Institute that Professor McCready Price was not the only scientist who took this unorthodox view of geology.

Professor A. H. Sayce (Oxford University) had written that "Sir H. Howorth's arguments from the presence of herds of mammoths, etc., in places where they must have been overwhelmed by a sudden catastrophe, have always seemed to me very strong, and have never yet been answered by orthodox geology."

There is the evidence, also, of a great climatic change. Mammoths had been found in the Arctic Regions with tropical vegetation in their mouths. How had these animals come into these regions? Would not these discoveries prove that the Arctic Regions at some time in the past, probably before the Flood, had had a warm climate, and that through a sudden change, from warmth to extreme cold, these mammoths had become instantly entombed in the ice where they had rested until found by their discoverers thousands of years afterwards?

Professor McCready Price, in his *Fundamentals of Geology*, says: "Who has not read of their untainted meat, now making food for dogs and wolves? Their stomachs are well filled with undigested food, showing that they were quietly feeding when the

crisis came. Dr. Hertz recently reported one not only with its stomach full of food, but with its mouth full, too."

The Biblical record is that out of chaos God made the earth in its ordered and organized form, and placed plant and animal life upon it by a special creation. Afterward, because of the corrupt practices of the earth's inhabitants, God destroyed "the world that then was" by a huge catastrophe called the Flood. The strata of the earth that now is marvellously corroborate the Bible record.

God did not use the process of Evolution, covering millions of years to form the earth as we see it to-day, but ordained Christ to be the active creative principle and dynamic power to produce and sustain the world. "All things were made by Him." "For by Him were all things created," and He upholds "all things by the word of His power."

Mr. HOSTE said: Though unqualified to criticize the geology of this paper, I am surprised at the sparse references it contains to the Bible. Or are we to conclude that the relations of geology to the Bible are practically nil? When the question was mooted one day as to how far Gen. i was in harmony with science, Huxley made the sage remark that we must first know exactly what Gen. i teaches and what science teaches. It is too easily taken for granted that the subject of the whole chapter is the creation of the world; it would be more correct to say the renovation of the world. In verse 1 we have the original creation, "In the beginning (whenever that was) God created (however that was) the heavens and the earth." Then follows a gap which the geologists may make as long as the physicists will allow them—a gap during which the great geological strata had ample time to be deposited. The Dover cliffs took rather more than six days, or even the period of the Flood, to be deposited. Call it "onion-coat theory" if you will, though I never knew till now that the coats of an onion were deposited in that way. Then in verse 2 we have a description of the earth's condition, "without form and void," in which it was when the Spirit of God took in hand to prepare it as a habitation for man. The heavens are not referred to now, but the earth.

The Hebrew "tho-pu ravohu," in the only other places, I believe, in the Old Testament where they occur together (Isa. xxxiv, 11, and Jer. iv, 23), describe a desolation effected by judgment. Many

believe that the same words in Gen. i describe not the original, but an induced condition. Why we are not told. Isa. xlv, 18 (R.V.), tells us explicitly, "God created not the world a waste" (thohu). Not unlikely the Ice Age had preceded verse 2 for many hundreds of years (I do not say it came then to an abrupt conclusion), and what organic life could survive such a condition of things? Distinguished Hebraists affirm that the form of the Hebrew in verse 2 is precisely that which detaches verse 2 from verse 1, though it describes a condition which had existed prior to verse 2. The "and" at the beginning of verse 2 would prove besides that verse 1 is not a summary of the chapter. Canon Fausset mentions above as "one of the three leading views of the most eminent geologists." Dr. C. Wordsworth says it had been adopted, among others, by Buckland and Sedgwick. Dr. Pusey, in his book on Daniel, p. 86, second edition, strongly upholds this view. The elder Delitzsch, in his *Commentary on Genesis*, Ed. 3, p. 92, maintains the same view. See also speaker's commentary *in loco*. If you make "the days" of Gen. i ("evenings and mornings") geological periods, you must read Exod. xx, 11, "For in six geological periods," etc.—from which one might argue for a similar length of the Sabbath.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE writes: The author has shown that the formations to which he calls attention present marked difficulty on the theory of orthodox geologists. But is this enough?

If, after making allowance for local variations, there has been no general progression of living forms, how are we to explain the widespread evidence of such development which exists in regular formations? We are presented with a choice between two difficulties of which that created by the hypothesis of the author appears to me to be much the greater.

From Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S.: What the writer is aiming at in this paper it is difficult to see. He seems rather like the proverbial bull in the china shop. With one horn he has destroyed the science of Geology and with the other that of Palæontology, and then, standing among the ruins, he tells us to put the fragments together and construct a new system of Geology. The title of his paper led one to hope that I should find something in it in "relation to Scripture Revelation," but until his closing sentence no reference

is made to the testimony of Scripture, and then only to express the confidence that the new Geology will "reveal nothing which is out of harmony with it." Reading between the lines, one cannot help the suspicion that he is harking back to the childish theory that the Almighty having made the world smashed it all up by a great catastrophe and then made it all over again in 144 hours. To come to particulars. The author does not seem to use the terms "conformable" and "unconformable" as geologists generally use them. He says "conformity" (p. 106) means that "one stratum has followed the other with only a slight interval of time intervening." Then he proceeds to say that "real conformity between two successive strata represents substantial continuity of deposition." Now the term means nothing of the kind. It has no reference to "time" or "continuity of deposition." It simply means that two strata have been laid down one upon the other, the lower surface of the upper one following the same line of formation as the upper surface of the lower. Like two planks of wood or two sheets of paper which may be bent or folded or lying flat. The upper one may have been laid down ages after the lower.

Similarly the writer does not seem to understand that the old controversy between "uniformitarianism" and "catastrophism" is as dead as Queen Anne. We are all uniformitarianists and catastrophists. Geological processes have in the past gone on for ages with the same uniformity of method, although not always at the same pace as they are proceeding to-day, but catastrophies have occurred like that of the recent earthquake in Japan—more or less local, or more or less general. But it seems that the author will not have it so. He *appears* to insist—but can it be so?—on viewing "the fossil world as a whole, a unit," and then supposing "some great world catastrophe" as churning the whole mass into an "anti-onion-coat" mess "as the most probable general explanation of the major part, but a quite indefinite and undefinable part of the stratified deposits" (p. 101). So that after the catastrophe some "indefinite and undefinable part" of the "onion-coat" formation was left or came back again! But he assures us that the attitude of the modern catastrophist "is not dogmatic—it is teachable and willing to learn," and very much need it has of it.

I have no wish, however, to minimize real difficulties. The case he presents on p. 107 needs much further explanation. Under what

local conditions a carboniferous stratum could be laid down or now found upon a cretaceous it would be difficult to say without further information than the writer has supplied. And so with the other similar examples. Geologists are not unaware of these facts, and in some cases, as, for instance, in the formation of the Alps, the stupendous forces of nature at some great catastrophic period have, as Prof. Geikie says, turned some of the strata "completely upside down," and it is not inconceivable that at a later period these masses may have been thrown back again upon strata more recently formed. But I submit that these few exceptional local anomalies do not afford sufficient evidence for the writer's gesture in rejecting the whole system of stratigraphical geology built up after more than a century's painstaking observation and collection of facts by thousands of competent observers and workers in all parts of the world. Take the case of the coal measures. These strata occur nearly all over the world. The palæontologist finds in them the same orders of plant life everywhere. They follow and are succeeded by similar strata, and their position in the Palæozoic period of the scientific story of creation corresponds precisely with the position of plant life as the predominant feature of the "third day" in the story of Gen. i. Take again the Mesozoic period. The enormous saurians—40 feet, 50 feet and 100 feet long—belong practically to that period and to that period alone, and their position in the scientific story corresponds precisely with their position as the predominant feature of creative power on the fifth day of the Scripture story. If Prof. Price destroys the geological evidence for the historical accuracy of the Creator's work he will destroy the accuracy of the Scripture record also. The two are in such perfect agreement that he cannot destroy the one and retain the other. Each is, as he fitly says in his concluding sentence, the "sublime record of the early days of our world which has been furnished us by the only Being capable of knowing all the facts."

Mr. H. O. WELLER writes: As a scientific member of the Institute, I am much disappointed in Prof. Price's communication. The title led me to suppose that he was presenting for our publication a paper that could be read profitably along with such a work as that, for instance, of Sir Bertram Windle, LL.D., F.R.S., &c., in his *The Church and Science*. In place, however, of an ordered

discussion and comparison of Geology as we understand it with revealed Truth as we receive it, Prof. Price has given us an almost incoherent account of some unaccepted theories of his own without relating them, except in the thinnest way, with the Scriptures. This very thin connection is, I take it, his reference to "some great world catastrophe," meaning, I suppose, the Deluge.

All this is disappointing for several reasons, the chief being that it leads our non-scientific members and associates to suppose that current Geology is irreconcilable with Scripture. This is not so: and, consequently, I suggest that anyone who wishes to show the relation of the two would be advised either to concentrate his attention on the science as thrashed out by a succession of trained workers (not all of them heathen!) than to accept blindly the enthusiastic material of some newly-inspired amateur just because they suppose him to be upholding Scripture. I say "suppose" because, so far as I can see by a second glance through the paper, the only reference to the Bible is under the name "the good Book" (p. 99) and the only reference to God the Creator is under the name "the only Being" (p. 115). Are these sufficient references for the Victoria Institute of 1924?

There is only one of the questions discussed in the paper that I wish to comment on—the alleged disposal of "the myth of a great Ice Age," by Sir Henry Howorth. I was not aware that this "myth" had been disposed of; but if it has, I, for one, am sorry, because I regard the great northern and southern ice-caps—in some places measured as two miles thick—as an argument for a world-covering Deluge. If the whole world were actually covered by water, this water would naturally be ice to latitudes closely approaching the tropics, north and south, and would take years to retreat. It may be mentioned that the date of the great ice-caps is placed by at least one reputable writer, not in any remote time, but "while the civilization of Babylon was in its hey-day."

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I do not think that I ought to take the valuable space of this report to answer objections which are clearly due to the fact that my objectors have not given proper attention to what my paper actually says. However, I may have made a mistake in assuming

that these matters in dispute between me and the evolutionary geologists are as familiar to the people of England as they undoubtedly are to most of the people in America who are interested in these questions, for my books have had no considerable circulation across the Atlantic. The friends of the Bible here in America seem to have no difficulty in seeing the bearings of these geological facts upon the older views regarding the first chapters of Genesis. In proof of the latter I may mention the fact that in the recent Fundamentalist-Modernist Debate, held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, the Rev. John Roach Straton rested substantially his whole geological argument on what I have worked out in my *New Geology : a Textbook for Colleges*, this part of his argument occupying nearly six pages in the published report.

There are only two interpretations of the rocks now before the world. The first is the evolutionary, which is highly speculative in its methods, and extremely dogmatic in the presentation of its teachings. In fact, it is largely occupied with dogmatisms about the relative ages of the various stratified deposits, and assures us that it has worked out an infallible system of chronology of all the various types of life.

The other system of geology I have called the New Catastrophism. This is not dogmatic ; for it is inductive. Also it is non-evolutionary, for a strict inductive and objective study of the rocks does not reveal any ascertainable world-chronology which is decipherable from the strata. It endeavours to keep facts and hypotheses clear and distinct, in this way eliminating dogmatic assertions and speculative theories. In short, it is an endeavour (perhaps imperfectly carried out) to reform the methods of the science of geology, and an attempt to place the facts of this science on the same objective basis as is now employed in such sciences as physics and chemistry.

It is unfortunate that this method of handling geological facts is so new that it appears "disappointing" and "almost incoherent" to some of the honourable members of the Institute. Have we been so long accustomed to dogmatisms and theorisings in this science that a severely objective treatment of the facts should bring out such criticisms ? If so, I fancy that this condition only indicates that a reform in this science is long overdue.

The evolution theory has so long been entrenched in the science

of geology that to some it may seem like iconoclasm to question its chief theory—the chronological arrangement of the fossils. *But no adequate discussion of the theory of organic evolution is possible until this alleged chronological arrangement of the fossils has been evaluated by strictly scientific methods.* This I have tried to do. That I did not go further has been due to the limitations of time and space in these reports. But I flatter myself that the bearings of these geological facts, as presented in the foregoing pages, ought to be self-evident to every thoughtful reader.

At any rate, I could not well trace out in detail the connection between such a system of geology and the Bible without being in danger of departing from that strictly objective treatment and inductive method which it has been my chief endeavour to follow.

THE 662ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MARCH 10TH, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. ARTHUR H. FINN IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following:—The Rev. Canon H. E. Nolloth, D.D., as a Member; and David Somerville, Esq., and the Rev. Prof. Julius R. Mantey, Th.D., as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A., D.D., to read his paper on "The Johannine Authorship of the Fourth Gospel."

THE JOHANNINE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH
GOSPEL. By the REV. HAROLD SMITH, M.A., D.D.

I.—External Evidence : (a) For the Book.

WE find at the close of the second century all four Gospels, bearing their present names, universally accepted as authoritative Scripture. This holds good all over the Christian world.

Irenaeus (c. 185 A.D.) gives, as is well known, rather fanciful reasons why there must necessarily be *four* Gospels,* neither more nor less. But it is clear that neither he nor his contemporaries first decided upon the number *four*, and then reached it either by addition or by subtraction of doubtful cases. Such a process has clearly sometimes taken place, *e.g.*, in arriving at the exact number of "Seven Penitential Psalms" or "Seven Deadly Sins." But *Irenaeus* has another passage where he points out that the Gnostics have strangely neglected the number *five*; he shows that this recurs constantly in nature (*e.g.*, five fingers and five senses) and in Scripture (*e.g.*, five books of the law, five wise virgins). Thus, if *five* Gospels† had been at all generally recognised he could quite as easily have shown that number to be determined by the fitness of things; so with *three*.

* III, xi, 8, p. 190.

† II, xxiv, 4, p. 151.

Perhaps somewhat earlier, perhaps somewhat later, we have what is known as the "*Muratorian Canon*" (because first published by the Italian scholar Muratori, eighteenth century). This gives, in a very corrupt Latin text, a list of books recognised at Rome. It recognises four Gospels, declaring them to be harmonious in the main points, although various elements are taught in each. It gives an account of the origin of the Fourth Gospel, by "John, one of the disciples" (*see later*).

Theophilus of Antioch, 180, quotes John i, 1-3, as the utterance of John, one of those inspired.

The Gnostic *Heracleon*, who wrote a commentary on this Gospel, must have known it as John's.

From a time considerably earlier than this we find this Gospel used and valued, though nothing is said of its authorship. In this, however, it shares with the other three Gospels, which are also used without being named.

If later imagination had had anything to do with the naming, we should not have had Gospels ascribed to Matthew, Mark and Luke, all men of secondary importance. Therefore, there is nothing distinctive or suspicious in the absence of ascription of authorship to quotations or echoes of the Fourth Gospel; and, like the rest, its ascription comes from apparently authentic tradition, not imagination or conjecture.

Justin Martyr (150-160) uses this Gospel as one of the "memoirs written by the Apostles and those who followed them." He does not, indeed, quote from it nearly so often as from the rest; but has several clear echoes of it (*e.g.*, on the new birth); and his doctrine, especially that of the Logos, is largely based on it. His use of it is like his use of St. Paul, whom he never formally quotes in his extant works. Any idea that Justin regarded this Gospel as of less value than the rest is overthrown by his disciple *Tatian*, who not only has several quotations from it in his *Apology*, but made, either in Greek or in Syriac, a harmony of the Four (*Diatessaron*), using our Fourth Gospel equally with the rest, and beginning with its Prologue, "In the beginning was the Word."

We find it highly valued among the *Gnostics*, especially the *Valentinians*. *Ptolemaeus* quotes and interprets the Prologue. *Heracleon* wrote a commentary upon a large part of it, if not the whole; we have only fragments of it in Origen's commentary, which itself has reached us very incomplete. *Heracleon* sometimes applies it to establish *Valentinian* teaching; but often his sayings are of interest and value, apart from coming from our oldest commentary on the Gospels. Thus he has some good notes on Chap. IV: "The water which Jesus gives is of the Spirit and his power; this life is eternal and never decaying, for inalienable is the divine power and gift. . . . Those who partake of what is supplied richly from above, themselves

pour forth the things bestowed upon them unto the eternal life of others." . . . "The Saviour called His Father's will His own food, for it was His nourishment, refreshment and power." But still more significant than this use of the Gospel by Valentinians is the fact that their distinctive terminology seems based upon the language of this Gospel, especially the Prologue. Hence it must have held a recognised position by the time the Valentinians originated, say A.D. 130.

There are quotations or echoes also in other Gnostic writers, including a book ascribed to *Basileides*. But there is the possibility that this comes from a later member of his school.

The relation of the epistles of *Ignatius* to this Gospel is not clear. He has close affinities of language and ideas, but no definite quotations; and the echoes are not quite clear enough to make it certain that he was familiar with the book, and does not simply echo current teaching.

The only second century rejection of the book comes from some writers, whom Epiphanius, perhaps following Hippolytus, nicknames the "Alogi"—a term signifying that they (1) rejected the Logos, and (2) were therefore *irrational*. They were strong opponents of the Montanists, with their doctrine of the Spirit, for which they appealed to this Gospel; and their Millenarianism, for which they appealed to the Apocalypse. The Alogi sought to cut the ground from under them by denying the authority of both books, ascribing them (or at least the Apocalypse) to the heretic Cerinthus. But they did not assert that either book was recent.

Thus this Gospel can be traced back to 130, when it must have had already a recognised position; possibly to 115. The *terminus a quo* depends on the date of the circulation of the other Gospels. Tradition is clear that this was written after the rest; one form is that John knew and approved of them, but regarded them as incomplete.

(b) *For the Author.*

There is plenty of evidence that at the end of the first century there lived and died in "Asia"—more particularly at *Ephesus*—a great Christian teacher and ruler named John, a disciple of the Lord, who is repeatedly spoken of as "the beloved disciple" of this Gospel, and as its source or author. Thus *Polycrates* says that the "great lights fallen asleep in Asia" include "John, who leaned on the Lord's breast, who had been a priest wearing the sacred plate,* a witness (or martyr) and teacher; he sleeps at Ephesus." Irenaeus, speaking of his own intercourse with Polycarp, says "how he would relate his intercourse with John and with the others that had seen the Lord."† Elsewhere, giving the origins of the Gospels, he says: "John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned on his breast, also published a

* πῆταλον Eus. v, 24.

† Eus. v, 20.

Gospel while living in Ephesus of Asia." He also gives, on the authority of Polycarp, the story of John rushing out of the bath-house at Ephesus on meeting Cerinthus there.* Clement of Alexandria may have gained his knowledge of Christianity in Asia from one of his teachers, an Ionian. He gives the story of John and the young robber as "a true story of John the Apostle," who, "when on the death of the tyrant he removed from Patmos to Ephesus, went also to the surrounding districts . . . in one place appointing bishops, in another setting in order whole churches, in another ordaining a ministry."

The Leucian Acts of John—one of the oldest of the apocryphal Acts, perhaps belonging to the second century—also put John at Ephesus.

The Muratorian Canon gives no place, but associates John with Andrew. "The fourth Gospel comes from John, one of the disciples. At the instance of his fellow disciples and bishops he said: 'Fast with me to-day for three days, and let us tell one another whatever may be revealed to each of us.' The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should write all in his own name, and that all should certify."

It is perhaps worth noting that the character of John as revealed in the two reasonably authentic stories told of him by Irenaeus and Clement is close to that of the Apostle. Later stories are of not nearly the same value.

But while there was a general agreement that this John was the author of the Gospel, and, no doubt, he was commonly identified with the Apostle, yet Clement is the first to state this definitely. Others simply call him the "disciple of the Lord." This of itself would raise no difficulty. It might be thought sufficient to use the title given in his Gospel, where the term "apostle" is practically absent (only in xiii, 16). And as the son of Zebedee is the only disciple bearing that name in the N.T. (unless John Mark be so reckoned), further distinction would be thought unnecessary. It is not as with two named James or two named Philip.

But there are two points of external evidence against this identity: one long known, the other discovered only of late.

(1) There is some appreciable evidence for the existence of another John, distinct from the Apostle. The two may then easily have been confused, as seems to have been the case with the two Philips, the Apostle and the Deacon. We are told definitely by Polycrates that Philip the *Apostle* settled at Hierapolis, near Laodicea. But the mention of his *daughters* by Papias, Polycrates and Proclus seems to identify him with the Deacon. So, it is said, it may have been with John.

* III, iii, 2, p. 177.

The oldest piece of evidence is Eusebius' extract from the preface of Papias' *Exposition of the Lord's Oracles*. He says he had collected what he could from those who had followed the elders (*i.e.*, the Apostles), inquiring what Andrew said, or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; "and what Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, say." Notice that he uses the present tense of these two last; this suggests that they were living and accessible when Papias collected his sayings; Eusebius thinks that from his frequent quotation of them he may have known them personally. But, as Eusebius notices, he has two mentions of "John." Are they one, or two? The title "elder" proves nothing, as it is used of both (as is that of "disciple"). If one and the same man, the Apostle, is meant, we have rather a clumsy piece of composition. Eusebius maintains that two Johns are implied. He desires to find a second John to whom to ascribe the Apocalypse, for which he does not care, and perhaps also the two minor catholic epistles; but moderns would identify him—and not the Apostle—with John of Ephesus, the writer or source of the Fourth Gospel. On the other hand, the juxtaposition of John and Matthew may be suggested by both being evangelists.

(2) Comparatively lately it has been noticed that there is some evidence that John the Apostle suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Jews, presumably, but not certainly, in Palestine. This is stated, in the best MS. of Georgius Hamartolus, a writer of the ninth century, and in what probably is an epitome of Philip of Side, of the fifth century, to have been stated by Papias in his second book—(the two writers may not be independent). But it is very strange that if Papias really said this, Irenaeus and Eusebius should have ignored it; it would seem that either he did not really say it, or they did not credit him. These two writers are not remarkable for accuracy; Georgius combines the martyrdom of John with his return from Patmos and residence in Asia. On the work of Philip of Side, a presbyter of Constantinople in the earlier part of the fifth century, and thought at one time very likely to become Bishop, we have a contemporary criticism by Socrates the historian. His *Christian History* was a most voluminous work, dragging in all kinds of irrelevant matters in order to display the author's learning; it was written in an elaborate but obscure style, and constantly shifted from one period to another, so confusing the sequence. Some of the fragments we possess do not show much accuracy.

There are, however, various other writings (*e.g.*, the Syriac Martyrology) which speak of the martyrdom of John the Apostle. These would have more weight if they did not come from the period when every leader of the earlier generation was supposed to have been a martyr, at least if he was to be honoured properly. Mark x, 39, may be used on both sides; it is held by some that it shows that

John had already suffered martyrdom when Mark wrote his Gospel ; but it may equally well have led men to assume, without any definite tradition, or without seeing its incompatibility with the residence of John at Ephesus, that he must have been martyred. The story, told first by Tertullian, of his being given a cup of poison and then plunged in boiling oil, but escaping unharmed, seems based on this verse, as giving a literal fulfilment of the "cup" and the "baptism."

There is thus *some* evidence (1) for there having been two Johns ; (2) for John the Apostle having been martyred, presumably early. Hence there is a tendency to ascribe the Gospel to the other John. Some forms of this view, however, make little real difference ; the Gospel comes, all the same, from an intimate disciple of the Lord.

II.—Internal Evidence.

It is usual to work this out in stages : *e.g.*, the author is (1) a Jew ; (2) a Jew of Palestine ; (3) of the first century ; (4) an eye-witness ; (5) an apostle ; (6) St. John. But it is difficult to keep some of these stages separate ; *e.g.*, most of the arguments for his being a Jew point to his being a Hebrew, not a Hellenist.

That he was a Hebrew is now generally recognised—allowing for the fact that some distinguish the *source* or *witness* from the *evangelist*. According to Dr. Latimer Jackson, "The general trend of scholarship is to affirm that [the evangelist] originally belonged to Jewish Christianity. The Gospel, penned for Gentile readers to whom Jewish terms had to be translated and explained, throughout reveals a distinctly Semitic mode of thought by its phraseology, its frequent Hebraisms, its comparatively limited vocabulary. . . . His diction has closest affinity not with the literature of Hellenistic Judaism, but with that of Palestinian learning."

Dr. Burney regards the Gospel as having been originally written in Aramaic.

Mr. Abrahams ("Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis," in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*) says : "Most remarkable has been the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, especially in relation to the circumstances under which they are reported to have been spoken."

We notice that (1) some of the quotations from the O.T. are independent of the LXX (*e.g.*, Zech. xii, 10; in John xix, 37); (2) a number of Hebrew or Aramaic words are given, with their correct meaning ; (3) there is familiarity with Jewish ideas, *e.g.*, Pharisaic contempt for the common people (vii, 49) ; warning against multiplying words with a woman (iv, 27) ; low opinion of the dispersion among the Greeks (vii, 35). In particular, more light is thrown upon the current doctrine of the Messiah than in all the rest of the N.T.

The one serious charge of ignorance is the mention of Caiaphas as

“High Priest that year,” which suggests it was thought to be an annual office. But it may well mean simply that he was High Priest “that fateful year, the year of all years.”

An argument against the writer’s Jewish origin is his constant description of the Lord’s opponents as “the Jews”—not “the scribes” or the like. But this merely associates the Lord’s opponents with the Jewish opponents of Christianity when the book was written; and is balanced by the saying “Salvation is of the Jews.”

He has also full knowledge of the country of Palestine, speaking familiarly of places not mentioned by the Synoptists, *e.g.*, Cana of Galilee; Aenon (a true Semitic name); the city called Ephraim; Jacob’s Well, which is deep, and the neighbouring mountain. Sychar is pretty certainly not a mistake for, nor a parody on, Sychem (Shechem), but a distinct place nearer the well, now Askar.*

He is also familiar with Jerusalem, knowing, *e.g.*, the pools of Siloam and Bethesda, the Treasury, Solomon’s Porch, the distance of Bethany from Jerusalem. This seems to imply familiarity with the city before its destruction by Titus. The controversies and questions also are not such as would be in dispute at Ephesus at a later date, but such matters as Sabbath observance, purification, and Messianic expectations. Palestine in the early part of the first century is reflected, not Ephesus in the second. (This is fully worked out by Dr. Scott Holland, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 51 *f.*)

That the evangelist was an eye-witness and disciple appears from the many unimportant details he gives, obviously because he happened to recollect them. See Holland, p. 55, who notes “the amazing trouble taken to explain how there were boats enough to carry the people back over the Lake of Tiberias (vi, 22–24). So also his repeated notes of the time of day. This record of details of no special importance is a feature also of St. Mark’s Gospel—in fact the two have more than one striking coincidence of the kind, as the 5,000 sitting on the *grass*, or the ointment of *spike-nard*. It might be said that in these cases the Fourth Evangelist follows the Second; but he has much of the same kind quite independently. In the case of the Second Gospel this feature is almost universally held to come from an eye-witness, thus supporting the tradition that in this Gospel we have St. Peter’s recollections. It is thought to overthrow the old view that Mark is an abbreviation of Matthew, and to prove that in many narratives the relation is just the reverse. The same argument surely holds good when this feature recurs in the Fourth Gospel. It is far more natural than either of the rival views (*a*) that we have here simply a realistic piece of fiction or romance; (*b*) that all these details involve some hidden allegorical meaning. Here we

* G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, II, xviii.

may deal with the view that the Gospel as a whole is meant to be allegory rather than history. This is alleged to be supported by Clement's statement of the origin of this Gospel: "John, perceiving that the bodily (external) facts had been set forth in the other Gospels, at the instance of his friends and the inspiration of the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel."* Sanday interprets this as "one which sought to bring out the divine side of its subject." This seems much better than Dean Inge's view (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 260, D.C.G., i, 885), that by *spiritual* is meant not doctrinal, ethical and philosophical, but allegorical, as opposed to barely historical. If this were meant, we should expect Clement and Origen to draw a marked distinction between the Gospels, taking the others literally, this allegorically. Origen says that in the Scripture, particularly in John, there is a mixture of what is unhistorical, with a view to spiritual training. But neither he nor Clement supports the view that the three normally give literal history, the Fourth being commonly allegorical. There is no marked difference between Origen's treatment of the First and of the Fourth Gospel in his respective commentaries on them. These writers, by their idea of allegorical and spiritual teaching, are able to combine high views of inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture with full admission of historical inaccuracies. The sacred writers made no *mistakes*, but sometimes consciously meant to convey spiritual truth rather than literal history. But this does not in practice hold good to any extent of this Gospel more than the rest.

Thus much the most natural explanation of these details is that they come from an eye-witness, who recalls points which happen to have stuck in his memory, whether of intrinsic importance or not.

In two or three places there is more direct evidence: i, 14, "*We beheld his glory*" is most naturally taken of the Lord's personal disciples than of Christians generally. We at once compare 1 John i, 1-2, which expresses this thought more clearly. (The arguments for different authorship of the Epistle are far from strong; the many resemblances, both of thought and language, far outweigh the few differences.) But the great passage is xix, 35: "He that hath seen hath borne witness and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe"—a solemn assertion of the truth of the statement that blood and water came out of the Lord's side. The first part might by itself be taken as the evangelist's testimony to the credibility of his source; but the last part is against this—there is no point in referring to the conviction of some one else. Thus, either the writer is speaking of himself in the third person throughout; or "*He knoweth*" refers to the Divine knowledge. Thus, the Evangelist was present at the Crucifixion.

* Eus. vi, 14.

The evangelist is distinctly identified with the beloved disciple in xxi, 24. But the authenticity of the appendix (chap. xxi) is disputed; and this verse is an addition to it by persons unknown to us. But it is quite clear that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" must be either the evangelist or his main source.

But, if so, he can hardly be other than an apostle. He is prominent at the Last Supper, where we should infer from the Synoptists that only the Twelve were present. He stands in the closest intimacy with the Lord, *i.e.*, in the position of an apostle. He is present by the Cross; to him our Lord commends his Mother. He is together with apostles at the sea of Tiberias; he is closely associated with Peter throughout the closing chapters. In other places where an unnamed disciple is mentioned the identity is not so certain. Thus it is generally held that he was one of the two disciples of the Baptist who followed the Lord, Andrew being the other; but there is not such complete agreement whether he was "the disciple known unto the High Priest," who got Peter admitted. Much is now made of this verse.

But we are next led to conclude that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" was the Apostle John. He is clearly one of the leading disciples, but distinguished from Peter and Andrew. This suggests either James or John, and James died early. He is found in close connection with Peter (cc. xiii (xviii), xx, xxi), just as Peter and John are found together in the early chapters of Acts. It is also noteworthy that the evangelist never names *John*, whereas he has much to say of other apostles; our only clear view of several of them comes from this Gospel. How is it that only James and John left no impression on the evangelist? A minor point is that while the other evangelists constantly speak of John *the Baptist*, here we read of him simply as "John," as though there were no need to distinguish.

The great argument against this identification is that the character of the son of Zebedee, a "son of thunder," impetuous and keen to avenge his Master's honour, does not suit the evangelist. "To have received and remembered what he afterwards recorded he must have been other than the son of Zebedee was. He must have been already as companion what he proved as witness, appreciative of and sympathetic with that inner life of Jesus which he has unveiled for us."* This is a strong point; but (1) John is not clearly set out in the Synoptists apart from James; he seems his brother's shadow. (2) This view usually exaggerates what is unattractive in the two brothers. (3) The character of John of Ephesus, as shown in the reasonably authentic stories of him, has affinities both with the Apostle of the Synoptists and the "disciple whom Jesus loved."

But we now come to a view which has "caught on" very much of

* Garvie, *The Beloved Disciple*, 229.

late. Are we, after all, bound to suppose the beloved disciple to have been one of the Twelve? This view starts from one special feature of this Gospel which has often aroused suspicion—the interest in Jerusalem as distinct from Galilee. This suggests that the author was one of our Lord's disciples at Jerusalem (vii, 3). Again, if this is the disciple who brought Peter into the High Priest's house, he was "known to the High Priest"; this suggests he was of good position and family, perhaps priestly. So, again, he is acquainted with the private meetings of the chief priests and others. Here comes in what Polycrates says of "John who leaned on the Lord's breast": "He had been a priest and worn the sacred plate."

These points fit well together, though each may be otherwise met (*e.g.*, Nicodemus may be the source of some information). But it is not easy to account for his presence at the Last Supper. One view is that he was a kind of supernumerary apostle, perhaps too young to be one of the Twelve, who, nevertheless, shared their intercourse with the Lord. But Dr. Garvie* holds that the Last Supper was held in his house; if the apostles remained there it is explained how he was with Peter when Mary Magdalene came from the tomb. He regards him as the unnamed disciple † of chap. i, and as having accompanied the Lord in His early ministry (chaps. ii–iv), but afterwards remaining at Jerusalem.

This view in its higher forms does not make much practical difference from the traditional one. It still makes the Gospel proceed from an eye-witness, an early and fairly intimate disciple, though not one of the Twelve. But another argument for apostolic authorship is the great difference between this Gospel and the others. Could a Gospel of so different a type have won acceptance, unless its author were known as of the highest authority? And if this disciple of Jerusalem held such a position in the early Church how is it that we hear nothing more of him in the N.T.? Various identifications have been made with some known person, *e.g.*, Lazarus or the Young Ruler, but all seem fanciful.

One more view must be noticed. A distinction is drawn between the witness or source, whose interest is largely in the history, and the evangelist; between the man whose recollections are recorded, and the man who wrote them. This view maintains that while much of the Fourth Gospel comes from the beloved disciple, yet he was not the actual writer. Just as in the Second Gospel, the source (Peter) is distinct from the writer (Mark), so here; only apparently this Gospel took its name from its source rather than its writer. This is very possible. But, while Mark is usually credited with little more than selection and arrangement, it is possible in the case of this Gospel to make the source supply only the events and the unknown

* p. 148.

† pp. 221 *f.*

writer the theology, which thereby loses much of its value so far as this depends upon external attestation. Some assume also a redactor, who is as clumsy as these redactors usually are. But there seems no need to suppose more than one editor, at most.

Many important points in the criticism of the Gospel have been passed over. The authorship is a great subject of itself.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN :—We shall all, I believe, be agreed that we are indebted to Dr. Smith for a calm, judicial and lucid setting forth of the evidence for and against the Johannine authorship. I have been especially struck with the candour with which full weight is given to all possible objections against it. If anything, I am inclined to think that he has been a little too cautious in dealing with them. For instance, on p. 132 he has contented himself with saying “the authenticity of the appendix (c. xxi) is disputed; and this verse [24] is an addition to it by persons unknown to us.” Personally I cannot conceive that any unprejudiced reader could doubt that the account of the sayings and doings by the lake, so full, so minutely detailed, so tenderly truth-like, must come from an eye-witness, and that eye-witness the one who modestly veils his identity under the title “the disciple whom Jesus loved.” Had this been written by anyone else, what possible reason could there have been for withholding the name of one so favoured? As for v. 24, the chief argument for supposing that it was added “by persons unknown to us” lies in the plural “we know.” But then, what of the following verse with the singular “I suppose”? Did some one of the “persons unknown” take upon himself to add that to the joint testimony of others? But, further, is it in the least likely that any of St. John’s hearers or readers would have ventured so to endorse the testimony of a witness of such authority? Or, if the author was not St. John, were there any so unscrupulous as to give a forged testimonial to a fabricator? For myself, I think, it far more likely that the writer would intentionally associate himself with his fellow-Christians rather than use the egotistic “I know.”

So, too, with regard to the two mentions of a disciple not named, the argument holds good again that no one who was not the person meant would have any interest in suppressing the name. As for the disciple who was known to the High Priest, there is a link which

perhaps has been little noticed. It is not unlikely that the unnamed "his mother's sister" of St. John xix, 25, was "the mother of Zebedee's children," mentioned by St. Matthew (xxvii, 56). Now we know that Elizabeth, the Virgin's cousin, was married to a priest, and, therefore, the Virgin's sister may also have married similarly, in which case St. John would himself have been of Aaronic descent. This would not only account for his being known to the High Priest, but also for his reluctance at first to enter the tomb (St. John xx, 5), since to a priest it was defilement to come in contact with the dead.

The evidence that the author of the Fourth Gospel must have been a Jew (not much touched on in the paper) might be considerably strengthened. Lately I have been reading Dr. Edersheim's *Life and Times of the Messiah*, and noticed how often he, saturated as he is with Judaic and Rabbinic lore, finds occasion to point out how thoroughly Jewish and even Rabbinic the tone of the Gospel is. In particular, there is a very remarkable note (Vol. II, p. 193) on a certain Rabbi Eliezer, "accused of favouring Christianity." The learned author finds in the questions put to the Rabbi "a distinct reference to the words of Christ in St. John x, 11," and concludes by asking, "Does it not furnish a reference—and that on the lips of Jews—to the Fourth Gospel, and that from the close of the first century?"

I do not know how it may appear to others, but to myself it seems that most of the arguments put forward by opponents of the Johannine authorship are not so much to show that the Gospel was not or could not have been the work of the Apostle as to show that it may have been written by someone else. It looks very much as though they had not been compelled by the evidence to reject the traditional belief, but rather that they have raked together every scrap of evidence that might tend to support a preconceived idea that the Gospel was not written by the Apostle. We know that the Alogi rejected the book because they disliked and refused the doctrine of the Logos. Is not that really the case with many nowadays who seek to discredit the evidence of the Gospel? They are uneasily conscious that if the book were actually written by St. John it would upset the theories they have formed about the Person and Teaching of our Lord. Therefore they do all they can to discredit the value of the Gospel.

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY said:—Our lecturer has referred to the

Diatessaron, stating that Tatian used the Fourth Gospel equally with the other three in composing it, and this is true. But Tatian appears to have taken the order of events from St. Matthew's Gospel, and to have placed the incidents recorded in the other Gospels in a very haphazard manner. Discrepancies can be found in it in the position of events recorded separately by Mark, Luke, and John; for instance, the last-named places the meeting with the Samaritan woman at the well (iv, 5-42) *before* the feeding of the five thousand (vi, 4-13), but Tatian inverts the order of the narrative of these two occurrences.

Tatian's work would have been still more satisfactory for our purpose if he had not only given extracts from all the Gospels, but if he had also placed these in the *same* order in which they appear in the different Gospels, but this he has not done; and from his time till quite recently a satisfactory harmony has not been produced.

But at last it is claimed that it has been attained, when it is recognized that there are three parallel narratives in the Gospel of St. Luke—thus testifying that there is no chronological contradiction between St. John and the other three evangelists, as was formerly very generally supposed.

It is satisfactory that this method of historical investigation now supports the authority and inspiration of St. John's Gospel—that Gospel which is so dear to us by its great spirituality and by its strong testimony to the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ (St. John xx, 31).

Mr. WALTER MAUNDER said :—There is one argument in favour of the view that the author of the Fourth Gospel was none other than the Apostle John, which appears to me to have great weight, although it has not been mentioned in this paper.

The Fourth Gospel is pre-eminently the Gospel of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. This subject is followed out from the first chapter, which begins with the essential Divinity of the Word and ends with the acknowledgment by Thomas of the resurrection of Jesus and his avowal of Him as "my Lord and my God." The writer of the Gospel declares that he had written it "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through His Name." And the Fourth Gospel differs from the other three in this, that it is not a narrative of events. It is a single course of teachings by the Lord Jesus

Christ Himself, given in His very own words, of the doctrine of the Resurrection ; that is to say, of Himself as the only source of Eternal Life for men.

But Acts i, 22, tells us that the calling of the twelve Apostles was to be for witnesses (literally "martyrs")* of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. There is no doubt who "the twelve Apostles" were : they are named, all of them, in other Gospels, and after the suicide of Judas Iscariot they are named "the eleven." There were none others present with Jesus than the eleven when Judas had gone out after the Supper and in the Garden. Therefore it must have been one of these eleven, whose names we know, who leaned on Jesus' breast and recorded His words.

But there were three who were pre-eminently witnesses—Peter, James, and John ; these three, and no others, were with the Lord when He was transfigured on the Mount, and during His agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. And it must be remembered that on the Mount "He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen till the Son of Man was risen from the dead. And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one another what the rising from the dead should mean." Of these three, James was killed by order of Herod, and when Peter had been killed by the order of Nero, only one of the three witnesses remained—the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee. When of the twelve called to be the witnesses to the Resurrection only one, the Apostle John, was left, is it conceivable that he would not have written down the sayings of the Lord which he had heard ? And is it conceivable that if another man—not one of the original witnesses—had brought out this Gospel, that those in places of authority in the Church would have accepted it ? When the other witnesses had been put to death or had fallen asleep, to whom could the Church look to complete "the testimony of Jesus" but to the last of the twelve, the last of the three, who still remained alive ?

Mrs. WALTER MAUNDER said :—I must confess to no small irritation at the use of the argument from the "two tombs in Ephesus,

* The use of the word "martyr" as signifying one who was put to death for his testimony to the Resurrection of Christ is a late and secondary use. In the Acts it is constantly used as meaning simply "witness."

and that both are called John's even to this day" (Eus. Book III, chapter 39). Eusebius brings forward this in connection with the authorship of the Book of the Revelation; he is accurate in his quotations from his authorities, but he is not notable for sound judgment. It is perhaps excusable in him to make this suggestion therefore, but it is not excusable in modern critics, even in the case of the Apocalypse. For in that book, though the City of Ephesus is mentioned by name, it is only mentioned in the same connections, and with no greater or less particularity than Smyrna or Laodicea, or any other of the "Seven Churches which are in Asia." But because, *and only because*, it had been handed down that the Apostle John, after having been exiled to Patmos and released from thence, "governed the Churches in Asia," and "coming from the Isle of Patmos to Ephesus" made it his headquarters (Eus. Book III, chapter 23), it is *assumed* that Ephesus was the place of writing of the Apocalypse.

But "moderns," as Dr. Harold Smith tells us, are not content with the suggestion of Eusebius that it was the second John of Ephesus who wrote the Apocalypse; they would ascribe the Fourth Gospel to him also. Here the argument is even weaker and with less excuse. For in the Fourth Gospel there is no mention of Ephesus from beginning to end; no word is said to connect that city with the place of its origin. The "moderns" argue wilfully from their own confusion of thought, thus: The Fourth Gospel is said to have been written by the Apostle John: the Apostle John is said to have resided at Ephesus: there was another John, not an Apostle, living at Ephesus: therefore this second John, not an Apostle, wrote the Fourth Gospel.

As regards the authorship, and therefore date, of the Fourth Gospel, it is well to bear in mind those for whom it was written as well as he who wrote it. I think there is strong evidence that the people for whom it was written were Christians who spoke and thought in Greek, and who were, in the main, neither converted Jews nor the children of Jews. The Aramaic expressions and names used in the gospel are interpreted, and it would have been unnecessary to tell the children of Jews, who had been in the habit of going up to the great feasts, that the Passover was "a Feast of the Jews" or that the Feast of the Dedication was held in the winter. But just as certainly the writer was familiar with the feasts and services

in the Temple and with the reading of the Law. Indeed, the Law, especially the Book of Deuteronomy, was in the minds of the speakers and the hearers in all the teachings and discussions from Chapter III of the Fourth Gospel to Chapter X.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS mentioned a difficulty not dealt with by the lecturer, namely, the dissimilarity of the diction of the Gospel from that of the Apocalypse, and suggested that the Apocalypse was written at the end of the reign of Nero or in that of Vespasian, shortly after the evangelist John settled at Ephesus, and before he had become accustomed to think in Greek and compose freely in it; whereas his Epistles and Gospel were written some twenty or thirty years later when he had by constant use become better acquainted with the Greek language.

The Chairman had anticipated the idea he was about to bring forward, that the evangelist was of priestly family and was known to the high priest and was constantly in Jerusalem. He would thus be acquainted with the Jerusalem ministry, whereas Peter, who is supposed to have supplied Mark with the materials for his gospel, and Matthew had confined themselves to the Galilean ministry.

Mr. HOSTE remarked that the controversy as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel reminded him of a discussion many years ago, when the fashion came in of which the Jesuit, Father Hardouin, was the most radical exponent, of questioning the traditional authorship, even of classical works, and the question of the authorship of the *Iliad* came under review. After much learned discussion the conclusion was reached, it is reported, that the traditional authorship must be set on one side. Homer did not write the *Iliad*, but another man of the same name, who lived at the same time and place. An analogous conclusion seems to have been reached here. It could not have been John the Apostle who wrote it, but a particular friend of his of the same name, a sort of supernumerary apostle, a class of person the Gospels forgot to mention.

It has been asserted that our Gospel was first circulated by the Gnostics, but this is not borne out by the facts, and had it been so it would have been a sufficient reason against its acceptance by the Church Fathers (*e.g.* Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Eusebius, Irenaeus), who were strongly opposed to Gnosticism. Indeed, the testimony of the last named, who was well acquainted both with the

western and eastern churches, to the canonicity and authorship of the Fourth Gospel, has additional weight from its non-controversial character ; he speaks of it as a well-known fact beyond dispute.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I must apologise for having passed over many points altogether, and having treated others so cursorily. I thought it best to confine myself to the question of authorship without dealing with, *e.g.*, differences from the Synoptists, or the exactness of the discourses. And even on the main subject I had to decide between trying to cover the ground generally, or dealing with certain points at length while neglecting others. Hence, it is quite true that very much more might have been said to show that the Evangelist was a Palestinian Jew, and an eye-witness of what he records.

As to some points mentioned by the Chairman :—Personally, I do not think that the arguments for ascribing the last chapter to a different author are very convincing. But that it is an appendix seems shown by the careful way in which chap. xx ends, giving, as one speaker has said, the object for which the Gospel was written, whereas xxi ends abruptly. But v. 24 certainly looks to me like an attestation by others ; otherwise we shall have “ He knoweth ” as in xix, 35. The tradition in the *Muratorian Canon* either interprets the verse thus or supports this interpretation. But I could not deal with the authority of chap. xxi except at the expense of other points. The suggestion that John the son of Zebedee may have been a priest is interesting, but it is only a possibility.

The difference in diction between the Gospel and the Apocalypse might also have been dealt with. A few years back the Neronian date of the Apocalypse was strongly in favour ; not so now. If this be given up, the difference may be explained by the Apocalypse having been written down just as the author spoke, *i.e.*, very Hebraistic ; while the Gospel was written at leisure and perhaps carefully revised.

Of older books maintaining the Johannine authorship, Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays* is extremely good. The most recent book on this side is that of Dr. Scott Holland. There is also a very good book on the Four Gospels by Dr. Maurice Jones, fully up to date.

THE 663RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MARCH 24TH, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

JAMES W. THIRTLE, ESQ., LL.D., M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Rev. A. W. Oxford, M.D., who was to have presided, had been prevented by illness from attending, and that he had stepped into the breach.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Mr. Clifford Newton as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Mr. W. E. Leslie to read his paper on "Telepathy."

TELEPATHY.

By WILSON EDWARDS LESLIE, Esq.

TELEPATHY is a subject which arouses widespread interest, but there is a general lack of information as to the data which have been accumulated by systematic record and research. Unfortunately this is true also of certain aspects of the subject in which a lack of perspective can easily lead to far-reaching misconceptions.

It was thought, therefore, that a brief and ordered outline of the data might usefully be attempted. As the Victoria Institute is interested in the special sciences rather in their relation to Christian Philosophy than as ends in themselves, the wider implicates of the subject have been kept in view.

The word "Telepathy" is used in this paper to denote the related emergence of an idea or sensation in two or more minds when the circumstances preclude the operation of chance or any hitherto recognized medium of communication. It is not intended to imply any explanation of the phenomena, which, indeed, might be due to more than one cause.

Let us now consider what evidence there is that telepathy is a fact in Nature. We may begin with certain experiments which, in the view of the workers concerned, have yielded negative results.

Two universities across the Atlantic have, as the result of bequests, engaged in psychical research and issued reports thereon. At the Leland Stanford Junior University about 10,000 experiments were carried out by some 200 students working in pairs. One of them (the "agent") drew a card from a pack, and the other (the "percipient") guessed what it was. In about half the experiments the agent looked at the card before the percipient guessed; the object being to discover whether correct guesses were more frequent when the agent visualised the card. Some of the experimenters were remarkably successful, but the series taken as a whole yielded no results inexplicable by chance. No attempt was made to determine whether extended experiment with the successful subjects would yield a different result.*

In the Harvard psychological laboratory 605 experiments were made with the agent and percipient in a dark sound-proof room. An electric lamp was lit up to the right or left of the agent, the percipient moving a switch to the right or left in accordance with the mental impression he thought he received. Here, again, the results were, in the opinion of the investigators, negative.

Common sense suggests, however, that in investigating an obscure and elusive phenomenon like telepathy it should first be studied where it is found, or purports to be found; such experimental conditions as experience may show to be desirable being gradually introduced. The failure of the American workers to recognize this detracts from the value of their results, whatever view may be taken of the interpretation they placed upon them. Doubtless, such a method involves possibilities of fraud and malobservation in the early stages, but pursued with diligence and discretion it has, in the hands of workers connected with the Society for Psychical Research and others, been abundantly justified by the results obtained.

In the present paper large use is made of the material collected in the *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, to which references are added for the benefit of any who may desire to read further.

A large number of experiments (of which those carried out at Brighton by Prof. Henry and Mrs. Sidgwick and others may be mentioned) have been made with simple objects, such as a card drawn from a pack, or a lettered or numbered counter drawn from a bag. In such cases, the exact degree of success can be quantitatively determined and subjected to mathematical treatment.

* See Addendum A.

The successes obtained were greatly in excess of the calculated probabilities, clearly indicating the operation of some factor other than chance. (*S.P.R.*, vi and viii.)

In other experiments the results have not been of a nature susceptible of exact computation. Among these the transfer of simple drawings makes a vivid impression upon the mind of the reader. (*S.P.R.*, ii, v, xi.) It having been suggested that the similarity of the drawings of the agent and percipient might be due to a general tendency to think of certain designs more frequently than others, a test was made with a series of 2,000 drawings fortuitously paired, when it was found that the percentage of coincidences did not approach that obtained in the telepathic experiments. (*S.P.R.*, vi.)

The three interesting series which follow are similarly incapable of exact mathematical assessment. They also introduce us to more complex phenomena.

Prof. Gilbert Murray has carried out a long series of guessing experiments, in which a subject was chosen while he was out of the room and guessed by him on his return. Muscle reading and hyperæsthesia were not rigidly excluded, but in view of the complicated subjects chosen and the high proportion of successes it is almost impossible to believe that no other cause was at work. (*S.P.R.*, xxix.)

In the second series Miss Clarissa Miles acted as agent and Miss Hermione Ramsden as percipient. Miss Miles noted in a book kept for the purpose any impressions which she tried to transfer. Miss Ramsden daily recorded her impressions and posted them to Miss Miles who pasted them into the record book against the impression she sought to transfer. There were many striking successes in the series, including a number when no conscious attempt was made to transfer anything.* (*S.P.R.*, xxi, xxvii.)

The last series (which, it may be noted, is of outstanding evidential value) is more properly a systematic record of spontaneous phenomena than a series of attempts to get specific impressions transferred. Mr. Hubert Wales acted as agent and Miss Jane Samuels as percipient. The impressions were received during the night, noted with pencil and paper taken to bed for that purpose, and posted to Mr. Wales next day. Miss Samuels received numerous glimpses of Mr. Wales' thoughts and feelings, and passing incidents in his life.†

* See Addendum B.

† See Addendum C.

She also received numerous vivid impressions from a soldier friend in barracks at the Curragh, but it was not possible to record these properly at the time. (*S.P.R.*, xxxi.)

As the further consideration of non-experimental phenomena will take us rather far afield, we may here pause to equip ourselves with some information as to what has been learned concerning the mechanism whereby the telepathic impression emerges into consciousness. The subconscious, hypnotism, hysteria, and multiple and trance personality, though very proper subjects for the consideration of the Institute, obviously cannot be discussed in the course of this brief outline. Suffice it, therefore, to say that, while most of us have experience of the complicated acts of which our bodies are capable while our minds are "absent," the sleepwalker and the hypnotized subject show us phases of the subconscious resembling the activities of a second self of which the normal consciousness knows nothing. These buried activities can be brought to the surface under hypnosis. At times they are echoed in dreams, or temporarily control the senses as when stimulated by crystal-gazing or listening to a shell. Sometimes various muscular systems are controlled as in automatic speech or writing (with or without planchette), movements of the divining rod or pendulum, and table tilting. While most, if not all, our ideas are related to these subconscious levels, this is pre-eminently the case with telepathic impressions which, like hypnotic suggestions, sometimes emerge via the automatisms just mentioned.

The inter-relation of telepathy, the dream state, and hypnosis is illustrated by some experiments of Drs. Ermacora and van Eeden. Dr. Ermacora successfully suggested to "Elvira" a "trance personality" of his subject, Signorin Maria Manzini, of Milan, that she should induce telepathic dreams in the latter's little cousin, Angelina Cavozzoni, of Venice—a child of four years who was with her on a visit. (*S.P.R.*, xi.)*

With these things in mind we will look at some more cases, beginning with two which appear to be entirely spontaneous.

At about 3 a.m. on the night of April 16-17, 1902, the wife of a "Goods" Inspector on the L. & N.W.R. reached for a glass of water beside her bed. To her surprise she saw in the glass a picture of a railway smash. Shortly after 3.10 a.m. her husband, who was on duty, saw the wreckage of a Leeds to London "Goods" on the Micklehurst New Line. (*S.P.R.*, xxxiii.)

While breakfasting with a friend at Fort William, Miss X. suddenly perceived a little red man dangling in the air a foot or two from her

* See Addendum D.

friend's head. On returning from the day's excursion the friend received a letter which had arrived during their absence with a red seal bearing the impress of a figure similar to the little red man seen by Miss X. in the morning. (*S.P.R.*, xi.)

In the next three cases the parties were specially interested in, or thinking of, each other.

On August 4, 1913, Mr. L. C. Powles, of Rye, Sussex, called upon Mr. J. W. Sharpe, late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Mr. Sharpe said that he saw behind Mr. Powles "a dark, not inimical, half human creature with knotted hands placed upon his shoulders" which he felt to be symbolic of illness. That afternoon Mrs. Powles, who was worrying about her husband's health, had been reading a story in *The Strand Magazine*, in which a man disguised as a gorilla came behind his enemy and broke his neck with his hands. (*S.P.R.*, xxxiii.)

The Rev. P. H. Newman, when up at Oxford, dreamed that he was at the house of his fiancée and ran upstairs after her and put his arms round her. Crossing the letter in which he sent her an account of this dream, she wrote to him asking if he had been thinking of her, for, as she went upstairs, she had heard his step behind her and felt him put his arms around her. (*S.P.R.*, iii.)

A Mr. Malleon, living in a small house near the sea between Littlehampton and Rustington, sailed with his boy by the night boat from Littlehampton to Honfleur. He retired to his bunk, the boy remaining on deck. Some passengers, whom he had asked to see if the boy was all right, returned to the cabin saying that they had not noticed him. Mr. Malleon, as an occupation for his mind, imagined himself looking for the boy, then, as though telling himself a story, imagined he should never see him again. He found himself going home along the coast, and breaking the news to his wife. This produced such agitation that he roused himself, went on deck, and found the boy. Meanwhile Mrs. Malleon was awakened by feeling someone bending over her. She felt it was her husband and said, "Oh, Willie, you have come back!" She put out her hand and felt his coat, noticing that it was dry. "Yes, I am come back," was the solemn reply. "Has anything happened?" "Yes, something has happened." Thinking of the boy, she said, "Where is Eddy?" There was no reply, and she felt herself alone. (*S.P.R.*, x.)

Note.—The record of this case is not of the highest standard, but the general outline is probably reliable.

The last example serves as an introduction to the exceedingly numerous cases in which the impression approximates in time to the death of the person to whom it relates.*

When the impression is received after the death of the presumed agent, the question arises: Has a telepathic message been received from the dead, or was the impulse received subconsciously by the percipient at or before the death of the agent? That this

* See Addendum E.

is possible is indicated by our experience of the delayed emergence of hypnotic suggestions and other subliminal material. The recognition of the possibility of unconscious leakage of thought from mind to mind has made it exceedingly difficult to prove that any given message originated in a disincarnate mind. To establish this it is obviously necessary that the message shall contain some verifiable element which is not known to any incarnate intelligence.

Attempts have been made to meet this condition by sealing up messages known only to the writer in order that if, after his death, the sealed message were communicated the deceased writer might be indicated as the only possible source of the communication. A little thought, however, will show that this does not fulfil the conditions. Leaving aside any possibility of clairvoyance, the message may have leaked into other minds before the writer's death, which, surviving him, remain potential sources of information.

It happens that we have what might almost be regarded as a working model of this difficulty. On July 13, 1904, Mr. Piddington wrote and sealed up a message to the effect that after his decease he would try to convey the idea of "seven" in various forms. Four years later he opened the sealed envelope, because, in the interval, six automatists had referred to "seven" in various ways. It is suggested that Mr. Meyers and others "on the other side" became aware of the message and used it to make a "cross correspondence." Some co-ordination was perhaps implied by the statement of one of the automatists that seven persons were concerned; but there remains the probability that the idea leaked from Mr. Piddington's mind. Had he died before its emergence from the subconscious of the automatists it would have been regarded as the fulfilment of his expressed intention to communicate.

"Cross correspondences" are later phenomena which are thought to indicate the telepathic influence of the departed. A number of literary allusions have been found in the scripts of various automatists which, taken by themselves, are incoherent, but when united are seen to form a co-ordinated whole. It is claimed that this must be the work of some co-ordinating mind or minds, particularly as the allusions are often to Greek and Roman classics with which the alleged communicators were thoroughly familiar, but which are unknown to some of the automatists. Against this there is the possibility of telepathy

from the living, a good deal of subjectivity in identifying and collocating the allusions, and the element of chance. (*S.P.R.*, xxii, xxiv—xxvii, xxix, xxx.)

Book tests are a still later development. In these the "communicator" announces to the sitter that on a given page of a book in a given position on his shelves will be found a passage of a certain tenor, which is frequently to be regarded as a message from the "communicator." (*S.P.R.*, xxxi.)

In considering such phenomena it is, of course, wise to work from the known to the unknown, to try first the simplest hypothesis before resorting to the more complex. In doing this we have to determine when each hypothesis becomes strained and far fetched and requires to be replaced with another. So in these cases the hypothesis of telepathy from the living sometimes seems more complicated than the supposition that we are dealing with some disincarnate intelligence. The whole subject, however, is so complex and so many pre-suppositions are involved, that each student will probably draw the line in a different place.

So far nothing has been said of the suggestion that these messages, if they do not originate with the living, may emanate from some non-human source. If there are evil spirits capable of communicating with man, and the New Testament clearly teaches that this is the case, it would not be easy to prove that the messages referred to did not emanate from them. If the message be of a high moral tone this might be ascribed to artifice on the part of the spirit designed to mislead its victim. On the other hand, how is it to be proved that such spirits are concerned? The evidence either way is so ambiguous that it will probably be interpreted in accordance with the pre-suppositions with which it is approached.

A word of warning may be given here. The subconscious is "suggestible" to a degree quite unrealized by the layman, and has an inveterate tendency to drama and personification. This tendency provides the material for dream analysis. An illustration will be found in an elaborate dream of Prof. Hilprecht, in which the subconscious recognition that two inscribed fragments were parts of a larger object, emerged in the form of an ancient priest who gave the history of the cutting of the stone. (*S.P.R.*, xii.) If it be suggested to a person with psychic tendencies that they are related to evil spirits, the subconscious is quite capable of acting the part with appalling consequences. Whatever may be said for research work by

trained psychologists, those who are not prepared to submit their minds to rigorous scientific discipline would be well advised to leave these things severely alone.*

Leaving now our review of the data, we must glance briefly at the bearing of our phenomena upon psychology, philosophy and theology.

Of course the whole subject is full of interest for the psychologist, but only two points are emphasized here. One is the possibility that it may be a hitherto unrecognized factor in the psychology of society, and the other its bearing upon the technique of research. Just as in the days of Mesmer experimenters unsuspectingly produced the phenomena of "animal magnetism" by their suggestions, and later auto-suggestion produced the "N Rays," so to-day there is a danger that the unexpressed thoughts of the investigator may reproduce themselves in the reactions of his subjects.

Our view of the philosophic significance of telepathy will depend upon whether we regard it as due to the direct action of mind upon mind, or some unknown physical medium. Three considerations tell in favour of the former view; (a) that which is transferred is a mental quantity, (b) all known physical communication is conducted by means of some kind of code, of which there is no trace in telepathy, and (c) telepathy exhibits no trace of the operation of the law of inverse squares.

While perhaps we cannot say that telepathy disproves the materialistic interpretation of the universe, we can say that inasmuch as no physical vehicle is indicated and mind appears to act directly upon mind, the phenomena are entirely congruous with any metaphysical theory that regards mind as ultimate reality. The writer is inclined to regard mind, or rather minds, as the ultimate reality, existing, in some sense, apart from the space time continuum. If this be so it will absolve us from the difficulty of conceiving of action at a distance, and throw light upon certain apparently well authenticated cases of prevision.

If created minds can thus enter into immediate relations with each other apart from matter we must obviously suppose that they are capable of similar relations with the Creator, which brings us into the realm of Theology.

The reality of such relations is fundamental for Christian philosophy. From a purely logical standpoint they doubtless

* See Addendum F.

fall within the definition of telepathy adopted in this paper, but from every point of view it is desirable to retain the distinctive terminology at present in use—Revelation, Inspiration, Prayer, Communion. At this point the question inevitably arises: Does anything we have learned concerning the interaction of finite minds shed any light upon the higher relations with which Theology is concerned? At first sight it does, at least so far as communications from God to man are concerned. It may be urged that in both cases the point of arrival is the same—the human consciousness: and that if there exists a supra-sensuous avenue into the human mind there is some probability that God would make use of it. Further, it may be pointed out that the early history of prophecy affords indications of special psychological states analogous to those which we have learned to associate with the activities of the subconscious. On the other hand, in a region concerning which we are so profoundly ignorant, we can easily fail to distinguish between phenomena that are in reality due to totally different causes.

However this may be, our experience of the way in which the ideas of one person may be introduced into the mind of another, afterwards emerging as though they were his own, and, indeed, clothed in garments derived from his own personality, suggests that He who created the complex human organism may well be able so to implant truths within it that they shall attain efficient expression without, as is sometimes hastily assumed, involving anything that can properly be described as “mechanical dictation.”

There is, from the Christian standpoint, another factor in the relation of God to men, which cannot be ignored. The Scriptures speak of a special quality called “life,” the inception of which is described as a “birth” or “new creation,” and its absence as “death.” This quality implies a unique relation to God who is its source; indeed, its possessor is said to be a “partaker of the divine nature.” We are obviously dealing here with a reality which transcends the terminology of psychology; a reality which cannot be expressed in the departmentalized functioning of the Intellect, the Emotions, or the Will, because it is a vital product of their co-ordinated activity in knowing, loving, and obeying God.

At an earlier stage it was suggested that certain experiences were best unsought. Here, however, is a goal at which all should aim, nay, must aim, if ever those wonderful and

mysterious powers of which we have but glimpses now are to be consummated in the contemplation of Him who created and alone can satisfy them.

ADDENDA FOR MR. W. E. LESLIE'S PAPER ON TELEPATHY.

A.—The term "agent" is used to denote the mind in which a telepathic impression may be assumed to originate, and "percipient" that in which it emerges. It is not implied that the "agent" is necessarily the active party.

B.—For example, one Sunday evening Miss Miles did not attempt to transfer anything. Instead, she attended to her correspondence, which included a letter from a Polish artist. On that evening Miss Ramsden wrote: "On Sunday night I felt that you were not thinking of me, but were reading a letter in a sort of half-German writing."

C.—A few summarized examples may be of interest. Miss S. correctly indicated work that Mr. W. was doing in his garden. She received an impression that a train was lost and the words "alone in London," when Mr. W.'s niece had lost her train and Mrs. W. was anxious about her being met. Miss S. objected to her notes being laughed at—which had actually happened. She reported that someone wished to dye their hair, when Mr. W. had received from a lady in India a letter in which she said, "My hair is going grey. . . . I'd dye it, but don't know of anything good." Miss S. had an impression of tying up a parcel when Mr. W. was carefully packing some valuable prints. Miss S. correctly described the rather peculiar writing of a letter received by Mr. W. These incidents may appear trivial in themselves, but the record of almost daily reports extending over a period of about eight months is most impressive.

D.—Dr. van Eeden having attained the faculty of executing in his dreams, with full presence of mind, voluntary acts which he had planned while awake, arranged with Mrs. Thompson (before he returned to Holland) that he would call her in his dreams. On three occasions Mrs. Thompson's trance personality "Nelly," announced that she herself, and on another occasion another spirit, had been to visit him in his dreams. In two instances these "visits" corresponded closely with his dream-visions. In the second instance, Dr. van Eeden called "Elsie, Elsie" by mistake—the name being quite strange to him. Two days later he had a letter reporting that Nelly said her spirit-friend Elsie had heard him calling. If Dr. van Eeden was correct in supposing that the name Elsie was entirely strange to him, there would appear to have been telepathy from some part of Mrs. Thompson's consciousness. (*S.P.R.*, xvii.)

E.—The following are recent examples :—

Lieut. David E. McConnel, R.A.F., was killed in a flying accident at Tadcaster, on December 7th, 1918, at 3.25 p.m. Between 3.15 and 3.30 p.m. Lieut. J. J. Larkin, R.A.F., saw and heard him come into the room where he was sitting, and exchanged a few cheery remarks with him before he went out again, closing the door noisily behind him.

Capt. E. W. Bowyer-Bower was killed in action in France in the early morning of March 10th, 1917. The same morning he was seen by his half-sister, Mrs. Spearman, at the Grand Hotel, Calcutta. Thinking he had been sent out to India, she put down her baby before embracing him, but when she turned he had vanished.

At or about 5.0 p.m. on Wednesday, May 31st, 1916, Mrs. F. Baxter, of New Road, Peterborough, had a vision of her brother, a sailor on the *Queen Mary*. The ship was sunk soon after 4.48 p.m. (summer time) that afternoon.

F.—The experiences of a foreign member of the *S.P.R.*, who had been experimenting with self-suggestion, illustrates this. Near the end of her report on the case, Miss Alice Johnson says : “ It may, nevertheless, not be out of place to conclude this paper with a warning of the risk of trying experiments such as are described in it. There is clearly a possibility that hallucinations, if once deliberately started, may develop and tend to recur spontaneously and more and more frequently, till the whole mind may conceivably be thrown out of gear. Mr. Grünbaum (not the real name) himself was not unaware of this possibility, and especially desired that if his experiences were published, readers should be warned of it. He thus describes what he regards as the greatest danger of all : “ I found it as a rule very easy to manœuvre myself into some mental state from which I could not get myself out again.” (*S.P.R.* xxvii, 409.)

DISCUSSION.

In moving a vote of thanks to the lecturer, the CHAIRMAN remarked that it is in “ the life that now is ” that we are encompassed by such marvellous powers and faculties as Mr. Leslie had demonstrated.

Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY writes :—On page 148 of his paper our lecturer advises many of us to leave this subject severely alone, and no doubt his advice is wise, but one form of telepathy may be safely investigated.

I well remember a relative of mine having had a striking experience, so I wrote and asked her for details and she kindly wrote as follows (21.3.24) :—

“ It was in 1906. I had been praying a great deal for the white residents in India, and in April of that year I received a letter from a total stranger, saying he had three times dreamed my name and address, with the intimation that he was to write to me, though the dream did not say what he was to write about ; he asked me, if there was such a person at the dream address, to write to him, as it would be very strange.

He signed his name, address and government office, and he was one of the white residents for whom I had been praying.

I wrote to him, and after some correspondence I believe him to have become a Christian ; when he came to England on leave he came to see us, and it was a very pleasant and curious meeting, as we had become good friends, though never having met.

However, in the course of time, and with going to Australia, and then the war, I have entirely lost touch with him, and can give no further information.”

This relative is a lady of considerable force of character, and was in charge of many of the W.A.A.C. workers in France during the war.

This incident always reminded me of the meeting of Peter and Cornelius in Acts x.

A retired naval officer living in this neighbourhood (Norwood) told me the following story : Some years ago he was in command of a warship on the North American coast, when he received orders one dark night to find and rescue a vessel in distress.

He did not know which way to go, but estimated the probable direction as well as he could, and prayed earnestly for guidance. Having made all his arrangements, he gave over charge of the ship to the next senior, and being very tired went to his cabin, and was soon asleep, when he dreamed that he was told to alter the course of the ship by a good many degrees ; thinking this was an answer to his prayers, he gave the necessary orders for changing the course, and dropped off to sleep again.

Presently there came a loud knock at his cabin door. A sailor reported that they were close to a ship in distress. The ship was rescued, the sailors being greatly surprised that they had been searched for in a position out of the usual track of vessels. But surely this was another answer to prayer.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said :—The subject before us this afternoon is for this Society a rather unusual one, but still one of very great interest, and for me especially, because in my family we have had some of these psychical experiences.

I suppose that the Celtic races are peculiarly sensitive, responsive or subject to these so-called telepathic phenomena.

The *absorbing* study of these is, however, a rather dangerous one.

This mysterious, elusive sixth, or *x*-sense, the laws of which seem so puzzling to us, has always seemed to me to be a relic of those larger powers which man once enjoyed in Eden, and which we have lost the control of through the fall of our first parents. Do not misunderstand me to infer or say that these psychical experiences are even now *excessively* rare. They are, I think, far commoner than is generally imagined.

You may write a letter to a friend and next morning there is a letter from him from which it is clear that about the same time, possibly at

the very moment that you were writing to him, he was penning his letter to you.

You sit quietly beside the fire enjoying the company of a dear friend when suddenly a thought arises in your mind ; you think of another, a mutual friend, and you blurt out : " Oh, have you seen or heard of Mr. Blank lately ? " " That's funny," replies your companion, " I was just thinking of him, too."

Now if that can happen 5 or 6 feet away it may happen 5,000 or 6,000 miles off just as well, or so I think.

" Il n'y a que le premier pas qui coûte."

Many a rising thought may have its origin from the concern of friends far away.

I had once in my life an experience of this that was to me so extraordinarily vivid that I can still recall it as few other events of my life. I was in Sweden, in the town of Gothenburg. I had just got into bed, was falling asleep, or about to do so, when I got a strange feeling about my mother, who was then in London. I saw her in her room lying in bed, her head leaning down on the right shoulder, and knew instinctively that she was seriously ill.

I thought and then I asked myself, " What can I do ? I am 600 miles away," and then said to myself, " The only thing I can do is to pray," and praying, I lost consciousness. Next morning I awoke with the vision still well remembered, but with a happy consciousness that my prayer had been answered, and that my mother was much better and out of all danger.

I wrote home an account of this experience, and on my return found that all that I had seen and felt in Sweden had happened in London.

The consideration of the subject sent me to Bishop Berkeley and his Idealism, which seems to offer the only solution to these psychical and other mysteries of our existences. I understand Berkeley to maintain that all we see is the product of mind. God willed all things *into* being ; and when He so wills He can will, or think, all things *out of* being ; so that all this visible tangible world of what we call matter, like a scroll shall roll up and pass away into nothingness.

In all these speculations one must guard against the subtle error of Pantheism and, as the speaker has already told us, such speculations had better be left alone by most people.

There is one thought that greatly interests me. If one's mind can influence another or more minds, how sweet to remember that the

mind or intelligence that made all can influence benignly all willing minds.

This is through the Holy Spirit and seems to be the source and explanation of all true revivals, and that verse of God's Holy Word comes to my mind in Psalm cx, 3, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power." May we not be gross or dull, but always responsive to that blessed mind and will of God!

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS characterized the paper as able, careful and informative. He pointed out that the answers George Müller received to his prayers could not be explained by telepathy, as there was no direct communication between him and those who felt impelled to send him money, often the very sum he prayed for. This phenomenon involved Divine intervention, and he recalled how W. T. Stead had said that Müller had invented a telephone to Heaven.

But more important than what we might say to God was what He said to us. And he thoroughly agreed with the lecturer that New Testament inspiration did not mean mechanical dictation. On the contrary, God revealed certain truths to human minds, and these persons clothed the truths in their own words, guided, however, by the Spirit of God; so that while those who wrote were men of like passions with ourselves, what they wrote had the certainty of Holy Writ.

Mr. HOSTE writes:—Insertion D seems to be more akin to spiritism than telepathy. I do not see how anybody can have a trance personality called "Nellie" or anything else, unless "Nellie" be a sort of familiar spirit.

The cases of persons appearing to their friends after death hardly seem pertinent to the enquiry. They seem to be objective phenomena, because the persons who had the experiences were not thinking specially of them, nor saw them *in articulo mortis*, but apparently alive and well. I should have thought these were something quite distinct.

The AUTHOR'S reply:—Mr. Edwards' impression that the Celtic races are psychically gifted is widely shared. I do not, however, know of any statistical evidence on the point. That telepathy is

a relic of larger powers once possessed by man is, of course, possible, but on what evidence and reasoning does the suggestion rest ?

Mr. Theodore Roberts does not challenge the definition of telepathy given on page 141, nor the suggestion (page 149) that, logically prayer falls within that definition ; yet in his reference to Geo. Müller he uses the term as though it imported only relations between finite minds. I would rather say that since unmediated communication between man and man is fitful and uncertain it was obviously more reasonable to suppose that Müller's supporters were moved via Him who can both read and influence the minds of His creatures.

I did not limit my remarks to New Testament inspiration, and my whole analogy was intended to suggest that the inspired writers did not clothe the truths communicated to them in their own words, and yet were not necessarily the instruments of mechanical dictation.

Reply to Mr. Hoste's remarks :—The term "trance personality" is intended to be entirely non-committal. If, as suggested by Mr. Hoste, they are spirits, the experiments alluded to do not so directly illustrate the interrelation of the psychological states named. As, however, these highly developed "trance personalities" lie at one end of a series of similar dissociations of consciousness extending through phenomena that can be made to appear and disappear by suggestion, and cases produced by mental shock, to changes brought about by a blow on the head, it is highly probable (subject always to evidence to the contrary in any particular case) that they are purely psychological states. Mrs. Sidgwick's exhaustive monograph on the psychology of the Piper phenomena should be consulted. (*S.P.R.*, xxviii.)

Similarly phantasms of the dead certainly do not, at first sight, appear to be telepathic. When, however, they are related to closely similar phantasms of the living which, in their turn, shade into purely experimental material, telepathy becomes the natural explanation. It may be pointed out that the Empty Grave places the Resurrection Appearances in a totally different category to such phenomena.

THE 664TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, APRIL 7TH, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

JAMES W. THIRTLE, ESQ., LL.D., M.R.A.S., F.R.G.S.,
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the CHAIRMAN then introduced Professor F. F. Roget, of the University of Geneva, to read his paper on "The Influence of John Calvin down the Centuries on the Religious and Political Development of the Protestant Nations."

*THE INFLUENCE OF JOHN CALVIN DOWN THE
CENTURIES ON THE RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL
DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROTESTANT NATIONS.*

By Professor F. F. ROGET.

THE general history of the Christian Church falls roughly into three periods. Leaving primitive Christianity out of count, there is :—

1. The formative period, from the Emperor Constantine the Great (324 A.D.) to Pope Gregory the Great (590 A.D.).

2. Roman Catholic Church Christianity, from Gregory to the days of Dissolution and Reformation.

3. And, for the purpose of this paper, the establishment of Protestantism in Church and State as a form of Christian worship, and a source of policy in civil government, forming together, in Geneva, a single polity. We set aside Lutheranism, as having shown itself, in the course of time, to be developing upon a line distinct from Protestantism in both those respects, from the moment when Protestantism found its one leader in Calvin.

So, definition brings within the pale of these considerations the Protestant Church, in Geneva ; in England, whether conformed or not ; in the Low Countries ; and hence in all parts of

the world, wherever the Anglo-Saxon race has rooted itself in, bringing with itself its own sense for Church, School and State.

We have, unfortunately, to leave France out of count, for the French, as a nation, show no Protestant essentials answering those tests.

It is difficult to say when began anything, for we know no beginning that has not a past, and is not apparent at least in a scattered form in the past. But history has erected fixed landmarks along the stream of the ages and divided it in reaches, by means of buoys.

The test of Protestantism is that it binds together in its essentials Church, School and State consistently, throughout centuries of national life up to the present, and prospectively including the future.

The countries mentioned above and some of the limbs of other nations moving in the wake of them answer this description. They are Protestant, and their civil polity bears a common impress from that spirit derived. So all we have to do is to follow dates in their order.

In 1536, by a decision of the citizens met together legally under the public Constitution, State and Protestant Church were united in Geneva. Thereafter none but those qualifying as Protestants possessed citizenship in the Republic, in which office could be held only by public selection based upon Church membership. So understood, Church membership was a civil act, the Church the civil bond and the clergy a civil body attendant on State and School, as expounders of Scripture, this being the root of the moral identity since held in common by the Protestant-minded Commonwealths of the world. If you go and look under the porch of the Geneva College you will see that the Scripture verses carved in the cartouches are Hebrew, Greek and German when not French. No Latin when quoting Scripture. Here we find in its very cradle the new spirit, the Protestant strain in civilisation. Thereby I do not mean the gentle arts, but the government of man by himself with the leading strings of the Bible to move in, and the self-government of the Commonwealth under the moral law arising therefrom, while it is the office of the school to gather the young round the fountain head, and that of the Church to maintain the thus acquired discipline among citizens and magistrates alike.

To sum up these preliminaries, there were founded in Geneva in 1536, by the people assembled, the public School, the public

Church, the public State, all compulsory. Do not read into this the word Democracy : it is the rule of conscience innerly compulsive, made compulsory outwardly.

It cannot be too often repeated that the first Protestants anywhere became such by a personal, independent, free act. They broke away singly, and when they conglomerated into States, they did so by means of a form of oath to God and a mutual pledge quite novel, placing the public good in a public goodness, to be acquired and then shown by each of them to all.

Public education of the young people as a public duty is made compulsory upon the State, without removing the pupils from the family hearth if possible, and under the guidance of the Bible men. There is not a Protestant Anglo-Saxon author living who will not tell me that he feels this principle to have been as true in his country and to be as much bred in his heart-consciousness as if he had voted that law in 1536 at Geneva, in the spirit, and his ancestors had observed it ever since while in the body.

That condition of mind has and had nothing whatever to do with nationality. There is duty there and the human touch, which suffices for any right-doing in the world men and women are set over. So we may now behold Protestantism in its inter-national aspect.

Two months after the men of Geneva had sworn each other in after that fashion, a young French traveller, aged 27, well trained in the humanities, laws and Divinity as understood in the French schools of the time, and bent upon going to Strasburg to study further, entered Geneva for the night, a Protestant. When death removed him 28 years later, his stamp was firmly impressed upon the town : *Geneva civitas libera Academia ac Ecclesia*, a free City, a free School, and a free Church.

What meaning should we attach to this threefold claim to freedom ? Did it simply mean self-constituted freedom ? We must define it by its opposite : *principatus*, principality, or, more closely, we must qualify this verbal opposition as follows : the limitation of principality to its legitimate object by seeking consent from those subject to it, as parties to its authority by common reference to that of Scripture.

Authority has two mainsprings, a double source. It must be contractual, it is an arch resting on two pillars, and if we add the School to the Church and to the State, as Geneva did, we may say that every human Commonwealth, in the Protestant idea thereof,

rests on three columns, and that from this treble support proceeds the maximum of public good.

This doctrine Calvin based on Scripture. It comes very near proclaiming the infallibility of conscience. This certainly marks it as an optimistic doctrine, and as branding that of an autocratic authority in Church, State and School as pessimistic. But let us not forget that Calvin surrounded his doctrine with a statute of limitations. For all that, he put trust in the free working of the Christian mind as the true estate into which men and women should grow : liberty respecting and bounding authority ; and authority instructing and protecting liberty. And this throughout, in all the callings of man, spiritual, moral, social. When we add political, we mean all these respects put together, for the Church and the State, humanly speaking, are ever the reflex image of the common conscience, an optimist's or pessimist's presentment thereof in the fruits therefrom grown, and their effect when partaken of. The conscience of man and woman raised and trained through Church and School for the good of the State ; conscience winning from liberty an acknowledgment of authority ; conscience enforcing respect of liberty upon authority ; such is the instrument Calvin seems to have conferred upon Protestant peoples, for the achievement of their contribution to the history of nations, even beyond the pale of Christianity, for who will deny that the Anglo-Saxon race, steeped in Protestantism, is also the race whose impress upon the world is now quite the most wide-spread, the deepest, the broadest in character, and the race the most respectful of its inferiors ?

To sum up, the fundamental unity of Calvinistic influence was, as a keynote, struck at Geneva in the sixteenth century, whence Calvin's doctrine was carried to Britain, engrafted upon the native stock the graftsman being John Knox, assisted by a host of other helpers sprung spontaneously from the British soil. Indeed there is no doubt that the British soul was inwardly Protestant, both in the secular and spiritual import of the word, before the connection with Geneva and Calvin became a fact in the history of the British public mind.

That Calvin conceived man as a responsible being whose independent conscience bore a relation to God rather than to such Establishments as the Church and the State were then in Christian countries, rather than to Philosophy and Science even, the twin lamps which were then claiming to shed their fresh light upon the Christian intellect, appears from many passages in his

works which were epoch making in this respect. But what has to be quoted here is the sum, as he called it, of his political doctrine.

This appears as a commentary to Matt. xxii, 21, in his "Harmony of the Gospels": "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

"Moreover," he writes, "this doctrine extends further, namely, that each and every one, according to his calling, shall do his duty to another: children shall *voluntarily* subject themselves to father and mother, servants to their masters; and they shall comply with one another and gratify each other according to the rule of charity, provided that God's sovereign rule thereby obtain among them all their days, and so that thereon may be dependent all that may be due to men, the sum of this injunction being thus: because any who disturb the order of the State are rebellious against God, the obedience rendered to princes and magistrates accords well with the fear and service of God; but if, to the contrary, princes should commit an outrage in some part upon the authority of God, then they must not be obeyed, except in so much as may be possible without offending God."

Now see the sequel. When Mary, Queen of France and of Scotland, returned to the Kingdom of her forefathers (1561), after the sudden death of her spouse Francis II, King of France, John Knox was the most popular man in the kingdom of Scotland. She summoned the disciple of Calvin to Holyrood, and, during their first interview, asked him this question:—

"Think you that subjects, having power, may resist their princes?"

"If princes do exceed their bounds," quoth he, "and do against that wherefore they should be obeyed, then I do not doubt that they may be resisted even by power."

If we asked Knox further by whom they may be resisted, the political conditions under which he spoke make it clear that, by subjects, he meant God-fearing individuals, acting together or singly.

The Protestant test of right and wrong in the Establishments of Church and State appears to be this: whatever injures there the conscience of man is wrong religion and wrong politics. Whatever follows the ruling of conscience is right religion and right politics.

Now, this law is subject to enlightenment by the instituting of schools, free under the guidance of God, acknowledgment of

which belongs to the relatedness of man's moral endowments to God, the only subjection he need carry into his membership of Church, State and School.

No need to add that this conception, realised among the Anglo-Saxons to an extraordinary extent, is still discountenanced in many Christian countries and denied by many a system of thought, political government, scientific research, ecclesiastic teaching and action.

In 1901, M. Ferdinand Brunetière, then the leading lay publicist upholding the Roman Catholic doctrine against the Protestant, came to Geneva to challenge it. Enlarging upon the world-wide work of Calvin, he distinguished between the scholar, the divine and the political reformer. Speaking of the latter, he said :—

“In the measure, gentlemen, in which the political work of Calvin is bound up with the history of your Republic, you are better acquainted with it than I could be. One oration, moreover, would not suffice, but a whole book would have to be written if, from a more general point of view, one wished to examine Calvin's principle, which was the confusion of politics and of morals.”

No doubt the orator wished his hearers to put a depreciatory construction on his words. But what could illuminate more strikingly the public work of Protestantism than this reproach of mixing up morals with public life? And how dreadful the implication that under another form of Christianity the voice of morals is not heard in politics! That right and wrong are unknown epithets there! That the forces of logic and materialism are alone competent in the determination of means and ends!

So we have it: The Protestant citizen confuses in his conscience politics and morals. In other words, he would guide the State, administrate the body politic according to morals. The vastness of the abyss yawning between Brunetière and Calvin in those words may be measured by the greatest apparition in the world of politics these recent years: the personality of President Wilson of the United States and that, second to him alone, but hopelessly obfuscated, of the great Hungarian Calvinist, Count Tisza.

The complexion of Protestantism is one that justifies its very name. Starting from the laying bare of a mutual relation, it aims at inhibiting its extreme aberrancies. It is not prohibition

of either submission and freedom, but of the excess, the over reaching of either over the other. They both *protest* alternately and make each other fit in with the greatest possible number of men and women by broadening out for them a middle course.

The whole course of the mind history of England in Church and State offers an unbroken illustration thereof. The confusion of religion, morals, philosophies, as M. Brunetière would resent it, is perpetually recurrent, is an endemic feature in British public life, and nowhere is it more evident that Church, State, School are the proper arena for the fights of free minds about right and wrong. English Churchism is free: it knows neither Syllabus nor Pope. English Dissent is free. It does not raise a finger against anybody except in argument, and none is raised against it otherwise. There is a kingship and imperialism serving strictly the civic commonwealth, which is republican quite. And most of all, the School is free: the free mainspring of every freedom in Church and State, and the common foundation for that confusion of politics and morals which is the safeguard of the world leadership devolving upon the Anglo-Saxon nations.

The best proof of—and result of—the balancing effect of that happy confusion is seen in the voluntary and free aspect of military service in Anglo-Saxon nations. There can be no doubt that it was the Anglo-Saxon *spirit* (the spirit of Protestantism in aggregate form) that rose against its contrary in 1914 throughout the British Empire; in 1917, too, the same spirit flamed forth from the United States of America—rose in arms and then—laid its weapons, and was dissolved again as into thin air, when the unholy evil that had provoked it had ceased from its provocation. Of the protesting spirit nothing was left. There was no other reason, no other excuse or explanation of its insurrection and lightning-like effectiveness in striking and then vanishing, except that the moral values of Protestantism were challenged in politics by means intolerable to humanity, and immediately, force of the same order sprang up to restore fair conditions of battle to those holding for the right in the contention of forces. And it is somewhat peculiar that the alarm was sounded as early as 1905 by two Genevans, who, stout opponents of Imperialism in any form, and of so-called National Armies in permanent service, urged the passing of a terminable Military Act for the enrolment of British manhood in general preparation for War. Both these advisers were Calvinist Protestants of the

earliest observance by descent direct, their families having lived uninterruptedly at Geneva.

This brings the next question within sight. Are Protestants moved to action by national passions? Have they the national spirit? Do they form nationalities?

We may best examine this by looking to the missionary spirit which is most at home among Anglo-Saxons as an individual characteristic of the Protestant. It is among them that the sense of a missionary duty is most prevalent and colours the colonising instinct so deeply embedded in the moral features of the race. They could not lay the plan of a Colony except as a project of Commonwealth, bearing a moral and religious impression profoundly Protestant. Dutch Calvinism, too, was conveyed to South Africa. There was a contradiction in the terms in which war broke out between the South African Dutch and the English Government, as the course of political history has shown since the 1906 reconciliation. This brought in its wake the agreement of such minds as those of Botha and Smuts with the League of Nations' scheme: President Wilson, for instance, would have set up world-wide politics on the purely moral foundations dear to Protestantism, a proposal which rang true to the "confused" Anglo-Saxon mind, as Brunetière would define it, on that very account. A French or Belgian Colony is indescribable, except as purely administrative, commercial and military. It is selfless and an official appendage of the Home Government. A new France beyond the seas, in the sense of the New England on the American coast, was historically impossible. The French political soul is not communicable in segments suited to emigration, and its religion was a set framework, bound with steel hoops, cast in Rome. The doctrine of the Excommunication of outbranching forms of *the Faith* has been fatal to the activity of religious "plasma," and the interdiction of dissent in finding one's own way to the Throne of Righteousness has unnerved the creative spirit springing from the root consciousness in man, that every conformity must be as free an act as a heresy is, and that a common heresy becomes the foundation of a sectional Church as a common moral standard is the cornerstone of public action on behalf of morals through the State. Those who signed the Covenant of the *Mayflower* were, each of them as a Christian, a moralist and a citizen, in a state of perfect conscious unity. The same unity stamped their plurality and is visibly perpetuated all along the line of American

Presidents, from Washington to Lincoln, on to Wilson and the present Coolidge, if we view them as the impersonation which their public action and private tenets entitle us to, as well as in their Presidential utterances in morals and religion.

The ethical duty of the State rests upon individual conscience and religion more than ever now. It is in the front of American politics, and engrosses everyone among the people, as any one may see who looks at the wet or dry dinner-table, round which the American family sits, a liberty which the Protestant confusion of morals and politics alone enables us to take. This confusion it is that makes of the Protestant an ardent, often turbulent missionary, and an ethical pioneer who is not a mere planter, or counting-house agent.

I am inclined to think that the United States bond of nationality is nothing else.

The Americans are bound together neither by a National Church, nor by a National Name, or National School System; they have no distinct bond of language or laws. They have nationalised nothing. They are in a condition of absolute confusionism, they are Protestant and with the British Empire stand in the van of Christian lay activities.

It must be confessed that Britain lagged long behind New England in building up firmly its own commonwealth on the Protestant principle of mutual restraint, and in divesting Church, State, and Law of all power which divides men, so as to set all men free from force and officialdom in matters personal and voluntary, while assuring protection to property, life, and mind in all sectional institutions, without nationalizing them.

The story of toleration, particularly, is more easily written from American history books than from English, though the leave given to the *Mayflower* people to be free heretics beyond the seas, under the English flag, was a distinctly Protestant compromise.

Proceeding on these lines, at once inhibitory and liberal, there grew in England a commonwealth fit to spread until it included races more numerous and diverse than ever obeyed Rome, and which cost nothing like the same quantity of blood, treasure and tears, including, too, specimens of civilisation of all levels. This Britain owes to the universal application of civil government, to the forswearing of militarism, to the slowly acquired habit of valuing land for the people's good and not for a conqueror's sake. That is the Protestant root idea; that City

and School are the social hinges upon which the State moves free. So the success of the British Empire is due to institutions, not force; to the home institutions of which civil servants abroad and colonists carried with them the sense and which they restored among themselves. No French colonist could carry, as a home-good, with him the sense of French law, because it is an exoteric written law, not a habit of the mind embodied in public customs.

A very good example of this arose lately in the Saar. The French prefect trained to apply codified police law, having to deal with "picketing" in a strike, called in the French Military to stop it, because there was no article in the German law-books forbidding "picketing." He did not realise that "peaceful picketing" came under the common rights of the individual, so long as no violence was offered, which violence the ordinary powers of the local policemen would be quite sufficient to meet.

"The British Empire has held together in so far as Britain has discovered principles, and evolved a system, which is not British, but human, and can only endure in so far as it grows more human still," wrote E. A. Sonnenschein in July, 1915, prophetically and, we may add, with the insight of a Protestant. A strange approximation to that idea may be seen in the present Government of Great Britain, foreboding a greater socialisation of morals, school and government than has been attempted hitherto with the consent of the politically-expressed will of the people; clearly Protestant in this, that this object shall be attained by mutual inhibition of contrasted extremes, answering the curb set by morals and religious regard upon the dealings of man with man. The proof that this evolution is of Protestant origin would have to be sought (or taken from the event) in this commonwealth of an Empire whose political growth has been in the Protestant line for four uninterrupted centuries. During these, the process of religious expansion as the population grew in numbers has been dispersive rather than disruptive, and, under the law of liberty, an ever greater number of consciences have been promoted to being politically alive.

How? the sceptic may ask, looking to a procedure universal and abstract for such an operation as Church and Empire building. But forces are never universal and abstract; that belongs to philosophy, mathematics, physics and their principles. Forces are actual, concrete and applied. But, again, the sceptic

will say: How did the ancient Romans unite the civilised world into one international State? Did they not abandon the commonwealth idea which had been effective 700 years? Did they not set up their international empire on the basis of autocracy? Now, the civil fabric of the British Empire, just as international and vast as the Roman, under and after Augustus, does not rest upon autocracy. It was an immense step in the history of the world, the greatest ever made, that a quarter of its inhabitants, and that quarter standing at every level in human progress, should have been united into an international State, without that State abandoning, as did Rome, the commonwealth life-principle for the passive discipline of autocratic institutions.

When Rome secured its second primacy of the world through the Christian religion and Church, it fell into the same rut, now by ecclesiasticism, as by its late political imperialism. But here, too, the Anglo-Saxon spirit carried into practice the principle of free religious commonwealths, without unity, or rather leaving *that* unexpressed which might the more firmly so be rooted in each part, and, working freely therein, send forth all its strength from its place into the general structure. That is the contribution of Protestantism to Church and State. Deepest foundations are least seen, and, with a perpetual flow, there is little flood. It is in the sixteenth century that we find the deep-lying streams breaking away from the underground. That redoubled life-force set upon its course and moulded another society, dividing sharply between Romanism and Protestantism the allegiance of the Christian world. Conformity is not an Anglo-Saxon virtue, but aggregation is.

Those who, in freedom, joined together in their politics religion and morals obtained the best cement for binding together the forces of social life, achieving a system whereby, not a mere island, nor classes, but whole peoples, sundered by all the width of the world to which they belong only by a local root, to put it clearly, may by means of this local tie be made safe and happy under the rule of a common law, that law itself being that of a public opinion which is neither British nor national, but human in its scopè, and, consequently, both familiar and dear to any human being, or, as we might even say, to any animal with a home, a family and neighbours, on whose behalf he may *protest* when not on his own behalf.

The defensive and protective effects of social inhibition are

immense upon the Protestant commonwealth. One cannot imagine a better purifier of the air and disinfectant of the body politic. Without it the atmosphere which a civilised people breathes ceases to be sweet. It becomes stagnant and foul.

What is then that inter-State and inter-Church bond amid the plurality of States and Churches forming the Protestant Commonwealth of Nations, so undeniably distinct from the Latin or Romanist ?

We said that Protestantism meant order, peace, growth and social welfare by mutual inhibition and joint respect for the same human fundamentals in any difference exhibited. This respect we may call comity in its social aspect ; piety being a spiritual feeling of man for man, as a fellow-creature and brother.

Hence the mutual bridging over of contrasts by contract. To the Protestant mind it must be so. The whole political history of Protestant peoples shows that the political tie is by them (and somehow, quite instinctively) conceived and formulated as a contract, a binding enactment on a free basis, a bond, not a bondage ; a covenant, not an obligation ; in fine, an internal agreement laid bare.

Thus is placed beyond question the paramountcy of nature-born affections and the implicit voidness in morals and religion of any political supremacy obtained by compression of, or pressure upon, the legitimate expression of feelings.

Why should sensibility be used as a means of enforcing an obedience which then becomes a compliance as unreliable as it is unrighteously claimed by compulsion ?

The case of righteousness, as between ruler and ruled, has been magnificently put by Shakespeare in the very days of Calvin and Knox.

First, the majesty of rule, the object of a spontaneous, childlike piety :—

“ There’s such divinity doth hedge a king,
That treason can but peep to what it would,
Acts little of its will.”

Chettle, of the same date, writing of Queen Elizabeth, says :
“ She was, as all princes are or *should* be, so full of divine fullnesse that guilty mortalitie durst not beholde her but with dazeled eyes.”

Then, Shakespeare again, on the justice of revolt when an

outrage upon the heart releases conscience. Laertes, laying the murder of his father at the door of royalty, feels his loyalty melting away :—

“ I'll not be juggled with.
 To hell, allegiance ! Vows, to the blackest devil
 Conscience and grace, to the profoundest pit !
 I dare damnation. To this point I stand
 That both the worlds I give to negligence,
 Let come what comes ; only I'll be revenged
 Most thoroughly for my *father*.”

With the Protestant social bond holding good within the national life (international compacts are no longer concluded upon the base of common faith) ; there is easily mixed up something more devout, thanks to that peculiar confusion of politics and morals that marks the Protestant temperament. A spiritual element steps in which is made visible by the persistent intrusion of the name of God in political phraseology, whether merely formal or impassioned. We have then more than a mere contract at law. We have an act of dedication, of a validity spiritually binding, and mutual ; a mutuality which cannot stand if one of the parties departs from the spirit, as was well seen in the War of Secession in the United States. The common spirit could only be recovered and restored when the passionate element in the issue (which stood as between righteousness and unrighteousness, a plainly Protestant war issue) had received conscientious satisfaction. In the same way, British Imperial unity was achieved against Germany in 1914, and thence forward, only while the Protestant conscience was galled into wrath on broad, human issues. And, since then, the French Government has seen the same tide of feeling rise against its disregard of common humanity in the pursuit of political and materialistic aims. The Protestant conscience cannot approve of a political move that is not true to humane considerations, such as can be only executed by open covenanting on equal political terms (by supposition equitable, if not so in reality and reason).

Both Lee and Lincoln felt deeply how wrong it was to reach the direst extremities : “ A union in which strife and civil war are to take the place of brotherly love and kindness has no charm for me.” “ The ugly point is that a government should be kept up by force when ours should be a government of fraternity.” So shines forth the Protestant loadstar. Men

should restrict themselves, and so should all Governments, to securing the fundamentals of freedom by order, and of human brotherhood by human means, among men amenable to such arguments.

The Swiss Covenant of 1291 and that of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620 agree in this plain statement of the commonwealth's nature and expression. The form of growth in the Protestant type is congregational, or by dissent wording a new formula in associative freedom, or by federation of proximate formulas. So in political and public life. And when the common ideal, the most fundamental precept and observance of all, namely, respect of man in his mere soul and body, is challenged, the united front of the Protestant world defies Rome and Empire in point of hardiness, strength and sacrificial energy of individuals. The battle once won for right on those broadest of all imaginable lines, the Protestant hand is again stretched out in fellowship as if it had never worn the gauntlet of war. Protestantism has no enemies but those who fall away from humanity. No political oath should ever be demanded on another issue. The fundamental opposition of Romanism and Protestantism the history of Ireland has shown most acutely. There only, and perpetually there, human respect has failed to operate on either side. Elsewhere the Protestant commonwealth sense of the British was never brought up against Romanism as a bedfellow, so to speak. There they could not stand each on its own ground, nor could they formulate terms in common. There is at last some appearance that the human touch of Britain has found a way down to bedrock in Irish hearts. It has struck a note upon the stone. The stone has rung back in return. Nobody who heard and met the Irish delegates at Geneva, last autumn, could doubt it, or mistake the voice. The League of Nations, if anything, is something in and by the Protestant spirit, and Ireland is there truly at last.

On the other hand, the present French Government was there as the wolf within the flock or a thief within the fold. As one of their political spokesmen said, "The name of God is never heard and His presence never felt in contemporary French politics." Yet it were better to worship an honest pagan god than be no worshipper at all. It is well recognised at Rome that the League of Nations depends on the Protestant spirit for its life and that this spirit is not that of spiritual autocracy.

Mr. Brunetière, whom I quoted above, said at Geneva on the

same occasion that the spirit of Protestantism is one of aristocracy. The utterance was memorable and tri-partite.

He said and laboured to prove that Calvin had unduly intellectualised, then aristocratised, and finally individualised the Christian faith. This will remind every Victorian who reads these lines of Matthew Arnold's pronouncement on the Victorian age, which was that of his lifetime. He too threw down a triple challenge at Britain as a Protestant community, saying it was vulgarised in its upper classes, materialised in the middle rank, and bestialised in the masses below. It was not so. Its striving after morals was intense. That is now apparent by contrast. The morals which have suffered from past war conditions are of the personal kind. Those of the citizens as a body proved themselves more than equal to the stress laid on them, to the appeal made to them.

Does the threefold charge which Brunetière levelled at Protestantism hold good? When the Genevese heard it they felt honoured, not ashamed. They knew that their one merit, as servants to their fellow-men, rested on the three main props I have above mentioned:—

1. Intellectual enfranchisement of the faith by free schools: *Schola libera*.
2. The consciousness of having a voice and place in the State: *Civitas libera*.
3. A personal agreement of each believer with the tenets of the faith: *Ecclesia libera*; in other words, a right of choice and probation—that which the Church of England, for sincerity's sake, would call a Statute of Ability.

The raising by education of the quality of each individual was, in the thought of Calvin, essential to the attainment of a conscientious religious life, and did both uplift men and purify the faith; let alone the value of intellect, moral excellence, and individual character as a force making for the enrichment of national life. Whencesoever Protestantism has arisen and wheresoever it has set its feet, there soul, conscience, and mind—no room here for social distinctions in the narrower applications of the word aristocracy as opposed to inferiority in mere rank—have contributed to enlarge man to the fullness of his three dimensions, exempt from fear in so doing, and humbled thereby without undergoing humiliation.

The progress of man is marked in the history of his relation to religion from the darkest, the blackest of superstitions—the word is not properly descriptive of its meaning—to the noblest (aristocratic), most personal (individualistic), purest (intellectualistic, not rationalised, but freed from impurities and impositions). This last can only be an intellectual process.

The grievous mishandling of religion by, or in, Church and State is the saddest strain in the history of humanity. The more Christianity penetrates both in the future, the better for mankind. From Calvin to Wilson, in defining the place to be filled by Christianity in the political organisation of a world fit for man to dwell in, a very long stride can be measured. Wilson is the next best exponent of Protestantism as a political and social force and of Christianity pervasive of public policy. In his wake he drew all the Protestant Churches, States, and Schools. In this, neither was he succeeded nor was he led by Papacy. Yet his demise from actual leadership gave to Romanism every chance.

When the Peoples were moved everywhere, Rome was without a Prophet; has she then rung herself out of the Councils of the world?

We still have to consider the dual influence of Protestant religion and morals upon the law in public and private, which latter topic will bring us once more to that most important item in any Protestant Commonwealth: the School.

First the law. It is generally understood that Calvin's mind was essentially that of a lawgiver and lawyer. Two branches of law, canon law and public law, bulked more largely than any others in the concerns of his mind. The establishment of Protestantism as a theory of life and a practice applicable to a new social organization depended on the re-modelling of the spirit of the law in the relations from man to man and in the constitution of the bond of State among them. That the whole should be derived directly from Scripture was self-evident, and that the hitherto accepted medium should be set aside, namely the Church of Rome, whose conception and tradition in those things appeared then as a glass darkened and a warped mirror of the "law of God," if it may be so put in clear words. The Church of Rome did evolve and attempt to impose a certain *Civitas Dei* upon man. What it was is still apparent in what it has left behind, in those countries which are still bound up in the Latin traditions. This appears most strikingly in the

status of women as an object of public and private law. The Romanist started from the notion that man is born an outcast from the City of God and had to be brought back to it by submission to a discipline marking him as unworthy. The Fatherhood of God, on the contrary, would look upon him as a son and allow him dignity as such, though erring. If we look to woman particularly, she suffered more severely from so much harshness than her male companion in original sin. Her sex came in for a greater animadversion, a sharper attribution of guilt. She had to be guarded against as a constant peril, and this gave her a lower station. The segregation at law of women fallen into sin is one of the social conceptions kept alive in Romanism. That idea was absent from the Genevan Commonwealth. In this Commonwealth the Latin characteristic and the Protestant strangely crossed one another, geographically and ethnically. Geneva and the remainder of Protestant French-speaking Switzerland are beset with Romanism.

If we may let that local particularity go out of sight, and resume our consideration of terms universal, a glance at the Assembly of the League of Nations when public morals come within the field of debate shows a cleavage between Latin peoples (practically all Roman) and Protestants, clearly running along that line. When French opinion on certain rules and practices in French municipal law relating to women was expressed as a national claim, consciously put forth and claiming recognition, the benches occupied by the delegates from Protestant nations were wrapped in a reprehensive silence, speaking disapproval and dissent. The Frenchman, like everybody else, felt the tension that was in the air. The reader understands that I am not alluding to women in their political position in the State, but as sharers in one moral law with men, relatively to their persons.

The equality of all men, of whatever social station, before one another as Protestant Bible-believers, was restored in the acceptance of one and the same Bible-governance. Hence was in time evolved the Protestant notion of citizenship, drawn from that of the brotherhood of believers. This consciousness of citizenship differed *in toto* in spirit and performance from that which was set up through the French Revolution much later, and, as its future has shown, in total disacknowledgment of a moral law with spiritual credentials drawn from the Bible. For a time, American Protestants (improperly handled in the

political sphere by their English forbears) were dazzled by it. But they no sooner approached the question of extending their States and Schools as a spiritual Christian tie throughout their continent than Bible-religion penetrated the Federal Constitution as it had each of the contracting States. The present struggle for and against Prohibition by political legislation shows that continuity to have grown most steadily through time and to have spread over all the space accessible to the American Constitutional laws.

And where is the Anglo-Saxon country or English-ruled dependency that does not derive its administrative rules and legal powers from the same fountain head? A legality informed with morality, a morality informed with spirituality. There are more words in the English language conveying moral and religious consciousness than in any other, and nowhere else are they so constantly recurrent in poetry, literature, oratory, and common talk.

An examination of history shows that for the Protestant the leading of a moral life, the discharge of public responsibility, is a duty of double and treble import as to himself, his fellow-creatures, and his Maker. There is indeed much confusion in this . . . of the right kind.

Spiritual equality, moral equality lead to legal equality as necessary to social units, even in moral issues attaching to one's personal life and private actions. For these we may go to, or be brought before, a common court, which, one knows, will let no ceremony, formality, or "principality" stand in the way of equality. In an English court the moral aspect of any contention is laid bare to the very bone; the human motive is laid bare as much in extenuation as in aggravation of a fault, and the human sense predominates in judge and jury, at once stern and kind. One of the most characteristic features of this equality and individuality in responsibility to civil society may be illustrated from the case once brought by the present King, before an ordinary court, to have some slanderous charge made against him tried as though being in that respect a plain citizen, and from the amenability of a military officer to judgment by a civil court for any wrongful obedience to his superior officer, or wrongous act of his own in his military capacity.

This "Protestant" protection of the mere man may also be seen in the right of a private individual to seek from the ordinary courts redress from abuse or injury arising in the exercise of their

powers by Civil Servants. As the body of the State was at first equally distributed among, and all over, the congregation of Protestant believers, so has the common law remained unwritten by hand, but graven in the spirit.

And so is Law, in Protestant hands, a perpetual schooling, and that a free schooling, the doctrine being reborn in, and with, every generation. It is all character building, building out a character upon an inner model.

The more one thinks of it, the more one sees that it is mainly in Anglo-Saxon countries that Protestantism has run a true course and found, or made, a natural bed along which to receive affluent streams and be enlarged. The history of Britain is that of one long social evolution, a purely internal evolution. It made no wars for conquest, and won victory in defensive wars, or for free navigation, to enlarge the commonwealth. My readers know now what that word means under my pen. The social, moral, spiritual characteristic of the nation was made sure of growth and spread all over its solid and extensible material base.

Speaking of solid and extensible State structure, the Norman invasion was certainly a military event of constitutive import (using as a standard of comparison what happened to the British occupation of Ireland). The landing of William of Normandy at Hastings turned out to be an event of the greatest magnitude as a social departure, because it brought to England elements for State, Church and School construction which grew there, from the days of Henry VIII, into a Commonwealth rooted in itself. Quite free from *Latinitas* in its depths, it can best be called pre-Protestant. As a State mediæval England was most informal; as a civil society it was most richly endowed and quite self-contained, with remarkable powers for gemination and self-multiplication. Then Roman Church and British people began to fundamentally disagree. The word dissolution is rightly applied to what happened to Roman Church-mindedness in the island. It had out-lived itself, and the lay mind showed itself to be its supersessor and its inheritor. The Elizabethan Englishman and Scotsman showed himself extremely fervid. The intellectual fermentation was intense. Mediæval passivity entirely died out. Thought, extremely fertile, sprung up everywhere, among a people endowed with an extraordinary sense for social life, joined to an untractable opinionativeness. I do not mean here the intellect that seeks and finds satisfaction in reading and writing. I mean that which finds an outlet in personal meditation on impersonal

objects. Of such dramatic thought springs the force that makes of each of us a Protestant, and individual aristocrats, even in the humblest rank, out of the most ignorant men, or the most sheep-like among gregarious creatures on two feet. And so we are brought again within sight of the *tri-unus vir* denounced by Mr. Brunetière as the typical Protestant, but, to our way of thinking, ever *primus inter pares* or *nulli secundus* in human potentiality, ideality and respectability. Those are the three stepping stones to dignity, the way to humility without humiliation, to service without subserviency, to authority without domination.

The feature of Romanism in history was this : that it taught man to hold himself for a being of small price, during his human career. The Protestant revolted, and there is perhaps in contemporary Socialism a protest of the same kind coming from the masses whose existence has been compressed by the Juggernaut of Industrialism. For all these reasons, and in obedience to all these impulses, what happened in the sixteenth century was the resolution of existing Christianity into Biblical and Evangelical first elements, so as to breathe again in the original Christian atmosphere.

What was the office of the schools in this work ? It was to bridge over the gap which was then felt to separate laity from clergy. In this respect the schools and colleges in Britain, which were then formed, or whose spirit gradually changed, had a marked advantage over the Protestant schools elsewhere. They were "foundations," generally self-governing, and public in the English meaning of the word, bringing continuance to the new character which was spreading among the people under the guidance of the Reformers. These became moulders of the national spirit in its manifold progress, as time went on. The *direct* instruction of the young by the State is not a historical idea in England. So education remains there, in its middle and higher grades, a reflex from the particular intention attached to patronage in each school, and the choice is left to the parents according to their own proclivities in the matter of education. Thus we enter into the domain of personality in schools, and the formation of private character upon particular lines attains prominence. This specifically Protestant feature has been much obliterated elsewhere. Its preservation throughout Anglo-Saxon Christendom has been, and is, for the future maintenance of Protestant open-mindedness, one of utmost value to Christianity. Thanks

to this feature, Protestantism in its civilian garb is visibly active in the spirit which Anglo-Saxons carry anywhere they go in a national or personally responsible capacity.

Thus is made apparent perhaps the greatest service ever rendered to the world by the infusion of Protestantism into the blood and marrow of the Anglo-Saxon in his primitive island home.

The force of the Protestant principle, its social and moral momentum, may be judged by its work in the Assembly of the League of Nations. It is the rallying point, the radiating centre. It would be utterly victorious had it the help of the United States in the political guidance of the Assembly. That it is there religiously alive in the privacy of the soul is no less made visible by personal converse. That the Assembly should sit only a few hundred yards removed from the pulpit of John Calvin is historically justifiable. That an American President descended from Calvinists fathered the Covenant of the League is no unfit event.

The strength of Protestantism as a social force is seen in the variety of forms which are, together, the constituent bond of its unity. It breaks up into *nuclei* each of which testifies to the diversity in which active faith finds as many instruments suitable for the human mind to work with. The Christian spirit is free from uniformity in apprehending the objects of faith and in Protestantism it finds the liberty it requires to be happy in its religion. It gets as many focusing spots for the outpouring of faith, as many supporting points for a moral energy derived from Christian belief, as there are groups of men and women who seek a free relation to God—which is his will—upon which to build up a congregational religious life, and who help one another by communing with the sacred law of righteousness in His sight. Faith flowing from the fountain-head, divides itself out in as many streams as there are channels opening to receive it. Then each stream percolates through some particular area of common Christian ground. This faculty marks out Protestantism as a public good: *Christus per liberas communitates effulgens*. Christ shining upon the world through free companies of men.

Among legislators or reformers inspired by religion Calvin is the greatest *civilian*. He sought in the Bible rules for the reconstitution of the life of mankind in the forms of a society with an inherent Church. The expression of this inherency has since been seen in the infinite variety of organs in which the consciousness of grouped Christians has found utterance. No shunning of,

or withdrawal from, the world. Each collectivity of believers elects its ministers or follows its prophet. The height of confusion, says Romanism. But what a bringing home of responsibility and what a confident acceptance of it! How ennobling that appeal to the intellect in the fixation of belief! How full of dignity that aristocratic preference for the personal use of judgment in determining upon the best!

Equality and community within the Protestant bond bring up for discussion here—our final point—the whole question of personal allegiance and fealty, as compared with the collective covenanting oath, based on the equality of persons before God, and thereby implicitly extensible to, or reversionarily claimable by, the whole of human kind, as a compromise among, or contract between, all men, under Christ, whether high or low otherwise.

It results very plainly from all we have written in the preceding pages that a Protestant pledging himself to a superior “temporal” or secular power does so under two reservations implied in his conception of Christian duty, or explicitly allowed for in the wording of the oath: namely, a reservation in favour of his conscience, and another in favour of his spiritual tenets. On the contrary, when the same Protestant covenants freely with his like (such as the Pilgrim Fathers, or, in pre-Reformation days, the political Protestants who formulated the first Swiss Covenant), there is no encroachment upon the private conscience and spirit to be guarded against, but rather conformity thereto is, by a mutual guarantee, granted from like to like and, by equal and equal, is made specific and binding. Here, again, we come very near the notion of dedication as a binding clause good in public law, illustrative of, or merely exteriorising (the persons being spiritually alike) the feeling of a common vow, among equals as more cogent than one given to, or extracted by authority. The Protestant puts his religion in common. It is a Society, a Republic. Priesthood and Magistracy are merged therein. For him they are not derived from *Jesus Christus noster Imperator et Rex*, but from the Jesus Christ, Son of God and Saviour of Men, who is familiar to him in his own vernacular.

The religious sanction of, and penal clauses attaching to, a political oath of allegiance show, by their frequent misuse as an instrument of domination (and a successful one in spite of innumerable individual revolts), what a snare Authority has therein instituted for itself. How often, by the skilful wording of such a pledge, or by handling its implications in bad faith, it has found

formal justification for committing an evil deed offending in one individual the whole of mankind!

From the first the innermost proposition of Protestantism, in political matters, was that which it claimed in matters spiritual for itself. No arms, no violence, no compelling force of the materialistic order. Peace is the one social good amid many social evils. The public good is best understood as limited to the enforcement upon individuals of undertakings on behalf of undenominational welfare only in every sense of the word and the same rule holds good to justify international intervention on broadly human grounds, and on no other.

Unfortunately, there is in man an ever renascent rabid strain towards crushing spirit under matter. To curb that native wildness by sheer persuasiveness and education has ever been the goal of Protestantism; whence it has its name and *raison d'être*. Round this immanent ideality have revolved its cause and purpose throughout its history, a long course of self-education and an unceasing outward effort, not free from martyrdom.

The first edition of John Calvin's *Christianæ Religionis Institutio* was issued in 1536, the year in which the commoners of Geneva proclaimed Protestantism to be a public good and virtue, and also the year in which Calvin formed a life-long connection with that people, setting up in a Latin cradle an apostolic mission which was to bear its fruits among the non-Latin races, once under Roman domination, and thereafter in the grasp of a stifling Romanism.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving a vote of thanks to the lecturer, acknowledged the weighty language in which a subject of profound interest had been unfolded before the Institute. Whereas with us the name of Calvin and his principles are associated with a theological point of view—and indeed have furnished a theological catchword—on the Continent other aspects of the man and his influence have prevailed during the centuries. A striking aspect had been developed by Prof. Roget, whose paper should at least send us back to the biographies of Calvin and the great works which he gave to the world.

The resolution of thanks was accorded with much heartiness.

Lieut.-Col. MACKINLAY said:—Prof. Roget's paper comes at an opportune time when the kingdoms of the world have all been

shaken and disturbed by the great war, and now when the tendencies in modern successful government are plainly apparent. Autocratic rule has given place to a more democratic sway, while the aims of rulers are of a more sympathetic type than formerly, being founded on the teaching of the Bible, as our lecturer tersely puts it in his phrase of "a happy confusion of morals and politics."

Not so very long ago it was said that kings could do no wrong, but that idea was shattered in England by the legal death of Charles I, who had grievously broken our laws; but though the feeling of intense subservience to royalty still survives in some countries, we find that nowadays the ruler of a prosperous country freely acknowledges that he is himself subject to law.

England and the United States are pointed out by Prof. Roget as the leading examples of this modern trend in government, and Calvin is held to be the one who has largely led to the present state of things by his appeals to Scripture in reference to earthly rule.

The modern leading State is not one in which militarism occupies a prominent place, and wars of aggression and conquest are not to be aimed at; but, at the same time, a vigorous State must be ready to engage in a war in which it takes part from a sense of justice with enthusiasm, and as quickly as possible. Prof. Roget in past years came to tell us how England (on the Swiss model, could mobilize her immense forces in man and material with order and some rapidity.

When a war is over, the extra armies which have been raised should vanish as soon as possible, the arts of peace should be at once returned to and conciliation with former enemies should be actively sought for. Our own country affords happy examples of this adaptability to circumstances. For instance, after the Punjaub War the conquered Sikhs became our most loyal supporters in the suppression of the Indian Mutiny; and after the Boer War Briton and Boer have happily joined together in the government of the Cape. It is to be hoped that Briton and German will also combine together in the pursuits of commerce, trade, and science with mutual good will and with much less suspicion of each other than in pre-war days.

As Prof. Roget helped us before the war by impressing on us the duty that all should train and be ready to mobilize, so we trust

that this present lecture may help to cause to vanish the bitterness between us and the German nation, so closely connected with us by ties of religion and of kindred.

Doubtless immense difficulties will remain in all governments, in our own included. Wars, perhaps worse and worse in character, will remain with us to the close of the age ; but the broad features of present-day rule and success have been plainly put before us by our gifted lecturer, and we warmly thank him for his clearly worded and illuminating paper.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS pointed out that the province of Quebec, Canada, showed the lecturer was mistaken in saying that a new France beyond the seas in the sense of the New England on the American Coast was historically impossible. He also disagreed with the lecturer's statement that the progress of man in relation to religion was from the darkest superstition, for he believed the Book of Genesis showed that a very pure religion was known in early days and became corrupted.

He thought that France's being on the Allies' side in the late war was due to the accident of her proximity to Germany on the Rhine, and pointed out that the other two great Latin races, Italy and Spain, had lately gone over to autocracy, which he believed France would ultimately do.

He instanced Benjamin Kidd's latest book entitled *Principles of Western Civilisation* as maintaining a thesis somewhat analogous to that of the lecturer, particularly with regard to the primacy of the ideals of the Anglo-Saxon race on each side of the Atlantic.

He regarded Calvin as the most powerful mind since Augustine that had been brought under the sway of the Christian revelation, and pointed out that Augustine's teaching in his City of God had moulded the Christian Church for centuries. Augustine had insisted on original sin and the total depravity of man ; and Calvin, while accepting this, brought in the new principle of the individual conscience being wrought upon by Scripture.

He would have liked more from the lecturer as to the religious aspect of Calvinism, as he believed that this was at the root of its political importance, for Calvin stood above all else for the great truth of redemption through Christ.

Remarks of W. HOSTE on Prof. Roget's paper :—I am thankful

for Prof. Roget's reminder that the first Protestants anywhere became such by a personal, independent, free act (*i.e.* by individual conversion to God). One could wish they had been satisfied with God's order and come together into churches rather than conglomerate into States. Political Protestantism is verily a dead business. How can we ask for "voluntary subjection (p. 160) in the home or State unless the nature be renewed"? Surely Calvin meant this, but does it not need affirming? Did M. Brunetière really mean (p. 161) that politics may be divorced from moral principles when he speaks of Calvin's "confusion of politics and morals"? An R.C. lecturer would scarcely admit such a thing before a Protestant audience. Did he not, perhaps, rather mean that politics are not carried on strictly on Christian principles, but on principles proper to it (*i.e.* of righteous government), and that any attempt to set up a Christian government must either spoil your government or your Christianity. Christianity acts in grace; Government "beareth not the sword in vain."

It may seem a shocking heresy, but take the French action in the Ruhr. It is not Christian, nor does it claim to be; nor is it Christian to demand reparations, but governmentally it is perfectly justifiable and righteous. The Ruhr adventure may not turn out to be "good business," and it was on this principle that Bonar Law kept out, and he seems to have been right. But politically the French are within their rights. They have put the brokers in. I do not see how any government can be carried on on principles of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," though the French carve these words even on their prisons, and it sounds something good. "On se paie de mots." Government must have its sanctions; the policeman is as necessary as the preacher. "Righteousness exalteth a nation." Anything more fatal to good government than spasms of sentimentalism can scarcely be conceived. The plane of Christianity is incomparably higher. To demand a profession of Christianity before the vote, is to confound things that differ and infringe on the liberty of the subject.

Remarks by Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD, V.P. :—This masterly paper approaches Calvinism from a standpoint that is new to most people.

It is in its theological rather than its political aspect that Calvinism

is most generally known. Prof. Roget's paper is, however, an argument that the union of morals and politics is the essence of Calvinism, and largely the prerogative of the Anglo-Saxon race.

In theology Calvinism appears to most to represent one-half of Divine truth and Arminius the other half, the misfortune being the extent to which each half denies the other. And this for the obvious reason that to man the two are irreconcilable. But in Divine things only opposites can be true, and the two become one.

For example :—

Light and love in God.	Election and freewill in Protestantism.
A Judge and Saviour in Christ.	Jew and Gentile in church.
Law and liberty in love.	Slavery and freedom in Christianity.
Sovereignty and responsibility in Gospel.	

In most religious disputes each side has part of the truth ; and the needless conflict is not due to error in the word of God, but is rather a demonstration of the limitations of the human intellect.

The combination of politics and morals here asserted to be the essential quality of Protestantism is a Bible principle. The close of several epistles is full of it, and law and morals are there not confused but combined. The late war was a real conflict between brute force and morals, and was most remarkable for the union on behalf of the latter of the Anglo-Saxon and Latin races, which was indeed surprising, if we accept Prof. Roget's view of French principles as set forth on pp. 163 and 169.

665TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, APRIL 28TH, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL G. MACKINLAY IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from Lord Stamfordham acknowledging the receipt of the last annual volume of the Proceedings of the Victoria Institute, saying that he is commanded to express the thanks of His Majesty the King.

The Chairman then referred to the recent death of Mr. E. J. Sewell, a valued Member of the Council of the Victoria Institute as well as of other bodies. Mr. Sewell had served as an Honorary Secretary for some two years during the war, and did excellent service at a time when the Institute was passing through a period of stress. He gained the last prize granted by the Gunning Trust Prize Fund, by his paper on Jonah which is much valued. It may be mentioned incidentally that he generously gave £10 of the sum he had gained towards the finances of the Victoria Institute.

He was a distinguished (retired) member of the Indian Civil Service, and he freely employed his great linguistic talents in the service of the Victoria Institute, and of the Bible Society, of which he was a Vice-President, and for many years Chairman of the Sub-Committee which deals with the numerous translations of the Bible into a very large proportion of the languages of the world.

He was a modest, kind-hearted Christian man, beloved of all who knew him, and his loss is much felt by a wide circle; we respectfully tender our hearty sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Sewell.

The Chairman then called on Dr. Schofield, so well known and valued among the members of the Victoria Institute, to read his paper on "The Making of Men."

THE MAKING OF MEN.

By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

I WOULD preface my remarks on this somewhat difficult theme by saying at the outset that I use the term "men" in this paper definitely without distinction of sex. This must be clearly understood, and is essential to my arguments—that in

all cases "men" is a generic term and here includes the female equally with the male. To this I would add that any discussions of larger questions of the "why" and "wherefore" will find no place in this paper. Accidents of birth and of environment operate no doubt universally in the making of men; but proceeding as they do from inscrutable causes are regarded as beyond the scope of my subject to-day.

The terrible disadvantages that handicap so many in the race of life are, to the writer insoluble mysteries, as indeed are most ultimate origins and causes. I think we shall be more profitably employed this afternoon if we confine our study to such matters as belong to our province, and are within our grasp.

There can be no doubt of one fact, whatever many be its cause, that though all people are human beings all are not men.

It may be fairly asked here that I should define my terms, and say what I mean by "men." Perhaps, however, I may be allowed to defer my definition to the close of my paper, and confine myself here to quoting one verse of Kipling's solution of the question:—

"If you can talk with crowds, and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run
Yours is the earth, and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!"

What then are the forces by which men are made?

Leaving on one side for the moment the last and greatest of them all—the Spiritual—I may take them for the purpose of this paper as being three in number:—

1. Prenatal.
2. Parental.
3. Personal.

and we will briefly consider them in this order.

1. PRENATAL OR HEREDITARY.

This force is much better understood than it was fifty years ago. Of course, the archaic idea, that infants were born into the world an absolute *tabula rasa* to be written on at will, needs hardly be

refuted, at any rate to this audience. But granted this is never true, and that all infants come into the world as complex masses of predispositions trailing many things besides Wordsworth's "clouds of glory"; the question is, what is exactly the force of heredity in the making of man?

In heredity we must remember that we no longer believe that we inherit fixed qualities, but rather tendencies and potentialities, which by education and culture can be converted into flowers or weeds, into virtues or vices. This is true physically as well as mentally. It is very rare indeed for a man to inherit a disease, but very common to inherit tendencies to diseases: that is, an hereditary lessening of our resisting power in certain organs which, however, if successfully resisted (as it can be), or through three generations, absolutely disappears in the fourth!

To me this is a glorious truth, as it lifts from the race the dead hand of heredity which has rested so heavily on our newly-born.

Only the other day at a great scientific meeting I heard the assertion that absolute vices and diseases were inherited, and the new-born child was an almost necessary victim. That this is not so I shall prove later, not only by the fact above stated, but from another reason more remarkable still.

Battered and defaced though the Divine image may be in humanity mind, it can still be clearly traced in infancy.

All infants are distinguished soon after birth by two remarkable natural tendencies or principles: one is love and the other is justice. All children love; and all, in infancy, have a marked sense of justice or right; which often causes them great distress when they find any injustice in those whom they are taught to believe are wiser than themselves. Now love and justice are simply love and light—the essential nature of God. God has impressed these two qualities on every infant mind. But, observe, love may be changed into a positive vice by becoming simply love of self or pure egotism. Justice itself may be turned to evil, if it is developed into nothing else than caring for one's own rights. On the other hand, both may be made to blossom into beautiful virtues in proportion as they become altruistic. In short, our tendencies which are inborn may develop into vices or virtues by training.

The quality of the man himself in this light evidently depends on nature and nurture—nature that implants the tendencies, and nurture by which they grow into virtues of character.

Environment and suggestion are undoubtedly two strong

forces by which the early life should be trained, suggestions of good and not of evil, for suggestions have an overwhelming weight when they come from such a powerful influence over a child as its mother. It is hardly too much to say that a mother is nearly as dominant over a child's mind as a hypnotizer is over his patient. The results of such training are, of course, not seen till long after. The springs and roots of character lie in these hereditary potentialities deep in the unconscious mind—the flowers and fruit appear later in consciousness.

Mrs. Browning's beautiful lines show the force of which I speak :—

“ The baby has no skies, but mother's eyes,
 Nor any God above, but mother's love.
 His angel sees the Father's face,
 But he his mother's, full of grace ;
 And yet the Heavenly Kingdom is
 Of such as this.”

The second glorious truth—and none will think my words too strong who know how the slavery and cruel power of heredity has been proclaimed—is, that not alone do we inherit tendencies and potentialities only, but that there is a greater force over a man than heredity itself.

Darwin is the apostle of the dominant force of heredity ; but Herbert Spencer has discovered a greater. His words, never to be forgotten, are, “ A man becomes more like the company he keeps, than that from which he is descended.” In other words, that *environment* is the stronger of the two forces.

It is true, alas ! that with many unfortunates the environment only partakes of the nature of the heredity ; and that vicious parents often connote vicious surroundings, from which, for the infant there is no escape. We state the fact, but refuse here to pursue the subject further.

Where, however, the environment is the opposite to the heredity, it absolutely overcomes it.

This has been proved in a most remarkable way for the last thirty years by Mrs. Meredith's Prison-Gate Mission, and Herbert Spencer's immortal dictum shown to be true in practice. Babes taken from their mothers' breasts in prison, with four generations of hereditary crime behind them, are brought up by her in the nurture and fear of the Lord, and with a surrounding of the best forces for a dozen or twenty years ; and over

ninety per cent. turn out respectable, honest and often God-fearing Christian citizens fit for any post of trust.

Am I not right in speaking of this discovery as a glorious truth ?

2. PARENTAL.

Here I reach a large and little understood, and yet all-important, subject. Again I would divide it into three heads, as laid down by Matthew Arnold in another immortal saying :—

“ Education is an atmosphere, a discipline, a life.”

To explain this it will be absolutely necessary here to briefly explain the unconscious mind, to which this alone refers.

I may in the first place draw attention to the word “ education,” which is generally wrongly used—though rightly by Arnold. Education (*e-duco*) means to “ bring out,” not to put in ; and is the opposite of instruction. Instruction is what is given by schools, schoolmasters and books to the conscious mind (which until recently was the entire mind). But this in itself is never education ; which, on the contrary, is not addressed to the conscious but to the unconscious mind. The atmosphere, the discipline, the life—the three forces of true education—are not primarily exercised on the conscious, but on the unconscious.

And here I must make a short digression to explain what I mean by this, which is, I fear, still but imperfectly understood.

It is now over a quarter of a century since I introduced the “ unconscious mind ” into England, at a learned society which emphatically declared it was nonsense, and reproved the chairman for allowing the paper to be read. To-day it is a commonplace, and a somewhat fashionable topic, and I’ve lived to see it everywhere accepted.

It is true that in 1888 the Aristotelian Society held a special meeting to declare “ If mind is synonymous with consciousness,” and decided in the negative. But ten years after I still found no mind recognized but the conscious.

Mind is the total of psychic action, and the conscious mind is that part of it that is within our mental vision ; but sight is not our only method of investigation.

I see an island in the South Pacific, but I know it is but the visible summit of a vast mountain, whose unseen part far exceeds the visible. The latter represents the conscious part, and the former the unconscious, of the same mind. But between the

two is the tideway, and that part, sometimes visible and sometimes not, corresponds to the subconscious which lies immediately below consciousness.

A thermometer in like manner merely measures heat so far as the visible scale extends, but temperature extends indefinitely at both ends.

The spectrum only shows visible colours, seven in number, but far beyond extend others, generally unknown because invisible.

Gradually, very gradually, we are at last ceasing to deny the existence of what we cannot see—hence the unconscious mind becomes a possible truth.

Now the reason of this exordium is simply that the real distinction between instruction and education is, and it will bear repeating, that while the former develops the conscious, the latter develops the unconscious part of the mind ; which, after all, is the true self.

Let us briefly review the three forces at the disposal of the parent.

A. An "*atmosphere*" is the spiritual counterpart of our physical environment. It is what the mind breathes, that in which and by which it lives.

Moreover, an atmosphere is largely to character what a tin mould is to a pudding. You pour the cornflour into the latter and let it set, and then turn it out the exact shape of the mould.

Again, atmosphere is neither more nor less than the environment of the mind. But we have seen that this rightly used is a greater force than heredity.

How mighty then the power to make men which is in the hands of parents who understand even the first of these three great forces. They have but to arrange the environment in which the child is to live, say for the first twelve years of its life, with due reference to its heredity and its growth ; counteracting all that is evil in it with positive good, and fostering all that can be developed into virtues. Do not think I am romancing in describing parents as possessed of such a power : with the will and sufficient time to carry out their ideas, the atmosphere of the house can be made to beat with practically irresistible force on the young child.

One caution is, however, specially needed ; and that is to see that the good done by the mother is not undone by others, and that the atmosphere of the nursery is that of the house. Such is the ideal picture, but I have known houses replete with luxury

where the only atmosphere the child should breathe is in the nursery ; others, again, when the loss of a nursery through poverty brought the child under the mother's good influence for the first time.

As the child develops it is thus shaped by its environment, moulded on right lines, and its true education proceeds. More over, hereditary traits begin to stand out with greater prominence, and must be fostered or repressed as the case may be, all unconsciously to the child. The Jesuits, past-masters in child education, have always maintained that the great lines of character are practically formed by twelve years of age. In other words, the unconscious mind is educated before the instruction of the conscious in school-life seriously begins.

It is difficult to conceive a more delightful task than studying the seed plot which we call the child, with the power of arranging the atmosphere down to the smallest details (clothes, food, etc.) that will develop the growing plant to the best advantage.

What parents miss who know neither their responsibilities nor their powers in education, but foolishly think such matters are the provinces of governesses and schoolmasters, it is impossible to say. To my mind the two pleasures of greatest delight to parents worthy of the name, is the share they can take in the making of men, by the three great forces at their control, and in seeing the finished product of their labour in after life.

B. *A discipline.*—What this is is not obvious at first sight. The idea is that, while trucks are under discipline, carts and vans are not ; the difference being that while the former can only run on the rails, the latter can go where they will. In a similar manner the discipline of the Services make soldiers and sailors move in fixed directions. Now habit is well called the railroad of character ; and just as a railroad is physical discipline, a habit is mental discipline ; and it is this that is such a force in the formation of character, in the making of men.

With regard to habit, Professor Hill at Cambridge, and many others, have demonstrated that sensations and impulses that at first rise into consciousness and require voluntary effort and will to produce action, after a time do not rise into consciousness at all if repeated sufficiently often, but are "short-circuited" and performed without either effort, will, or knowledge. In other words, actions at first consciously performed become unconscious as they become habits, as, for instance, walking, dressing, etc.

If while walking I get into a brown study I may find my legs

have unconsciously taken me up a doorstep where I go every day. If I dress I pursue unconsciously a certain routine (to do otherwise makes me awkward). I always put the same foot first into my stocking and dress in a fixed order, and this without conscious thought.

Observe specially here, that so long as an action proceeding from a new principle is performed consciously, it requires a certain amount of effort and forms no part of my self or my character. The moment, however, that I have done it sufficiently often to become a habit, or, as it is called, an artificial reflex, it is not only done unconsciously and with perfect ease, but becomes for the first time a new quality in my character, another ingredient in the making of men. It becomes a spring of conduct that can be relied on. If I make a dirty boy wash his hands, he does it with effort and probably with reluctance, for cleanliness in this respect is no part of his character; but if he does this several times a day for a number of weeks under the guidance of one who knows the power of this second force, one day the washing becomes a habit; that is, the reflex action short-circuited runs in the mid-brain, never rises to the cortex or upper brain as consciousness, and is performed with perfect ease and no reluctance. For now cleanliness has formed, for the first time, a part of the ego; and the making of the man has proceeded another step.

Nothing, indeed, is mine, or a part of myself or of my character, until it is a quality of the unconscious mind, and performed naturally (unconsciously) and not artificially (consciously). Take another familiar instance in business life how ease and efficiency depend on habit. An office boy is engaged to put letters into envelopes and close and stamp them. New to the job, every action is consciously performed, and he gets through thirty in the hour. If another boy comes in for a chat, he goes all wrong and makes constant mistakes; for his conscious mind is fully engaged with his task, laboriously got through. Come again and see him in a few weeks' time. He is banging and stamping away at railroad speed at the rate of one hundred an hour; and not only so, but is laughing and chatting to a friend all the time and making not a single mistake. What is the secret? It is, that on a certain day the oft-repeated action became short-circuited in the mid-brain and never rose into full consciousness. The moment this was so, the habit was formed, the conscious mind released for other

work, and the boy, doing all easily and accurately, was worth twice as much to his employer.

Habit gives speed and accuracy, and is absolutely essential in business life.

As to habit, it is interesting to note its action in chess and billiards. In the former the moves are so intricate and varied that they never can become habits. It is therefore a laborious game, and must be played entirely with the conscious mind ; and the sigh of relief after the intense strain of a move in a master's tournament is most significant. Billiards is the complete opposite. The first thing that strikes an observer in a tournament is the consummate ease with which most of the strokes are played. The fact is, they have become so habitual that they are short-circuited habits, which means ease and accuracy ; and the stroke is performed with unconscious skill.

Again, habits are so powerful that they may change the whole man, even so far as his actual personality, the intimate thoughts of the individual, the character of the ego.

A father has six sons all pretty much alike at school, but the time comes for them to take up different callings in life. One becomes a soldier, another a sailor, another a merchant, another a farmer, another a parson, and another a scientist.

Go and see them after a few years ; and, lo and behold ! they are changed beyond recognition. It is not merely that one son is in the army, but that he absolutely *is* a soldier ; and a soldier is not a civilian. His very personality and the character of his thoughts are changed, and the outlook on everything in the world is changed to him ; all is seen from a new military angle. It is so with the sailor, who is not only completely different from what he was, but also from his brother the soldier. The merchant stands out in violent contrast to the other two. He is the absolute outcome of his environment and of his habits, as they are of theirs. The farmer looks almost as if he belonged to a different age and race by reason of the same forces. The parson appears as if he had been born a clergyman, while the scientist gazes abstractedly at his strange brethren and wonders how they could be so changed. Such is the discipline of habits.

The difference between a rich boor and a gentleman cannot always be seen in their conscious minds. When these are in action the boor can make a very praiseworthy effort of a more or less successful nature to imitate culture and breeding.

It is when they both forget themselves that the unconscious mind acts and gives them away. The boor is at once seen to be what he is, while the refinement of the other is self-evident.

In both the man himself is revealed; for my secret is now out, and the making of man is seen in its last analysis, mainly (though not entirely) to be *the education of the unconscious mind*.

It is always in our absent moments that we give ourselves away, our true personality is revealed, and the essential truth of the well-known lines is proved:—

“ Still, as of old,
 Man by himself is priced;
 For thirty pieces Judas sold
 Himself—not Christ! ”

The real value of the railroad of habit is that when once the line is laid down the nerve current moves more easily along it than in another direction; hence habits become more and more fixed, until in extreme old age the man becomes little more than a bundle of them.

They give an added force to Solomon's dictum: “ Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it ”; to which I may add with reverence, “ because he cannot.”

Pardon an illustration here that well proves this, even if it be of a somewhat lighter nature than is common in our Institute papers.

You are a lady at tea with a friend, a grand-daughter of an earnest follower of Matthew Arnold. The house is small, and you hear, after a ring at the front-door bell, someone coming into the little hall; and you ask your friend, “ Who is that, dear? ”

“ I think it's Uncle John, but we shall soon know: Listen! ”

And then you hear a shuffling noise repeated six times.

“ Yes,” says your friend triumphantly, “ I'm right.”

“ But how did you know? ” is your puzzled reply.

“ Didn't you hear him, dear? One, two, three—six times. Uncle John, I am told, was a very careless little boy and never wiped his feet; and grandmother determined to implant a habit that would cure him. So every time he entered the house from the garden or the road she made him, for many months, wipe his feet six times on the mat. Not five or seven times, but always six, which he counted. That's sixty years ago, and now he is known everywhere by the six wipes on the mat.”

If character be defined as the shape the mind acquires by use, it will be seen what a power the formation of habits becomes.

A glove or boot in a shop has no character ; but it soon acquires in a special way the physical characteristics of its wearer. In like manner, a new child has no character when he is just born, though full of potentialities. This has gradually to be formed, partly through his conscious, but mainly through his unconscious mind. But though in character the unconscious is predominant, we must guard against asserting that nothing that is done consciously can be a part of it. I may be a most truthful person naturally, and also consciously on principle.

The Greeks were very fond of the word "wisdom." Ο Σόφρων, or the wise and prudent man, was really the product of perfectly organized habit, who could be relied on to act wisely in every path in life, as the result of a formed "character," which word, by the way, is derived from the stamp on a Babylonian brick of its maker. To return to our ideal parents. They have full power to use this reflex force by forming what habits they please in the child, and when the act becomes unconscious it forms a fresh part of the child's character.

The habits may be physical—connected with health, with cleanliness, with manners, with the appearance or dress, etc. ; or they may be mental and moral. Truth, purity, beauty, accuracy, and the whole gamut of small virtues can thus be certainly and successfully implanted by the mechanical means (not the highest, of which I speak later) of laying down the rails which form them.

One word on the minute anatomy of the brain may be allowed here as helpful. The grey matter consists essentially of millions of cells, each the beginning of two or more nerve threads.

In a child there is but little actual nerve connection between associated cells, but as life proceeds and habits are formed the threads uniting groups of cells increase till a most intricate network appears.

It would appear that the brain when born may be roughly compared to a common, with buildings dotted at intervals round it, such as a church, a school, a shop, an inn, and a post office. You, who live with your family on its edge, will soon make a series of well-worn paths across it, which have very much the appearance of tram lines, to the various places of interest. These are much easier to traverse than the long grass of the common in other directions. In this way habits have a

certain physical basis in the brain in adult life, as nerve threads connect the cells used in habitual acts, so that character may in this sense be connected with actual nerve formation.

In this connection Ruskin has given us a beautiful thought—a key indeed to many others. He tells parents they can paint, and teach their children painting, with words instead of colours, with the result of forming habits of truth and accuracy in the child, so that these become to him objects of pursuit and pleasure. Your boy rushes in with some wild and very inaccurate tale of what he has seen. You make him tell the story again more exactly, and then again. You make him choose better words, till at last you have got the word picture in its true colours. This you do with every tale he tells, till he learns ethics artistically, and takes a real pride in conveying the exact truth by his choice of words. Again, I do not say this is the best method, but it is a most useful and beautiful help in the right direction. When the result becomes unconscious the boy himself becomes truthful.

C. *A life*.—We come now to the last of the three great natural forces in the hands of the parents, and in this we begin to touch the spiritual and highest part of our nature. “A life” means an inspiring life; not an idea, but an ideal, a vision that grips the child’s imagination; in short, hero-worship.

Nothing is more lamentable than the way in which this inspiring force has been neglected and ignored in education. Children are essentially hero-worshippers, and if they are not provided with right and worthy objects, they will make idols of their own and bow down and worship them. The imagination is so active in childhood that to a great extent it dominates the life. All with whom the child is brought in contact should be objects of inspiration and patterns worthy of imitation. Dreadful, indeed, is the outlook of the boy when he shrinks in horror from the thought of a Father in Heaven because of his unhappy experience of a father on earth. Terrible is the injury to a child when it detects a mother’s lie. All children are natural hero-worshippers, and few fathers would recognise the noble and beautifully heroic figure they present to their son’s imagination, one which should never be shattered even if it cannot completely be lived up to. It is thus that the lives of the parents themselves are an essential part in the making of man.

The counsel of perfection here is only to bring the child in close and constant contact with those to whom it can look up, and not down—personalities that inspire it; and in childhood this is

comparatively easy. The definite teachers and friends come next after the parents and help according to their quality.

Ever since, however, the Son of God has visited this little world of ours there remains a further transcendent Ideal for a child, the effect of which is so overwhelming that it requires God-given wisdom to know how to present it to the young mind, so that it may remain throughout life an inspiring force and a power in the making of the man that is unrivalled.

The simplest and best way is to adhere strictly to the absolute truth as told us in the Gospels, speaking ever with the deepest reverence, so that the sacred Figure in all its beauty is enshrined in the inmost recesses of the child's heart as its most cherished possession, shared only, if at all, by its idolised mother. Doctrines are here, to a certain extent, out of place, for it is not by them men are made. It is in the impact of the overwhelming personality—the Divine on the human, perfection on imperfection, as portrayed by the inspired pens of the evangelists—that the power lies.

Most of our greatest thinkers are agreed that in this Life, rightly presented, lies the supreme power for the making of the true man. Emerson gives us a lovely picture of one formed on such an Ideal which I must reproduce here: "When a man lives with God, his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn. He will weave no longer a spotted life of shreds and patches; but he will live with a Divine unity. He will cease from what is base and frivolous in his life, and be content with all places and any service he can render. He will calmly front the morrow in the negligency of that trust which carries God with it, and so has the whole of the future in the bottom of his heart."

Observe, I say nothing here of the future and eternal results of the knowledge of the Person and Work of Christ, for such is not here my theme; but simply of His actual power in the formation of character, in the making of man.

Having briefly discussed pre-natal and parental forces before proceeding to consider the last power that forms character—the personal—I may say a word of encouragement to those parents who have heard or read my description of their powers, but may feel them to be absolutely visionary. "Such fathers and mothers as I have described," they say, "may live in Utopia, but certainly not in London! The standard is hopelessly too high and absolutely impossible for ordinary parents."

Perhaps it may help these despairing ones if I outline, one by one, a few simple things that all willing and earnest parents can certainly do if they wish :—

(1) They *can* undoubtedly form habits of moral value, as none other can, in the child.

(2) They *can* so control the child's environment as ever to suggest good and not evil.

(3) They *can*, by example, furnish the child with inspiring ideals.

(4) They *can* feed the child's mind with good ideas.

(5) They *can* strengthen the child's will power so that he acts, even in small things, with decision.

(6) They *can* educate the moral sense in every way.

(7) They *can* present the Divine Christ to the child so as to be a true inspiration.

(8) They *can* at least obey these two precepts : "Train up a child in the way he should go," and "Offend not, despise not, hinder not, one of these little ones."

3. PERSONAL.

Once again, without dwelling further on the spiritual force on which I have briefly touched, I may say the greatest remaining power is the man's own will. Having passed beyond constant parental control he can, by the force of will, use now for himself and form for himself the three powers on which I have shortly dwelt.

1. The *atmosphere* or environment in which he is to live can now be determined by himself. There is no purer air to breathe than that so beautifully described in Philippians iv, 8 : "Whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report . . . think on these things." To do this effectively, however, requires will power.

2. Then *habits* can be formed at will and by the will ; and with regard to this, one point may be mentioned. It is no question during our whole life whether we will form habits or not, any more than it is a question whether we will breathe or not, for both are necessities. The point is, that the atmosphere shall be pure, that the habits which we are incessantly forming shall be good ; and that both go to the making of men.

3. *Ideals* also still inspire adults, though perhaps not so

wonderfully as in childhood. These can be deliberately set before the soul as standards of attainment. One value of a noble ideal is that it turns the eye outward and not inward. These ideals, in adult life, may vary from the highest to the lowest. With regard to the latter there may be some who say "Evil, be thou my good"; and in this connection I cannot but class that literature as most pernicious that glorifies evil in the shape of gentlemen burglars and forgers steeped in immorality. I have known a young man of family actually set before himself, as his ideal of life, that of becoming a prince of swindlers.

Then there are what I may call morbid ideals rather than evil, which, if not decadent, are certainly not heroic types.

There are those whose ideal is pleasure, and others again riches. There are many with nobler and higher ideals of duty, playing the game, honour and honesty. The higher and loftier the ideal the nobler and more spiritual the character. Indeed, the quality of the man is largely due to the character of his ideal. All men live by certain standards which, if they attain them, conscience condemns them not; if they fail, it does. Every school, college, profession, as well as every nation and country, has its own standards, which largely form the local concept of right and wrong.

When adult life is reached another force comes into play which is the theme of Kipling's wonderful poem "If," from which I have quoted a solitary verse, and that is opposition. The value of a bitter east wind, of having to swim against a strong current, of having to climb a rugged steep, are more or less physically familiar, but mentally and morally the same opposition makes the man. Here I must quote a few lines of Browning's, simply because I know no prose to equal them:—

" Then, welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go."
* * * *

" And so I live, you see,
Go through the world, try, prove, reject,
Prefer, still struggling to effect
My warfare; happy that I can
Be crossed and thwarted *as a man*,
Not left in God's contempt apart
With ghastly smooth life, dead at heart,
Tame in earth's paddock as her prize."

We must be overcomers or be overcome. Therefore difficulties, opposition, evil surroundings, bad circumstances all are good, *providing they can be overcome*. In many sad cases this is not possible, and when the current is so strong that no headway can be made, as is so frequent in the squalor of our great cities, the opposition becomes a curse and not a blessing. Browning's inspiring lines only conceive of difficulties that are surmountable. We are told, not without reason, that to no small extent it is the execrable English climate that makes Englishmen. That if we had not continually to overcome its evils, and lived instead under Italian skies, we should lose much of our national character and become soft and pleasure-loving.

To dash one's brains out, however, against a stone wall is not courage but suicide. To put a horse at a seven-foot fence would not teach it to jump, but probably ruin it.

All difficulties are not, then, blessings even in disguise. It is not, indeed, the difficulty, but the overcoming, that is always the real blessing. I make these remarks here, for as I read this paper I am greatly saddened by thinking of masses of our fellow-men to whom it is practically inapplicable. The audience before me can, I know, not only grasp my points, but in many cases may be able to use them in their lives; but I cannot shut out from my thoughts those whose lot is beyond the pale of such possibilities.

I have, however, still, alas! before closing, to define the word "man" as used here, and the more I think of it the less I feel inclined to fulfil my promise. I may, of course, say that a man *who is a man* is straight and fair and just and true; I may add that he is both upright and downright, and so on; but when I've said all, I come immeasurably below the definition I have already given from Rudyard Kipling's wonderful poem "If." Here is the most powerful and accurate definition I know of what a real man is naturally; and if to this I add the "super" touch that further inspires him and transfigures him when in contact with the Divine, I reach the highest concept of humanity.

The loftiest of all ideals unquestionably is Christ's, and that is to do the will of God; and the Christian who has this as his standard in life (and how few there are) has attained the full stature of a man. The seven forces which I have shown make this man are:—

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Birth. | 4. Education of the Un- |
| 2. Atmosphere or Environ- | conscious. |
| ment. | 5. Ideals. |
| 3. Habit. | 6. Standard of Life. |
| 7. Divine Inspiration. | |

I close with a statement that may be questioned by many, but is much valued by me.

The pursuit of the impossible is in itself ennobling, and has a wonderful power over character. To be always following after, and yet never attaining, as is the lot of the one who seeks the likeness of the Divine, has the twofold effect of transfiguring the character and stamping it with true humility. Such an one is growing holier and loftier each day, and yet is ever becoming more and more lowly in heart, for he never reaches his ideal. No pride is possible where the standard before the soul is never attained, where the reach is higher than the grasp; but the movement is ever upward and onward:—

“ That low man seeks a little thing to do,
 Sees it and does it :
 This high man, with a great thing to pursue,
 Dies ere he knows it.
 That has the world here—should he need the next,
 Let the world mind him !
 This, throws himself on God and, unperplexed,
 Seeking shall find Him.”—R.B.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: This paper is a most valuable one, and I feel sure it will lead to a valuable discussion. I therefore propose a hearty vote of thanks to Dr. Schofield. (This was given by acclamation.) He proceeded to say: The only difficulty I have felt in reading it through, with some care, in preparation to leading this discussion, is that it contains such abundant and good matter that it is hard to pick out any special matter to discuss which could be contained in the brief period allowed to a speaker upon the paper. I proceed, however, to make an attempt to do so. Dr. Schofield tells us that a little while ago heredity was held to have an almost overwhelming influence on a child; now he has almost gone to the other

extreme in belittling its influence. He tells us that diseases inherited will disappear entirely in four generations. Granted that it may be so, but what about the three intervening generations? Are not a father and mother more interested in their own children than in their great great grandchildren?

I can cast my memory back to unfortunate marriages in my own family circle, as probably many present can also do. In one case, noting that a very near relative was evidently seriously thinking of matrimony, I gave him information about the health of the family he was thinking of entering. He made enquiries for himself and the marriage did not come off.

Some may say that love is blind and that lovers will marry without thought, but my experience is that more people realise the great responsibilities of marriage, and they will act with prudence if they are warned in time to look for themselves at the probabilities which lie before them.

Closely connected with this is the folly of some parents who will not take preventive steps to cure blindness or other evils which may fall on the newly-born infant.

Passing on to the main features of the paper, I fully agree with the lecturer in the preponderating influence of the mother over the child in the early years of life, while the main responsibilities of the father begin, specially with boys, somewhat later, in the selection of a school and in the formation of the friendships of childhood. The selection of a school is most important and in many cases difficult, since there are many schoolmasters with good degrees from the universities who are utterly unfit for their work, being ignorant of what goes on among the boys under their charge, and who consequently are unable to stop evil practices which a schoolmaster with tact would recognise and stop at once. It is well to recognise that the passing of examinations and the knowledge of subjects by boys and girls is only one part of education. The training of the mind in habits of industry, self-denial, and the formation of character are of the first importance, and these can best be attained by the highest Teacher, the Lord Himself.

The lecturer has well said, that boys and girls are hero worshippers; and it is well to recognise this trait in their dispositions.

Advantage of this fact is well taken by the Children's Special Service Mission, in which young men and young women, under the

guidance of some one a little more advanced in life, seek for the real spiritual food of the young people at seaside resorts and holiday camps. This is a line of action well suited to the modern conditions. The children naturally look up to those a very few years older than themselves, and if they be real, bright Christians this has an immense influence; the children see that Christians can be bright and happy, and they may become converted.

On the other hand there are some parents who wish for their children's good, but, in an unsympathetic manner, to use a common phrase, have forced religion down their children's throats, with the result that the children think their parents are of a different nature to themselves; they think religion a very dull thing, and in many cases, alas! have strenuously resisted the well-meant but ill-directed efforts of their parents with disastrous results.

The C.S.S.M., on the other hand, have further developed their methods with much encouragement and blessing during the last couple of winters; large parties have been taken to Switzerland for winter sports with a large proportion of earnest Christian young men and young women, who enter warmly into the sports, and also enter warmly in the evenings into simple Gospel meetings and in singing hymns in an informal way with the children, with most happy results. As an instance, I may mention a near young relative of ours who was much surprised at the spirit of mutual good-will shown by his party of 150.

MR. SIDNEY COLLETT wrote: As I am unexpectedly hindered from attending Dr. Schofield's lecture to-night, I should like to offer the following brief remarks.

I consider his three points, in the making of men, viz., heredity, parental training and environment, are admirably dealt with *so far as they go*. But I am bound to say that, in my judgment, the lecturer has lost an opportunity in limiting his treatment of this important subject to *mere human efforts*. And this, according to the fourth paragraph on page 195, seems to have been done by design.

This seems, to my mind, to be very unfortunate, for, even supposing all the teaching of his lecture were faithfully carried out, the man would still be an *imperfect man* in the *most important* sense of all!

A *railway engine* might be constructed with consummate skill, but without the fire and the steam to generate the *power* it would fail of its real purpose and be useless.

A *sailing vessel* might be built according to the latest scientific measurements and shape, but without the *heavenly breezes* to fill the sails it also would be a failure.

So, in like manner, man, however much he might conform to the highest ethical ideals, would still "come short"; and, from the most important point of view, would be an *everlasting failure, without that change of heart* which can only be brought about by the operation of the *Holy Spirit*, leading to a personal appropriation of the substitutionary work of Christ, thus producing a *new man* (Eph. ii, 15, and iv, 24).

Had Dr. Schofield laid greater stress on this vital point his lecture would, in my judgment, have been far more valuable. For the Word declares *ye must be born again*.

The Rev. CHARLES GARDNER said he wished to protest against Mr. Sidney Collett's criticism of Dr. Schofield's paper. There was no man living who knew better than Dr. Schofield the need for the new birth. But surely it was not necessary for a man to reaffirm his faith in the doctrines of regeneration and atonement every time he wrote a paper.

Mr. Gardner expressed special interest in all Dr. Schofield said about the subconscious mind. He remembered the extravagant claims made twenty-five years ago by Maeterlinck, who called it a buried temple, and claimed something like omniscience for it. Later there was a reaction, and someone called it the dustbin. Dr. Schofield took a sounder line. It was a comfort to know that unconscious influence is much stronger than conscious. We used to be told to set a good example, and some people set about in a terribly self-conscious way to improve their neighbours. If influence flows from "being," we may safely leave it to our subconscious self, and escape at the same time being disagreeable.

The Victorians did not formulate completely the philosophy of the unconscious, though the attempt was made in Germany by Von Hartmann. But they were aware that unconscious influence is the most potent. Browning tells that Pippa passed, and a community was regenerated by her unconscious influence. In the *Ring*

and the *Book* the unconscious influence of Pompilia was a touchstone to all the persons in the strange old drama.

George Eliot tells how a little child put its tiny hand into the crabbed old hand of Silas Marner, and led him gently back into a life of fellowship. The child's influence was certainly unconscious.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS asked the lecturer whether the meaning of the sentence at the bottom of page 185 was that the tendencies to diseases disappeared in the fourth generation. He thought too much was made of habits as forming character, and regarded them as not more than skin deep and only occupying the fringe of character. He thought that the formation of habits set the mind free to take decisions in more important things, as the lecturer seemed to acknowledge on page 196, under head (5). It had been observed that a man took his character more from his mother than his father, and this appeared to be in accordance with Holy Writ, where we find the mother's name of each of the Kings of Judah mentioned in immediate connection with the statement as to whether he was a good or a bad king. In the case of Abraham's two sons, the whole teaching of Gal. iv was that they each took character from their mothers—Isaac from the free-woman, as Ishmael from the bond-woman.

There was one exception to all this, and that was our Lord Jesus Christ, who took nothing of His character from His mother, but brought all that made Him what He was with Him from Heaven. In His case environment did not form character, and thus He became the ideal for the human race.

Colonel HANS HAMILTON said : Can Dr. Schofield give us his views on the propensity of children, when left entirely alone, of being cruel to each other, and of their tendency to kill and destroy their own companions ?

My father, as vicar of a parish, when visiting his parishioners many years ago in a very poor part of a town, found some eight or ten children, from 3 to 6 years of age, left entirely to themselves, engaged in stoning the youngest of them against a wall. Will Dr. Schofield tell us how he accounts for this "predisposition" ? Is it prenatal, hereditary, or a part of the fall of man ? We can hardly call it, with Wordsworth, "a cloud of glory" !

In my long experience I find the secret of bringing up a child from

distinction, which, however, does not invalidate my argument ; for at the last analysis the spirit *is* the man, and, whatever concerns it, is the greater force in the “ making of men.” Mrs. Boyd’s illustrations are apposite and felicitous, and I accept them as such. It is well to note that practically heredity does not extend in force as a rule beyond parents and grandparents six in all ; but that, of course, in some families these six can be compounded in various proportions so as to make entirely different products from the same stock, which answers Col. Hans Hamilton’s question.

In reply to Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Dr. Schofield writes :—

(1) The unconscious mind, not subconscious, was practically denied by psychologists less than 30 years ago, when the President of the —— Society was taken to task for allowing me to read a paper on it.

(2) The “ subconscious ” self is not the subject of Lord Bacon’s remarks still less the “ unconscious ” self first quoted. It is the unconscious self that is man’s true nature as lauded by Lord Bacon. I would suggest that my critic re-reads the passage.

(3) The answer to question (1) is : No. It makes it an integral part of the “ ego.”

The answer to question (2) is : Yes, and I am careful to point out this is not the highest or best way to inculcate morality, &c., but by the transcendent ideal of Christ Himself.

666TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MAY 12TH, 1924,

AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. ARTHUR H. FINN IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HONORARY SECRETARY announced the following elections:— Dr. Edwin Ash as a Member, and Prof. Cyril Parker, M.A., Sc.D., and Ernest Rapp, Esq., as Associates.

After the CHAIRMAN had explained the inability of the author of the paper to be present, Professor Edouard Naville's paper on "Deuteronomy a Mosaic Book" was read by Lieut.-Colonel Hope Biddulph, D.S.O.

DEUTERONOMY A MOSAIC BOOK.

By Professor EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A.

IS Deuteronomy a Mosaic book? The unanimity of the critics deny it. They attribute the book to various authors having lived at very different dates, for none of them considers it as the work of one author. We shall not undertake to make a survey of the chief arguments on which they base their conclusions; we shall first state how the book appears to us, starting from a method which is absolutely different from that of the critics, and which is not special to the books of the Old Testament, but which applies to all documents of antiquity, whatever be their language or their origin. It is the historical method according to the principles of which historians and scholars judge Greek or Latin authors, or documents of the Middle Ages and even of the present day.

This is also Prof. Sayce's opinion: "On its historical and literary sides the Old Testament must be treated like any other book of ancient Oriental literature, and its interpreter must follow the evidence of the facts wherever they may lead."

It is therefore on the question of method that we shall assail the critics, by exhibiting another method to which they do not pay any attention, as if it did not exist, and which leads to results absolutely contrary to theirs. In order to apply it quite correctly, we must first of all discard theology entirely. We fully realize the religious value of the books of the Old Testament, which are

the foundations of the belief of many, and we do not think of curtailing in the least the respect and moral authority which belong to them, but we must keep entirely out of the department of religious belief. We shall rest exclusively on history and on the sciences on the testimony of which it may rely. Therefore, it is not the theologian who will be the supreme judge on the historical character of the book, but the historian, who will appeal, not to religious faith, but to the branches of knowledge which rest entirely on scientific method and research.

Among them, there is one to which undue importance has been given. I mean philology. The age and character of a book is not fixed by the language in which it has been written. Linguistic arguments are only secondary; they may be very useful and give a valuable support to properly historical arguments, but they are only in the second rank. For instance, the character of the law of Moses would be the same, whatever would be the language in which it was written.

We shall therefore consider Deuteronomy in the light of the principles of the historical method, of which there are three. The first one, which may be called fundamental, is this: We must take the ancient texts in their proper and literal sense, exactly as they were written, and interpret them in the simplest manner possible, allowing them to speak for themselves, mixing nothing of our own with them. In other words, we must begin by giving the texts a fair hearing, even when they may possibly not be in conformity with our modern ideas. This principle does not throw any special light on the question of Deuteronomy, except that we must listen to this testimony of the text which is positive, that Moses wrote the book, while the ideas of the critics are entirely the product of their reasoning or their imagination, and do not rest on any written statement.

The observance of the second principle will, on the contrary, contribute materially to our conviction that Deuteronomy is a Mosaic book. We must replace the book within the times in which the author lived, in the situation with which he was actually surrounded, with the manners and habits of his environment.

To begin with, there is the question of language. It is certain that if it is proved more and more clearly that the early books of the Old Testament have been composed in one of the languages written in cuneiform, as several assyriologists maintain—Sayce, Clay, Winkler and others—it brushes off the galaxy of writers who have been created by the critics. But we shall not make

use of this argument which, as I said before, is secondary, and we shall resort to other considerations which have nothing to do with the linguistic question.

Let us consider first who Moses is. He has begun life at the Egyptian court, afterwards he has spent 40 years in Midian as a fugitive. There he has received the mission to place himself at the head of the people and to bring the Hebrews out of Egypt into Canaan, which has been promised to them as an inheritance. During 40 years he has been leading the people towards that country, which he was not allowed to enter himself. It seemed at first that the journey would not be very long, and he brought the people very near the frontier of the promised land ; but then the people revolted, and as a punishment, they were ordered to turn back and to spend 40 years in the desert. During that time he gave them laws. The first were religious laws, which were given at Sinai, as soon as the fugitives felt safe ; afterwards a great number of other laws or ordinances were added to these during the journey, but the greatest number were given at Sinai ; they are found in Exodus and Leviticus.

Now, if we consider the form of these laws, we find that they are messages of God to the people, transmitted to them by Moses. They are exactly like the royal messages of the Semitic kings, which are called letters. Such a letter is not a document which is handed over to the receiver who has to read it. It is first an oral message, which the messenger communicates to the person to whom it is addressed. It is likely that he has it in writing so that he may be sure to have delivered the message correctly, but the important thing is the oral communication. The 53 so-called letters of King Hammurapi directed to a man in a high position in his kingdom, Sin-idinnam, are all messages and they all begin in this way : " To Sin-idinnam say : ' Thus speaks Hammurapi.' " Much later, at the time of Hezekiah, the king of Assyria sends messengers to the king of Jerusalem, saying : " Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah, king of Juda." When they have delivered the message, they hand over the letter to the king.

The book in which the legal character is most strongly marked is Leviticus, and in nearly every page we find this form : " The Lord spake unto Moses, saying : ' Speak unto the children of Israel,' " so that we see clearly that Moses is the messenger who has to deliver to the Israelites the messages of the Lord. Thus, a book like Leviticus is nothing but a series of messages which he

put in writing either before or more probably after having delivered them to the people. These messages may be very short ; we may find several of them in the same chapter and even on the same subject. Thus, in Leviticus, the chapter about the feasts ends with these words : " And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feasts of Yahveh." This chapter is cut into five parts, each of which is introduced by these words : " And Yahveh spake unto Moses, saying : ' Speak unto the children of Israel.' " Thus these feasts have been the object of five messages which may have been delivered at different periods.

That way of writing is exactly in harmony with the circumstances of the time. The children of Israel are a large tribe travelling in the desert towards Canaan ; Moses is their leader, he has the mission to establish among them the worship of Yahveh and to give them the laws to which they will have to obey when they will be settled in the country which is given them in heritage. How can Moses do it ? Certainly not by writing a code of laws ; it is by his proclaiming these laws orally to the people. Moses is a speaking legislator. He has to deliver to the Israelites the messages of Yahveh which they must remember. He will put them in writing. There is no order in these messages ; we often find a record of the occasion on which they were delivered, and sometimes they are repeated because Moses has not always the same hearers. They certainly do not form a continuous composition which we call a book.

This is one of the great errors of the critics : to apply to the writings of Moses the name of books in the sense which we give to that word. In the time of Moses, what was written was only a reproduction of what had been heard, so that it might be heard again. The composition and the style were governed by the exigencies of speech, and not by those which are imposed on a work conceived in the silence of the study, in view of future readers, and with a definite plan. A series of messages is governed by the character of speech, with its irregularities, repetitions, apparent or real contradictions, sometimes a lack of logic and a certain disorder in the ways the ideas are presented.

In what language did Moses write his messages ? I believe the new excavations in Mesopotamia will prove more and more clearly that the writings of Moses were in the language and script used by the Semites in the whole of Western Asia, Babylonian or Accadian, written in cuneiform characters ; but I do not insist on this fact, which is still disputed. The law would

be the same if Moses had written it in Hebrew. One thing is certain, he did the same as all the Semitic writers of the time; he wrote on clay tablets on which were texts of various lengths, but which were not connected together like the chapters of a book. They might have been written at very different times, without any chronological order. They were not more closely linked together than the lectures of a professor. The books of Moses were only a collection of tablets which were put together on a coffer of earthenware, or in an earthen jar which Moses gave into the keeping of the Levites who bore the Ark of the Covenant, and which had to be placed beside the Ark.

The books of Moses are the reproduction of what he said to the Israelites, and especially the messages of Yahveh which he had to communicate to them. When Moses was living in the house of Jethro his father-in-law, he had no idea of the mission which would be given to him. The third chapter of Exodus relates how Yahveh constituted him His messenger. Moses will have to repeat to them all that Yahveh has commanded him: "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel"—and henceforth all the orders, laws, commandments, will be conveyed to them in that way. Moses is the only messenger appointed, and we have no reason to imagine that some of these messages are due to others than Moses. This form of language is particularly striking in Leviticus, it is exactly the form of laws which could be given to a tribe in the desert. It seems an absurdity to consider this book as being the work of a school of priests after the exile. Nothing is more different from a code of laws given by learned men. They would not have cut up in small fragments a simple ordinance such as that of the feasts; they would have given them as a running composition, as Moses himself does in chaps. iv-xxvi of Deuteronomy.

And since the text says there was only one messenger, Moses, we can see no reason not to accept what the text says. We see nowhere that there was another appointed, and we cannot admit that priests of the post-exilian period should constitute themselves messengers of Yahveh and take the name of Moses.

The law given to the Israelites was recorded in a collection of tablets. They have been put together in books only many centuries afterwards, during the captivity. Here I am following the Hebrew tradition. It was done by Ezra. We know that the Babylonian kings, such as Assurbanipal, for instance, were fond

of learning and had in their capitals considerable libraries, containing all kinds of documents, especially those which were connected with religion. We know of libraries of that kind at Koyoundjik and Nippur, and quite lately that of Kish has been discovered. It is probable that in one of these Babylonian libraries were the tablets brought from the temple of Jerusalem, together with all the sacred objects, and there Ezra, "a ready scribe in the law of Moses which the Lord the God of Israel had given," put the tablets in the form of books.

Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers describe the legislative activity of Moses from the departure of the Israelites from Egypt to the end of their journey through the desert; when they reach the frontiers of the promised land, and after their first victories over several kings, they are near the Jordan, which they have to cross. Moses is not allowed to enter the country, and he is going to leave this people whom he has been leading for forty years. He knows them well, he has gone through the greatest difficulties, he has seen how fickle they were, and how easily they turned away from Yahveh. On several occasions he has been obliged to entreat Yahveh to "turn from His fierce wrath against His people." He is going to leave the people, which will be as sheep that have no shepherd. Who will recall to them the laws of Yahveh? Joshua will be his successor, but he must have a written text to appeal to, which will give authority to his language. The Israelites arrive in Canaan as a numerous tribe, having heard on many occasions the laws and commandments to which they are to submit, but this is only oral. It is true that these commandments have been put down in writing by Moses, and that the tablets on which they have been engraved are stored and in the keeping of the Levites. But they are unconnected, without any order; sometimes they are proclaimed in a narrative of the occasion which gave rise to them. In this mixture of texts of different character, where would a particular law be found, except perhaps the Decalogue, which evidently most people knew by heart? The law of Moses is the constitutive charter of the religion of the Israelites; it is a whole in which the ceremonial laws cannot be separated from the moral law; but this unity does not clearly appear in the numerous tablets of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, which are a kind of diary of what took place in the desert. There is nothing giving a general view of it, and being a law without any admission of historical narratives.

We cannot but suppose that Moses, knowing that he was going to leave the people, considered what was his last duty, how he had to finish his career. He had begun it by writing Genesis, in which he explained to the Israelites why they were to leave Egypt and go to Canaan, which had been given them as an heritage; and now, when they were going to enter the promised land, he must tell them clearly what was to be their law. He had done it at Sinai first, and afterwards during their journey to the confines of Moab, but it had been done piecemeal. Besides, the assembly had changed; most of the people who had witnessed what took place at Sinai had disappeared; they were no more, and their successors had been only imperfectly instructed if they had been. It was therefore absolutely necessary to repeat this law to the whole people. Deuteronomy is the necessary end of Moses' career; it is the summary of what happened during forty years—an historical account and the recital of the law. Joshua wanted it, and also the people as a nation when they would be settled in Canaan. If Moses had not done it he would not have finished his task. His legislative activity would not have its proper end.

The Israelities had no copy of the law which they could read. How could the future generations have cognizance of it? When they would be in Canaan the law would be engraved on stones on Mount Ebal, but that would not be sufficient. That law, which was oral, must occasionally be proclaimed again, every seven years; "in the set time of the year of release, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in his hearing." The law was to be read, but how could it be done if it consisted of a great number of tablets which contained a great deal else? A commandment could appear in a historical narrative. If it was to be read aloud on periodical occasions, it was to be put in a readable form; it must be disentangled from all other matters; it must become a proclamation, which it was not, and therefore Moses was obliged to write it again after having recited it for the last time in a loud voice to the people of Israel. That is Deuteronomy, a condensed form of the law which could be read on great occasions. It was necessary to write it, otherwise they would not have known where to find the law. Deuteronomy is intended to be its popular form. The people knew it as it was in Deuteronomy; that is the reason why most of the quotations in the New Testament are taken from that book.

In this characteristic of the book we have followed exactly the third principle of the historical method. In writings such as we have in the Old Testament it is of primary importance to ascertain what was the aim of the book, its *raison d'être*, who were the men to whom they were addressed, and what kind of influence they were to exert upon them. Here the aim of Deuteronomy is perfectly clear. We see why it was necessary to write it; we see that the men for whom it was written were the Israelites at the end of their long journey, the great majority of whom knew not the scene at Sinai. They were young children at the time. If they had some faint remembrance of it—even if they knew the Decalogue—they had only a vague idea of the other laws which were proclaimed at that time. For them a clear repetition of the law, such as we find in the Deuteronomy, was necessary.

This law was repeated as it was proclaimed, by the speech of Moses, of which it is distinctly said that Moses afterwards put it in writing and handed it over to the Levites bearing the Ark of the Covenant, that it might be a witness against the people, because it might be appealed to.

The repetition of the law was made in three speeches of Moses. The form of the language is totally different from what is found in the former books. We never see those words: The Lord spake unto Moses, saying . . . He speaks in the first person, as if he gave the commands himself.

The book begins thus: "These be the words which Moses spake unto Israel beyond Jordan in the wilderness," and it consists of the following three speeches of Moses.

The first goes from chap. i to chap. iv, 43. Moses must begin with an introduction; he must explain to the people why he has to declare this law, and he makes a short narrative of what had taken place since they left Egypt until they reached the land of Moab beyond the Jordan. This summary relates how, after eleven days of journey from Horeb to Kadesh Barnea through a great and terrible wilderness, at the request of the people, Moses sent twelve men to search the land. They came to the valley of Eshcol and spied it out. But, listening to the reports of some of these men, the people rebelled and would not go further, and the Lord was wroth and sware that no man of this generation, except Caleb, should see the good land. And the Lord was angry even with Moses himself, and said to him: Thou also shalt not go in thither. Therefore they turned back

and took their journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea, and they marched in the desert during thirty-eight years, until all the men of war were consumed and dead from among the people; then they turned north and conquered the land of Sihon and Og. Three tribes settled in that country, but the men were to follow the rest of the people and help them in the conquest of the land. Once more Moses entreated the Lord to let him go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly mountain and Lebanon. But the Lord hearkened not unto him, and answered: Speak no more unto Me of this matter. And now, since he will no longer be with them, "let Israel hearken unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you, for you to do them." He tells them that he is going to set before them the law, the observance of which is the vital question for them, for if they turn away from Yahveh they will certainly perish.

In all these speeches of Moses there are many repetitions, but we must remember that he speaks to people who had no written text to refer to, and not always to the same. In order to impress it on their memory he repeats two or three times what he fears they should forget, such as the scene at Sinai.

The Deuteronomy, like all other books of Moses, was written on tablets which were afterwards collected and made into a book. We observe that in what is called the introductory speech the tablets are not closely connected; they are interrupted by what I call notes. At the time when the tablets were made into a book, which I attribute to Ezra, some of the names of nations or localities had changed and would no more be understood; therefore, the collector added some explanatory sentences, which for us would be footnotes and which, since he could not put them at the foot of the page as we do, he inserted in the text. One of them is about the Rephaim and the Avvim, another about the bed of Og. It is an error to consider these notes as an indication of the date of the whole writing; they are the work of the collector, who wished to make the text clearer, and who also occasionally put a title to some of the fragments—for instance, the beginning of what is properly the law (chap. iv, 44): "This is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel."

The man whom I call the collector is in a position similar to a writer who in our time would republish an old text. He is obliged to add explanations which he puts at the foot of the

page ; he perhaps may separate the chief divisions of the text by inserting a title, but the text remains the same, and nobody would think that these notes indicate the date at which the text was written.

The second part of Deuteronomy goes from chap. iv, 44, to the end of chap. xxvi. It is properly the law, that which Moses wrote himself, until it was finished ; it is said twice that Moses did it, and probably, if it covered several tablets, he indicated that they were to follow each other, as we sometimes see in the Assyrian tablets on which there is a long text.

The whole of Israel is summoned and Moses begins his solemn speech, as is natural, with the Decalogue. The way in which the Ten Commandments were given to the people was so impressive, and filled the witnesses with such a great awe, that Moses feels obliged to describe again the scene at Sinai.

Much has been made of the fact that the Decalogue does not present itself to us in the Pentateuch under a single form, whereas one would have expected that it should be preserved to us without alteration and without uncertainty. This is a complete misunderstanding of the way in which the law is given to the people. There is no question of presenting to them a text of unyielding form such as a law in our times, voted by a parliament or decreed by a government. It is the supreme teaching given to the people, which is bound to keep it in remembrance. The important thing is that the people should remember it and live in conformity with it. Certainly Moses, if any, should know the Decalogue by heart. At the hour of his death, when he is going to leave the Israelites for ever, it is natural that he should begin by repeating to them the Decalogue. He does not fetch from the Ark the tables of the law. He quotes from memory the Commandments as they come to his mind. If we compare the two versions of Exodus and Deuteronomy, we see that the foundation is absolutely the same, and the order also. What is different is what I would call the developments or additions to the commandment, that which justifies it and shows its sense and aim, and which also facilitates the remembrance of it. This is no part of the commandment itself, and this is why there may be variations according to the moment when the Decalogue was quoted.

It is certain that in the following laws we find here and there some slight differences with what is found in the three preceding books, but the circumstances are different. The people are now on the frontier of Canaan, part of which they have already

conquered. They have now some idea of what the country is, and Moses feels obliged to add some new laws in reference to circumstances which he did not foresee when he was in Sinai at the beginning of the journey.

His first commandments after the Decalogue are religious, and refer to the worship of Yahveh. All the following chapters insist on Yahveh being the only God of the Israelites, of whom no image is to be made and to whom are not to be applied the rites of the Canaanites in worshipping their gods. "Beware lest thou forget the Lord thy God in not keeping His commandments, and His judgements. If thou forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and worship them, I testify against you this day, you shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord maketh to perish before you, so shall ye perish" (viii, 11, 19). Over and over again this idea is repeated, that the blessing of God is conditioned upon the fidelity of the Israelites to His laws. The alliance of God is positive. God has established His covenant, which He swore unto thy fathers. God will certainly keep it and pour all kinds of blessings on His children. But if they forsake Him, ruin is absolutely certain.

Moses wishes them to be convinced that this is for them the vital question : he relates the occasions on which they had forsaken Yahveh and were very near destruction, had not Moses saved them by appealing to God's mercy. These repetitions are a proof that this is not the written text of a book, a running text ; this is a speech, a discourse, *verba volant*. In spoken language repetitions are sometimes hardly noticed ; and since Moses has before him hearers, he is obliged to say over again what he wishes to engrave in the memory and in the heart of those who listen to him ; that is why, from chap. vi to the end of chap. xi, we find only the expounding of this idea. The Israelites have before them a blessing and a curse—the blessing if they hearken unto the commandments of the Lord, the curse if they do not hearken unto these commandments.

From chap. xii begin other laws. First of all they must have unity of sanctuary ; they will seek the habitation of the Lord "in the place which God will choose out of all the tribes to put His name there." Then they shall bring their sacrifices, their tithes and all their offerings. They shall not do "after all the things that they do on that day every man is right in his own eyes." Moses has no doubt that when the Israelites will be settled in the country, there will be a place chosen by the Lord,

but this was not executed. It was only in the time of David that the question arose of building a house to the Lord. The king was not allowed to do it, and Nathan brings to David the message of God : " I have not dwelt in an house since the day I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt even to this day ; but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle."

Then follow laws on the sacrifices, then what constituted the legislation of the Israelites. We find there what concerns royalty, which does not appear in the preceding books. The critics argue that this is a proof of the late composition of Deuteronomy. But Moses foresees that the example of Egypt and of all the nations of Canaan, which were all ruled by kings, might influence the Israelites to wish for a king ; it is a possible contingency, a probable eventuality " when thou art come to the land which Yahveh giveth thee, if thou shalt say : I will set a king over me like all the nations that are round about me." It is important that Moses should tell them that this does not carry with it the chastisements of Yahveh, but their king, if there should be such, should not imitate the kings of Egypt.

It may also be said of the cities of refuge that it is a command which could be made only when the Israelites would be near Canaan ; these cities could not be designated from Sinai.

The laws are abridged, like those on sacrifice or on the festivals, which are much more detailed in Leviticus. They could not be repeated with all their particulars. There was no need to repeat the description of the tabernacle any more than other laws and institutions such as those which concern leprosy. " Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently and do according to all that the priests, the Levites, shall teach you, as I commanded them, so ye shall observe to do." He sees no need of reminding them of the detailed instructions reported in chaps. xiii and xiv of Leviticus, further than to say that he has given them and that they are to be respected.

Here we have an example of the contradictions in the theories of the critics. Deuteronomy cannot be earlier than the time of Josiah, 621 B.C. Leviticus, like all the ceremonial law, belongs to the Priestly Code ; it is the work of a school of priests after the exile. Then it is this school who wrote these detailed instructions on leprosy, which two hundred years before, Deuteronomy says, have been given to the Levites.

The chaps. xii to xxvi are a summary of the laws which are in full on the tablets which constitute Exodus, Leviticus and

Numbers, with a certain number of additions derived from the circumstances in which Moses spoke.

From chaps. xxvii to xxx we find the final act, which was to be the sanction of the law and commandments, the renewal of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb. This covenant will lapse if the people do not hearken to the voice of the Lord ; then all kinds of curses shall come upon them and overtake them. And here, again, Moses repeats with greater force and warmth what he has said to them many times : that it is for them a question of to be or not to be.

Of all the words of this law it is distinctly said that Moses wrote them to the end and committed his book to the care of the Levites. Then he tells Joshua to assemble once more the eldest and the officers, that he may speak to them the words of a song, and the people listened to it as well as Hoshea, son of Nun.

But this is not the last act of his life. Like Jacob, he blesses all his sons individually, and for him his twelve sons are the twelve tribes of Israel. When Jacob made an end of charging his sons he gathered up his feet into the bed and yielded up the ghost. When Moses had finished his blessing to the people he went up from the plain of Moab unto Mount Nebo, and Israel saw him no more ; they did not even find his body.

It seems probable that this blessing was put in writing by one of his hearers, and that the last chapter relating his death and burial, which cannot be due to him, may have been written by Joshua or some one who had much to do with Moses. As for the last verses of this chapter, I attribute them to the writer whom I have called the collector, who arranged all the tablets of Moses and made books of them. I have said that I consider this collector as being Ezra. Having come to the end of his work, he concludes ; he sums up what the career of Moses has been. " And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face in all the signs and the wonders which the Lord sent him to do in the land of Egypt . . . and in all the mighty hand and in all the great terror which Moses wrought in the sight of all Israel."

We have adduced several reasons showing that Deuteronomy was necessary to the sons of Israel who were going to settle in Canaan, but we might add one which had a great force : I mean the feelings that filled Moses' soul. Israel was about to

enter into the land that had been promised them, Moses himself was not to enter it; he knew that the crowning point of his career was refused to him, and that he would only see this good land from a mountain top. Israel would be henceforth left to itself. They would have no longer the guide they had followed for forty years. It is easy to understand what anxiety must have haunted him. It is true that Joshua would be his successor, but would he be strong enough, would he have enough authority to keep the people in the way which had been traced for it, in the worship of Yahveh? For if Israel abandoned this worship it would perish; and thus, what one might almost call the child of Moses, to which he was passionately attached, which he had snatched from the oppression of the Egyptians, would march to certain ruin. After having taught for years a law of which he felt the value and the observation of which was a vital question for Israel, when he was about to abandon this people and leave it to itself, Moses could not do otherwise than remind it in the pathetic terms that its very existence depended on the observation of Yahveh's commandments. He had to leave this remembrance to the Israelites, to whom he had devoted himself all his life. It was the last duty which he felt bound to fulfil. One might justly be astonished if his life had not ended by such a farewell. Deuteronomy is the word of a dying man.

Deuteronomy is the fitting close to the career of Moses. We have seen to what a degree it is in harmony with what Moses was, with the circumstances of the time. We have recognized from the first why the book was written, to whom it was addressed, and what kind of influence it was to exert over the hearers. It satisfies entirely to the principles of our method, and we have no hesitation in declaring that Deuteronomy is the last of the Mosaic books, and that Moses was its author.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Rev. A. H. Finn), in opening the discussion, regretted that, as he had not seen the paper until he entered the room, he would not be able to give the considered estimate of it which it merited. He thought all present would acknowledge that they were indebted to Prof. Naville for an able and thought-provoking examination of the subject, showing how well the characteristics of Deuteronomy agreed with the circumstances of the speaker, the occasion and the hearers. Yet he was afraid that it would not

avail to convince opponents, who would maintain that the author, the occasion and the circumstances were altogether different.

He felt it was almost an impertinence to criticize so great an authority as Prof. Naville, yet he was constrained to demur to the theory that the book was originally written in cuneiform or incised on clay tablets. To be intelligible to the people the discourses must have been delivered in the Hebrew tongue, and therefore written down in the Hebrew character.

Also he objected to describing the book as a "repetition" of the Law. Some of the laws delivered at Sinai, and of those in Leviticus and Numbers were repeated, but by no means all, while there were various new laws to suit the changed circumstances. The idea of repetition really arose from a blunder in the Septuagint. The translators into Greek had confused a Hebrew word meaning "copy" with a similar word meaning "second," and so had turned the injunction that the king on his accession was to write "a copy of this Law" into one that he was to write "this Second Law" (*τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο*).

He had himself independently come to the conclusion that, as is forcibly urged in the paper, the repetitions, digressions and unsystematic arrangement of the laws in Deuteronomy form a very strong argument against its being a carefully written composition, a "reformulation of an older legislation," and in favour of its being a record of orally delivered addresses.

He concluded by moving a hearty vote of thanks to Prof. Naville, coupled with an equally hearty vote of thanks to the reader of the paper.

Dr. M. GASTER, speaking from a Jewish standpoint, said:— I welcome with pleasure this new contribution of Prof. Naville towards the elucidation of the problems connected with the origin and antiquity of the Pentateuch. Whilst agreeing in the main with the conclusions arrived at and the new historical method employed by Prof. Naville, there are certain points in which a difference of opinion is, I submit, decidedly called for. Thus, for example, there is the theory still so persistently held by Prof. Naville of the tablets with the cuneiform script, upon which various sections of the Bible have been separately written down and then mixed together in some earthenware jar and then some time or other taken

out haphazard, translated into Hebrew, and then put together without any definite rule. This is an impossible operation, leaving aside the fact that no references can be found in the Pentateuch to any such script, for when the Tables of Stone are mentioned the letters are described as having been "engraven" on the stone. There is, further, the far greater impossibility from a purely linguistic point of view of accepting a translation into the Hebrew tongue. Even should such a translation have taken place some time before Ezra, it could not have assumed the distinct archaic character which the language of the Pentateuch possesses in comparison with the other books of the Old Testament. Moreover, what kind of Bible could it have been which, according to Prof. Naville himself, had been discovered by the High Priest in the foundations of the Temple at the time of the restoration, if not a complete book from which the scribe was able to read the contents to the king and the assembled princes? Surely, at that time the Pentateuch must have already assumed the present form of a scroll, and did not consist of detached cuneiform tablets. This idea must be dismissed; it is neither possible nor helpful, and only adds a new difficulty to the many which are surrounding the history of the Pentateuch.

Prof. Naville is on much stronger ground when he discusses the form and contents of the book itself, and here I am sure everyone will be willing to follow, with the exception of his suggestion that glosses have been added by the supposed "collector" of the cuneiform tablets. Once we admit a "collector" with whom the choice is left to adopt and reject to add glosses, we are only one step removed from the higher critics, who are also guided by the same principle, with the only difference that they suggest many editors and various sources, but otherwise agree in the principle that the work is the result of editorial manipulation. Too much has been imported into the supposed activity of Ezra. The Jewish tradition knows only of Ezra as the man who merely transcribed the text from the old Hebrew alphabet into the new Aramaic one, out of which grew the square characters. The significance and importance of this transliteration must be sought in the determination of breaking definitely with the Samaritans and of driving a wedge between those who worshipped in the temple on Mount Garizim and those who were to worship in a temple not yet built, but which was to be built in Jerusalem.

Prof. Naville is perfectly correct in his statement that the Manasseh who married a daughter of Sanballat and joined his father-in-law, not wishing to repudiate his wife, was wrongly dated by Josephus. The curious fact remains, however, that a careful search by me in the Samaritan Chronicles has not revealed any trace of Manasseh. To the Samaritans evidently the advent of Manasseh seemed to be a matter of very little consequence, and he can therefore not be credited with bringing over the Law from Jerusalem which henceforth was to become the Divine Law of the Samaritans. For these speculations there seems to be no basis; the Law was undoubtedly in the hands of the Samaritans from the time of their ancestors, the northern tribes of Israel, and a continued examination of the Samaritan recension will more and more justify the assumption that the text which they possess, though altered, smoothed and modified in details, and also to a large extent corrupted by the carelessness of scribes, is essentially the Law which they had held together with the rest of the tribes, and points to a more ancient text common to them and the authors of the Greek version. It is not here the place to dilate more on this point, since in a work on a Samaritan apocryphon, which is now in the press, I venture to hope that I have been able to prove the existence of midrashic and legendary interpretations of the text of the Pentateuch in the possession of the Samaritans as far back as the second century B.C. As most of these legends rest upon a peculiar agadic interpretation of the text and even on peculiar letters and forms, it is evident that the text thus treated must have been considered sacred down to its most minute details and of great antiquity and authority. This in itself is sufficient proof of the high antiquity of the Samaritan text in its actual recension. All these points go to strengthen the results achieved so far by Prof. Naville, to whom Biblical science owes a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said:—I am sure we must all feel indebted to Prof. Naville for his lecture on Deuteronomy, especially as its aim is to prove the Mosaic authorship of that book.

There are, however, one or two points to which I desire to draw attention.

In the second paragraph on page 211 the lecturer says:—"When Moses was living in the house of Jethro, his father-in-law, he had no idea of the mission which would be given to him." This, however,

can scarcely be correct, for in Acts vii, 25, when Moses was still in Egypt, before he joined Jethro, we read: "He (Moses) supposed his brethren would have understood how that God by His hand would deliver them." So he must have known it himself!

Then, at the foot of page 214, the lecturer speaks of the Lord being angry with Moses, and keeping him out of the Promised Land, *in connection with the sending of the spies*. But the words of Moses in Deut. i, 37, refer to the time when Moses struck the rock instead of *speaking* to it, as recorded in Num. xx, 1-13. It was *then* that God was angry with Moses.

Again, on page 216, I confess I do not like the expression that, in giving the Ten Commandments as recorded in Deut. v, "Moses quotes from *memory*." There is evidently a Divine design in the altered wording as compared with that given in Exod. xx, which would scarcely be left to the caprice of human memory. For example, the wording of the Fourth Commandment is particularly interesting, that in Exodus being based on the rest of *creation*, while that in Deuteronomy is specially connected with *the deliverance from Egyptian bondage under the shelter of the blood of the Lamb*—a possible hint at the change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week.

There are, however, two interesting points not mentioned by the lecturer which prove conclusively that Deuteronomy could not have been written later than the time of Moses. One is the frequently repeated expression, "When thou art come into the land" (Deut. xxvi, 1), which would have no meaning if the book had been written when they were *in* the land. The other is the fact that, of the six Cities of Refuge, Moses was only able to *name* the three cities which were on the *East* of Jordan (Deut. iv, 41-43), although he gave instructions that when they were *in* the land three others should be chosen in the *midst* of the land (Deut. xix, 2). These Joshua chose and named (*see* Joshua xx). Now if Deuteronomy had been written in later years that distinction would never have occurred.

Lieut.-Col. F. MOLONY said:—Prof Naville has reminded us that Deuteronomy contains speeches attributed to Moses and natural for Moses to make. It might be added that these are speeches of burning eloquence, and yet there is no sign of artificiality about them. The opposition theory is that Deuteronomy was composed long after—about Josiah's reign.

I doubt if there is any case of eloquent speeches of deep feeling being invented long after the circumstances they refer to had passed away without those invented speeches having an artificial ring about them.

Such eloquence as we find in Deuteronomy can only be produced by deep feeling, and in reading these speeches we perceive that the author felt every word. How could an author about Josiah's reign have reproduced the feelings natural to Moses? It may be argued that there are very eloquent invented speeches in Shakespere, like Hamlet's soliloquy, but that refers to the question of life after death, in which Shakespere, like the rest of us, had a real interest. Or take Mark Antony's speech over the body of Cæsar. It is intensely clever, of course, but too exactly calculated to stir up deep feeling in the hearers to be like the speech of a man who was really feeling deeply himself.

The above are acknowledged masterpieces, but in comparison with them the speeches in Deuteronomy ring truer.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS ventured to say that the Chairman and Dr. Gaster had not convinced him that the lecturer was wrong, and pointed out that neither here nor in his larger works had he confined himself to Ezra as the translator from the Babylonian cuneiform into the Aramaic Hebrew, but according to his theory the translation might have taken place at any time during the period of the Kingdom. He thought the Tel-el-Amarna tablets supported Prof. Naville's theory. It was important to note that both views, diverse as they were, supported the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

He thought the lecturer was mistaken in saying on page 213 that most of the people who had witnessed what took place at Sinai had disappeared, and quoted Deut. v, 3-4.

He could not see how the addition by the translator or collector of explanatory sentences affected our belief in the inspiration of the whole, for inspiration was not limited to Moses. He knew one who was so obsessed with the narrow theory of Moses being the author of every word of the Pentateuch that he actually held that he wrote the account of his own death and burial prophetically.

Mr. Roberts compared the vibrating passion with which Moses addressed the people he had so long cared for with Paul's charge to his Ephesian converts recorded in Acts xx, 18-35, both instinct with

life and human interest. We needed to remember that the inspired authors of both Testaments were men of like passions with ourselves, expressing their own thoughts and feelings, though under the control of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. E. A. KNOX (late Bishop of Manchester) writes :—“ I have to thank you sincerely for allowing me to see Dr. Naville’s most valuable paper on the Book of Deuteronomy. As a Hebraist I have no right to express any opinion. But such study as I have been able to give to the works of Dr. Driver, of the writers of the Oxford Hexateuch, of Robertson Smith, of Wellhausen and others, has left me with a strong conviction that the literary assumptions on which their criticisms are based are wrong, and that a fresh review of the whole question is necessary, based on the archæological discoveries of the last half-century. For this reason I welcome Dr. Naville’s paper as a valuable contribution towards a fresh and less biassed review of the formation of the Pentateuch. In my book *On What Authority?* I have indicated the lines of thought which have led me to Dr. Naville’s conclusion, that Deuteronomy is substantially Mosaic.

The Rev. Professor JOHN R. MACKAY, M.A., writes :—I am glad to find M. Edouard Naville, our Egyptological Nestor, still write so effectively in confirmation of the historicity of that part of the Scriptures of the Old Testament with which his special and life-long brilliant studies brought him into closest contact.

An approach to an investigation of the historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament Scriptures may be made along more lines than one, but I am not surprised to find that the principles of historical investigation, which the late Fustel de Coulanges thought out and formulated, commend themselves to archæologists as eminently reasonable; as well as, in their application most telling. These principles have supplied Dr. Naville himself with just the appropriate *organon*, by the help of which he most instructively pours out, from his almost incomparably rich stores of archæological treasures, the relevant material—facts which, as presented under these forms, become the most accurate instruments in settling some difficult problems which, since the rise of the Higher Criticism, have emerged.

The first of these principles is simply a claim that writings, venerated

able for more reasons than merely for their age, shall not be denied the elementary rights of being allowed to speak for themselves and of having a fair hearing. And yet, in the present controversy, even those rights are often denied, and that in the name of presuppositions which must appear to all evangelical Christians as, to put it at the lowest, highly problematical.

It is, however, under the reasonable demand that the writings in question shall be placed within the environment of the historical conditions that are assuredly known to have obtained at that period of the world's history out of which those writings did, *prima facie*, emerge—and that is the second principle of the Historical School—that archæologists are able to bring their richest contributions to the settlement of those questions appertaining to Biblical history that are at the moment agitating the world. And, in this connection, one would be surely blind who should fail to see that the determination and the power of making these weightiest contributions, to the elucidating of these discussions, for which a host of archæologists now stand, is in the proper sense Providential. The question must go to the proof. The spade, and, in many cases, insight of our archæologists, are uncovering for us truths and revealing to us historical situations in the past that had been buried for ages. Nor need one be charged with partiality if one ventures to say that the Biblical history has, through these revelations, gained immensely in verisimilitude. Very significant to my mind in this connection is the verdict of Prof. Sayce in the sense that in almost every instance recent archæological discoveries stand to support the correspondence of the Biblical narratives with the historical situation as now that is being unveiled to our gaze (see his "Reminiscences" *passim*). Dr. Naville, in the present paper, illustrates this principle in the specific case of the comparison which he institutes between the form according to which Yahveh's messages were given, as in the Book of Leviticus, through Moses to the people of Israel, and the form (which we may reasonably regard as traditional and standardized) under which Hammurapi gave his commands through Sin-idinnam to his own people. There can be no doubt that, in the finest sense, the Biblical narrative gains in verisimilitude when read in the light of a situation such as is revealed to us in the so-called letters of King Hammurapi. The proof is of the species known as the argument from undesigned coincidences, a form of

argument which, since Paley's time, is universally felt to be one of the most convincing. May I, going slightly beyond the Mosaic writings, refer to another illustrative instance, in which Mr. James Baikie, in his recently published *The Life of the Ancient East*, shows the correspondence of the Biblical narrative, bearing upon Samson, with what is now known to us, through Knossos, of ancient conditions and manners among the Philistines? "It gives a new perspective," writes Mr. Baikie, "to think of Samson making sport for his captors in a Minoan theatrical arena, like the one at Knossos, while Cretan ladies, in their strangely modern garb, look on, as their ancestresses had looked upon the feats and agonies of their captives from Athens or Megara." Illustrative instances of the kind here intended are daily on the increase, and their cumulative effect upon candid readers of the Old Testament must, in the long run, be overwhelming.

As an unbiassed investigator of the question in debate between scholars who represent the traditional view of the Mosaic narrative and the destructive Higher Critics, Dr. Naville, in the paper before us, applies the third principle of the Historical School of students with great power as an instrument, at once, of destruction and of construction. For the question under this third principle concerns the *raison d'être* of the publication of the writings in question. In the case of the Pentateuch as a whole, it cannot be said that the Higher Critics have been either happy or convincing in the account they render of the emergence of these writings. With regard to Deuteronomy in particular, the Higher Critics might conceivably claim that they offer a palpable reason for the appearance of Deuteronomy, as they generally say, towards the end of the seventh century B.C., as they find in it an expression of the laudable determination of the leading men of Josiah's reign of purging Judah of idolatry. But this *raison d'être* is brought forth at a tremendous cost—the moral worth of the production is, at least to the modern world, irretrievably depreciated and impaired. Dr. Naville has shown that this must be so most effectively in his *La Haute Critique dans le Pentateuque*, which has been translated by me under the title *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch*.

Lieut.-Col. G. MACKINLAY writes :—Prof. Naville has given a simple and reasonable explanation, quite suitable to the circumstances of the times of which he treats.

Deuteronomy was widely quoted in the Gospels, hence it is possible that valuable original written remains of it may even now be found.

It is quite reasonable to conclude, as does the Professor, that Moses wished to leave a settled law for the guidance of the Israelites and for the assistance of his successor. It is also reasonable to conclude that details, such as those concerning the Cities of Refuge, were arranged just immediately before the end of the wilderness wanderings. These facts do not support the comparatively recent date of Deuteronomy maintained by the critics.

AUTHOR'S reply :—I am happy to see that the main conclusion of my paper—the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy—has generally been adopted. The chief objection presented by Rev. A. H. Finn and Dr. Gaster is that which has been made to me by the critics, the question of language, which I said repeatedly was to me secondary. “The character of the law of Moses would be the same whatever would be the language in which it was written. . . . It would be the same if Moses had written it in Hebrew.” I intentionally left aside the linguistic question, and dwelt on other considerations which seemed to me far more important, especially the method, which for me is the main point. In all my writings on the Old Testament, I exclusively relied on the historical method and its principles which apply to any book left by antiquity, leaving aside entirely all connection with religion. You constantly hear the critics saying that the traditional views on the Old Testament are unscholarly, and are brushed off by science, since they rest only on religious belief. Now I endeavour to show that studying these books as if their authors were Homer, Herodotus, or Livy, and applying to them the scientific principles of the historical method, leads to conclusions which are absolutely opposed to those of the critics, and support what is called the traditional view.

Up to the present the critics have never attacked me on the method which is the main support of my conclusions, and which is sufficient by itself and needs no additional argument. They always, like the Rev. A. H. Finn and Dr. Gaster, attacked a point which for me is secondary, and does not shake the conclusions derived from the method. I said twice that in this paper I should leave aside the question of language which is still disputed. But that does not mean that I have changed my point of view as to the

books of Moses having been written in Akkadian, like the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna. I did not say, like Dr. Gaster, "that sections of the Bible were separately written down and then mixed together in some earthenware jar, and then some time or other taken out haphazard and translated into Hebrew, and then put together without any definite rule." As to the language, I follow several of the leading Assyriologists—Sayce, Clay, Winkler and others—who maintain that Moses wrote in Akkadian. He therefore wrote on tablets, the collection of which is called a book, "a day book," and was given to the Levites which bare the Ark of the Covenant, to be put by the side of the Ark of the Covenant. Here, again, let us look at what was done in the time of Moses. This book which was the archives of Israel, was either in a jar like the archives of Tel-el-Amarna, or at Nippur, or more likely in a coffer of earthenware or wood, traces of which are found in the libraries of the cities of Mesopotamia. This was the usual way of preserving the numerous documents in those libraries. The writings of Moses were the archives of the Israelites, and since they could not yet be deposited "in the place which God would choose of all the tribes," they had, like the Ark, to follow the people and be carried by the Levites. They were preserved like the numerous documents which filled the libraries of Nippur and Koyoundjik, and since it was the custom of the Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors to fill their libraries with documents coming from the subdued countries, it seems probable that those of the temple of Jerusalem were carried to Babylon with the vases and other treasures; and there Ezra could easily study them, translate them into Aramaic and make books out of them, since these tablets were not closely connected together, for they had been written at various times during forty years. The law of Moses is an oral law, proclaimed to the people before being put in writing; it is a series of messages of Yahveh to the people, which did not come all at once, and not in the form of a continuous composition or of a code of laws. They were heralded to the people on several occasions, and at various places; some of them are the Commandments which Yahveh commanded Moses in Mount Sinai; other ones in the plains of Moab by Jericho, and some during the journey. Moses is a speaking legislator and not the writer of a code.

As to the Rev. A. H. Finn's objection that the Hebrews would not have understood the law if it was not in Hebrew, my learned opponent will allow me to remind him of what certainly was the case in antiquity, and which we see in the present day. The literary language, and especially that of the sacred books, is hardly ever the language spoken by the people, except where the people have been greatly modified by the school and by civilization in general, or education. When Hammurapi wrote his laws at Susa in the same language as he would have used at Babylon he certainly did not use the language of the people of the country. In our time, take the German literary language; it is originally the prose of the Saxon dialect of Luther. Now this written language is used from Königsberg on the Russian frontier to Fribourg in Switzerland. The same Bible is used in this vast area. How many popular languages does this literary German cover? Take a small country like Switzerland. If you go to church at Zurich you will hear the preaching in German, the Bible is that of Luther. But when you go out of church you will hear the popular language, which is very different from what fell from the pulpit, and which is not the same at Berne or Lucerne. German is an importation from abroad, and of much later date than the vernacular. A peasant from Brandenburg would not understand a man from Berne, although they both use the same Bible. The same with French, Italian, and, I believe in a lesser degree, with English.

It was the same in antiquity. At the time of Moses, there was a literary language used by the Semites in Western Asia, and covering evidently a great many vernaculars. Moses used the literary language of his time, Babylonian Cuneiform, also called Akkadian.

THE 667TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MAY 26TH, 1924,

AT 4.30 P.M.

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR GEORGE K. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF,
K.C.B., K.C.M.G., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following:— As Members, His Excellency Prof. Charles Hildebrand, Ph.D., LL.D., Robert Caldwell, Esq., F.R.G.S., and as Associates, the Rev. J. J. R. Armitage and Mrs. M. L. Jones.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Colonel Harry Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E., to read his paper on “The True Harmony of Man.”

THE TRUE HARMONY OF MAN.

BY Colonel HARRY BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E.

LIFE, as we have experience of it, is linked inseparably with matter; body and soul are intertwined, and although man's thoughts can defy the narrowest limits of matter, time and space, he himself lives like a prisoner within their bars. It is worthy of note that the chief aim of the progress of civilization has been to beat against these bars, and to reduce the limitations placed upon the activities of man by the restraints of time and space; the railway, the motor, the submarine and the aeroplane, on one hand, the telegraph, the telephone and wireless on the other, indicate the trend of man's genius and desire. Man rides

“a horse with wings, that would have flown,
But that his heavy rider kept him down.”

In considering, therefore, for a brief moment the complex nature of man, let us look first at his grosser element, the body, which is composed of matter taken from the earth on which he treads. The science of chemistry deals primarily with “matter,” and within the last few years this science has undergone a revolution, and that not for the first time. This revolution is still in progress of development, and he would be a bold

man who tried to predict or fix a limit to its course. The idea of the immutability of the so-called "elements" has been swept away with the very idea of the "elements" themselves, for the modern theory that the elements are built up from a common material has received support from laboratory experiments in transmutation. Radio-activity points to the final resolution of matter into energy rays, and study of the structure of the atom appears to have led to the belief that its ultimate composition is one of electric particles, a particulate theory of electricity being the basis of the modern theory of matter. In fact, we appear to be on the high road to the theory that all matter is but the expression of different forms of energy under varied conditions. The obvious example of how one's mental energy and thought are sustained and enabled to exert their powers and functions by the material food eaten may serve to illustrate the idea of the interconvertibility of matter and energy; and I propose to lay before you a few thoughts evoked by the consideration of these things.

First, let us note Paul's statement in Heb. xi, 3.* "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Here Paul states that the visible was made out of the invisible, a very different statement from that which one has seen propounded so often in books for adults, as well as for children, that "God made the world out of nothing." For although this is the interpretation put upon the text by many, ranging from St. Chrysostom and Luther to the present day, yet, as Delitzsch points out, such cannot be the true meaning of the words; and although he takes the view that the invisible things, from which the universe sprang, were the divine ideas in the mind of the Creator, yet he admits the attractiveness of the view that the invisible things are "invisible powers, to the understanding of which the eye of faith is raised by the contemplation of the visible."

Indeed, this appears to be the primary meaning of the words, viz., that the visible was created out of the invisible, that visible matter was created out of invisible forces. The exegesis of Delitzsch gives the origin of the process, while the text refers primarily to an intermediate stage in the process of creation;

* I accept the statement of Clement Alex: as to the essential Pauline authorship of this pistle, under a Lucan garb.

and an examination of the exact phraseology used supports this view, for it says that the worlds were framed by the *word* of God, and "*word*" can only give expression to antecedent "*thought*." "The world came into existence by means of ten divine utterances," said the Jewish Fathers, referring to the fact that the words, "and God said," occur ten times in the first chapter of Genesis; and it is worth noticing that the word used in Heb. xi, 3, is "*rhema*" and not "*logos*." Now, as Delitzsch himself points out, "*rhema*" is narrower in its meaning than "*logos*," for "*logos*" combines the notion of that which is inwardly willed with that of the will expressed outwardly, while "*rhema*" has the latter notion only; or, as Philo puts it, God makes all things by His "*logos*," and through the instrumentality of the "*rhema*." There seems, therefore, to be sound ground for the interpretation advocated here, viz., that both in Genesis i and in Heb. xi, 3, an intermediate stage in creation is referred to primarily, and that the teaching is that the visible was formed out of the invisible. "The present world is anagogical, ever pointing up to higher things, figures of the true. It is faith, and faith only, resting on the revealed creative word, which penetrates through the veil of phenomena to the Divine supersensual ground behind it. Creation itself is a postulate of faith" (Delitzsch). The heavens declare the glory of God, sang David, and Paul wrote that the eternal power and Godhead are understood by the things that are made.

Increasing knowledge of the works of God must call forth increasing understanding of and admiration for various records in His Word, without minimizing in any degree the power of the Almighty, or the need for faith. For instance, if the ultimate constitution of the atom is energy in some form or other, and if (as is now the universal opinion) there is no such thing as the immutability of the elements (the difference between gold and silver, for example, being one of status rather than of inherent characteristic), then the temptation of our Lord by Satan, "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread," was not asking of Him to do, what may be termed in no irreverent spirit, a conjuring trick, but rather the temptation of the Son of God to carry out in a moment of time, for His bodily needs, by the exertion of Divine power, that which was in itself a potential possibility, to be carried out by what we term "normal" processes extending over an immense range of time.

One of the features of many of the miracles recorded in the Bible was the practical elimination of the element of time, *e.g.*, the healing of Peter's wife's mother of the fever; the elimination of the element of space was the feature in others, *e.g.*, the sudden removal of Philip from the Ethiopian eunuch in the desert to Azotus. Again, other instances will readily recur to the mind in which the main element of the miracle appears to have been the synchronization of a "normal" process with the word of the prophet, *e.g.*, the passage of the Red Sea, or the destruction of Dathan and Abiram. But time and space are merely concomitants of mortal existence, *i.e.*, of life as we have experience of it, and are not absolute elements. We read of a period when time began (Gen. i, 1), and we believe that at some period in the future, time shall be no longer. We have to do with One who from everlasting to everlasting is God, the Great I AM, in whose sight a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past.

The miracle performed at Cana, when our Lord changed the water into wine, was a display of Divine power exerted upon matter, and when He told His disciples, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible to you" (Matt. xvii, 20), was not *one* of the truths inculcated this, *viz.*, that spiritual energy, exerted by a will linked to the Supreme Spiritual Being, and acting in harmony with His Will, would have power over all material and lower forms of energy? for we read that "by faith the walls of Jericho fell down" (Heb. xi, 30).

An exemplification of this power over matter exercised by a sinless Will seems to be given us in such events as those recorded in Luke iv, 30, Jno. v, 13, viii, 59, of which Professor Swete writes, "Such instances suggest that *before* the Passion, the Lord's sinless human will possessed a power over His body, which is wholly beyond our experience or comprehension."

Now man, the chief of the visible works of God, is a tripartite being, composed of body, soul and spirit; in him we see the connecting link between Heaven and earth, but his visible and invisible components are intimately connected and interwoven. That which affects the body often affects the mind, and that which affects the mind often exerts a powerful influence over the spirit, and *vice versa*. The distinction between soul (or mind) and spirit, which I assume here, is as follows: In vegetation we

see unconscious life ; in the animal world we see self-conscious life, with consciousness of this world only ; whereas man is a God-conscious being, and in him the earthly and the spiritual are linked together in a mysterious manner. Man was made a little lower than Elohim (Ps. viii, 5). Soul, therefore, in this connection has no existence apart from an organized body, while spirit is, in essence, independent, but in common parlance the word *soul* is often used to denote the mind *and* spirit of man, as distinct from his body. I am aware that the problem is not so simple as I have stated it, for in man the interweaving of the three components is intricate and mysterious ; and Paul refers to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit as being one of the mighty deeds which the Sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, can accomplish (Heb. iv, 12). Delitzsch indeed explains the *Scriptural* view of man as being trichotomous (Ps. xvi, 9 ; 1 Thess. v, 23), and yet dichotomous. "It distinguishes in man spirit (heart, "*nous*"), soul and body ; but spirit and soul belong to each other as principium and principiatum ; the former is "*pneuma zoes*," principium principians, the latter is "*psyche zosa*," principium principiatum : the former has its life immediately from God, the latter mediately from the spirit. Man's having a soul is in consequence of his having a spirit, and the latter is a mysteriously creative act of God, exclusively appropriated to the creation of man, and specifically distinguishing him from all other beings who are also "*nephesh khayah*."

The use of the word "*bara*," create, in the first chapter of Genesis, verses 1, 21, 27, is very significant in this connection. The word ushers in, first, matter (verse 1), secondly, animal life (verse 21), and, thirdly, man (verse 27) ; *i.e.*, body, soul, and spirit in turn ; each step calling for a new creative act, and indicating a gulf between them, unbridgeable by any other means. When man is referred to in creation (Gen. i, 27 ; v. 1, 2), on both occasions the word "create" is repeated thrice, as if to emphasize the threefold character of his being.

It is to be noted that vegetation is included in the first creative act, for no "*creative*" act intervened between the creation of matter and the ushering in of vegetable life ; and if the view be correct, which is taken here, it would seem that there is no unbridgeable gulf between matter and vegetation. Perhaps a future generation may see the chemist producing in his laboratory elementary forms of vegetable life. If such should ever be the case, I have little doubt but that the popular press and the

popular preacher will proclaim that man has fathomed the mystery of life, and that only a few and easy steps remain to be taken before he can produce in his laboratory animal life as well.

It may be useful at this point to note some of the more sober speculations of the Jewish mystics, the Kabbalists. I hold no brief for the essential pantheism of many of their ideas, but it is interesting to note how they groped in the dark after that which Paul displayed in the light under the teaching of the Spirit.

*With them the world is not a creation *ex nihilo*, for from nothing nothing can proceed. All existing substances are emanations, immanent emanations from the Infinite. Matter, therefore, is only a form under which spirit gives itself a manifestation. The universe is regarded as the effect of thought. From the highest of the Divine manifestations, the Crowned Logos, proceeded Wisdom (the act of thinking), then Understanding (the subject of thought), and from this combination issued Knowledge (the realization of thought in being). The Universe is a revelation of the Infinite, but though all existence emanated from Him, the world differs from the Godhead, as effect differs from its cause. In reality, "*matter*" is an emanative force attenuated almost to exhaustion; and as all existence has emanated from God, so it must ever be with and in Him to be maintained in existence, or it would vanish away. [*cf.*, "In Him we live and move and have our being," Acts xvii, 28. "He is before all things, and by Him all things consist," Col. i, 17.] The works of God are the writing of Him, whose writing is His Word, and whose Word is His thought; so that the works, the word and the thought of God are one, though to man they seem to be three.

[Speech, indeed, is the revelation of thought, and this idea, doubtless, explains the curious paraphrase of the words, "And man became a living soul" (Gen. ii, 7), given in the Targum Onkelos, which is usually so literal, "and man became a discoursing spirit." For in man and by man, the masterpiece of God's creation, ought God's thoughts to be revealed in this world.] In man, the microcosm, † the epitome of the universe, is reflected the Godhead more than in any other component part of the

* I draw my remarks from the writings of Dr. Etheridge and Dr. Ginsburg.

† *Cf.* "Man consists of the four elements and of soul and of spirit, and therefore is he even called WORLD."—Apolog. Arist. VII.

universe. The inner man, indeed, is considered to be a trinity in unity, like his Divine original. First, Spirit (Neshamah), which is the highest degree of being ; secondly, Soul (Ruakh), the seat of good and evil, and of the moral qualities ; thirdly, Life (Nephesh), the cause of the lower functions of the body, and its animal life, and which perishes with the body. Human life, in its perfect character, is the agreement between the ideal and the real, between intellect and matter, between God and Nature. The soul is at present being schooled to this harmony. All things, visible and invisible, are designed to aid him in passing through this probationary period here below. He is like a king's son, sent away from the palace for a time, to fulfil a career of education, and then to be recalled home. Sin has disturbed that harmony which subsisted at first between Nature and God. [cf. Rom. viii, 22.] Through sin, the soul became enslaved to sense, but when the time of probation has been accomplished successfully, it will attain the consummation of bliss in the fruition of God, *i.e.*, in the intuitive vision of glory, in perfect love, and in that oneness with Himself, in which it will have the same ideas and the same will with Him, and like Him will hold dominion in the universe. [cf. 1 Jno. iii, 2 ; Rev. xxii, 5.]

Thus far the Jewish mystics ; their doctrines, to which I would draw attention especially, are (a) the rejection of the idea that God created the visible universe *ex nihilo* ; a subject on which I have touched already in connection with Heb. xi, 3 ; (b) the original harmony existing between Nature and God, and the fact that human life in its perfect character is agreement or harmony between God and man ; (c) the disturbance of this harmony by sin. It is these two last points with which I now wish to deal.

The intimate connection in man between body, soul and spirit must be apparent to us all. How often do we see failure of physical power following upon the decay of will-power, and not due to decay of muscles or limbs ; while a temporary stimulus to the will-power shows itself reflected in a temporary resuscitation of physical forces ? Then, again, serious injury to a nerve, by which the will acts upon a muscle or limb, results probably in the atrophy of that muscle or limb. In fact, the central control of the whole man is exerted by his Will, and is manifested in his being ; for while the soul and spirit retain control, so long does his material body remain " alive " ; directly the spirit leaves the body, the latter soon falls to pieces, and usually

the mental powers fail before the spirit yields up its rule. "The human spirit maintains without a moment's interruption its vital energizing power over the human body, as much during the captivity of sleep as when in the full activity of its waking condition." (Delitzsch.)

Now, it is improbable to the degree of impossibility that the threatened penalty for disobedience given by God to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," was an arbitrary one. It must have been a statement of the inevitable consequential result, which must follow, if man should break the conscious harmony existing between his Creator and himself, and it may well be that physical death is due to corruption of the Will. It may be objected that death is often due to accident or violence, over which the sufferer has no control, and which may come upon him unawares, sometimes even while he is asleep.

The reply to such an objection is that in a *sinless* world, injury or death caused by anger, malice, envy or any other sin would be impossible by hypothesis; that it occurs in a sinful world is merely a melancholy proof that the sinner (like the whole creation) suffers from the sins of fellow-sinners. There remains therefore to be considered only that class of injury or death caused by (what is called) "pure accident"; for we must rule out, of course, deaths and injuries caused by what we term "acts of God," *e.g.*, lightning. In Ps. xci, 10-12, we find the answer to this objection. "There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. For He shall give His angels charge over thee to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." In a sinless world sinless man would have been preserved from all physical injury and harm by the ministry of angels. Even as it is in a sinful world, the heirs of salvation are the special objects of the ministry of angels (Heb. i, 14), a fact which is exemplified throughout the pages of the Bible, in which we see proofs that the bodily wants of God's children and their protection from danger are the especial care and duty of angelic guardians.

Again, it may be urged that if physical death be due to the corruption of the Will, then the length of any man's life will be in direct proportion to his righteousness and walk in the sight of God. Such a corollary, however, is not necessarily logical. When the original balance of equilibrium in man was

upset, and not only in man but in the world itself, a new order of things was introduced. For instance, man was affected by the laws of heredity which affect mind and body, the sins of the fathers being visited upon the children to the third and the fourth generation. The devil became the prince of this world ; the earth, on which man lives, was cursed for man's sin, and from the effects of his sin the whole creation groans and travails in pain. The earth is no longer man's true home ; his life on it is a period of trial, probation and opportunity. The righteous may die in the midst of his years, for the God before whom he walks takes him away from the evil to come ; the days of the wicked may be prolonged, for a merciful God is not willing that any should perish, and endures with much long-suffering vessels of wrath fitted to destruction. If earthly prosperity and length of days were the *invariable* accompaniment of a righteous life, it might be said in truth, "Doth Job fear God for nought?" and the very basis of the hope of redemption would be undermined, for now the just shall live by faith. Spiritual, moral and physical factors all affect the question of "length of days," and yet amid them all we see a general truth in the idea, for the principle is embedded in God's Commandments.

The proper chain of authority in man is (a) body ruled by the mind, (b) mind ruled by the spirit, (c) spirit ruled by the Divine and Eternal Spirit. Had man's spirit, as exercised through his Will, remained in perfect harmony with his Creator, and in willing dependence upon Him, the Supreme Spirit, Lord of all power and might, perfect equilibrium would have been maintained throughout his whole being, and perfect control exercised over it. Man had thus, in his first state, the capacity of immortality. The animal creation on the other hand, ruled by soul without spirit, lacking consciousness of a spiritual dependence upon its Creator, must necessarily and always have been subject to decay and death ; for the break in the conscious chain which links the beast with its Creator betokens a state of unstable equilibrium.

Comparatively recently I came across, in the *British Medical Journal*, a review of a book by Professor Pearl on the *Biology of Death*. It was as follows : "Professor Pearl has no difficulty in showing that natural death is not the inevitable penalty of life,—that on the contrary it occurs only in metazoan animals as a normal event, that even highly-specialized cells are practically immortal. . . . Why do metazoans die then ?

Essentially Professor Pearl's answer is the same as that great pathologist, H. G. Sutton's definition of disease—absence of rhythm the cellular system falls out of balance, the environmental conditions, which experiment shows to be necessary for cellular immortality, are not maintained, or there may be an outbreak of cellular bolshevism, which destroys the commonwealth." (*B.M.J.*, 3rd March, 1923.)

Essentially, then, Professor Pearl's investigations lead him to attribute physical death to the cause which I have mentioned, viz., loss of rhythm, loss of equilibrium and harmony. The highest stage of that rhythm, and the essential condition of equilibrium, where man is concerned, is perfect harmony between man's spirit and his God: a harmony which he had at the beginning, and in the environmental conditions of which he lived,* but which he lost so soon by his own act and will; for his will exerted itself, not merely in independence of God, but in opposition to the declared command of God, exhibiting in fact an outbreak of bolshevism; and this ruined harmony can never be repaired in its entirety in this life, for "the flesh lusteth against the spirit." As Adolph Saphir said, "The centre of our life is not fixed in God, and therefore there is no harmony and no peace; there is no health in us."

Take man as one meets him: how many there are little better than the animal world, in that they are ruled almost entirely by the animal soul; animal desires, instincts and wants exercise control over their beings. The ancient recluses were living witnesses in a world steeped in materialism, that the spirit, exercised through the will, was and could be superior to the animal nature in man. The second phase (that is, man controlled by his own spirit) is demonstrated to us by thousands who spend their lives and energies in the pursuit of knowledge, art, intellectual development, ambition, etc., with but little (if any) acknowledgment of the supreme claim of God to rule man's being in its entirety, from its highest power to its lowest. The third phase is that exhibited by the Christian, whose spirit is controlled by the Spirit of God, but alas! how imperfectly even in the best. Self is ever obtruding itself, whether through

* Our Lord declares that "every one that is perfect shall be as his Master," Luke vi, 40, or as it may be rendered "every one that is perfectly adjusted," which imports the same idea of perfect harmony; and this same word, *katarizo*, is used in Hebrews xi, 3, as indicating the primal state of creation.

soul or spirit, and prevents perfect rhythm. One must refer to, but need not dwell on, the terrible contrast exhibited by those cases (which exist, I believe) where the control of the man's spirit has been handed over to another, whether it be human or demon.

All of us suffer from a two-fold incapacity, corruption of the Will and physical descent from those who suffered under the same disability. Hence it would seem that the span of life, after man's fall, must have been on a descending scale, until it reached a line of approximate equilibrium under the changed conditions. Doubtless the climatic and other changes caused by the fall (for the ground itself was cursed by God for Adam's sin), and later on by the Flood, gave an impetus to that descent ; and for nearly 4,000 years the approximate line of equilibrium has been drawn at some 70 to 80 years. Formerly the span of life must have been longer, and I see no good reason to doubt that the gradually diminishing ages of the patriarchs, from over 900 years downwards, as related in Genesis, are records of fact and not of fiction.

Almost universal tradition bears witness to the truth of these facts. "It is beyond a doubt," writes Rawlinson, "that there is a large amount of consentient tradition to the effect that the life of man was originally far more prolonged than it is at present, extending to at least hundreds of years. The Babylonians, Egyptians and Chinese exaggerated these hundreds into thousands. The Greeks and Romans with more moderation limited human life within a thousand or eight hundred years. The Hindus still further shortened the term." And Delitzsch writes, "The state of integrity was succeeded by a stage of transition, during which death, the result of sin, but slowly overcame the resistance offered by the strong physical organization of primitive mankind. At all events, the climate, weather and other natural conditions were different from those of the post-diluvian world, while life was much simpler and flowed on in a more equable course ; and what was already probable in itself, viz. : that men should then live longer than they do at present, is testified by the unanimous voice of popular legends. According to Hesiod childhood lasted in the silver age 130 years, which presupposes a lifetime of 1,000 years in the golden age. Isaiah lxv, 20-22, predicts the restoration of such length of life in the latter days. Josephus appeals to Egyptian, Chaldee, Phœnician and other ancient testimony for the gradual shortening of human life from 1,000 years."

In connection with this reference to Isaiah lxx, 20-22, one may quote Kimchi's commentary thereon, "The people shall live to three or five hundred years of age as in the days of the patriarchs, and if one die at one hundred years, it is because of his sin, and even at that age he shall be reputed an infant, and they shall say of him, an infant is dead. These things shall happen to Israel in the days of the Messiah."

Here, again, we see the belief that when Messiah shall reign on earth, and sin shall be abated so greatly and kept in subjection, the physical life of man will be greatly prolonged; and will there not be, under the conditions of Messianic rule, much greater harmony between mankind and its King? Broken spiritual harmony, lack of rhythm, and self-will (which is spiritual bolshevism) spell death. When God created His works, He looked upon them and pronounced them to be, not perfect, but very good. That which is very good is capable of betterment, as well as of degradation; and in the earthly paradise it was not long before degradation ensued, and death entered; but in the heavenly Jerusalem we read of "the spirits of just men made perfect." Perfect harmony exists between them and their Creator, and their spiritual dependence upon their God is consciously perfect. Immortality is the assured result, for their perfection and their harmony with God is the work of Christ.

If man were in complete harmony with his God and Creator, his spirit in unison with the Almighty Spirit, his will in absolute dependence upon the Divine Will, what limit could there be to the power of man? It is sin, and sin only, which by corrupting man's will and by marring his spiritual understanding, prevents the clear revelation through man upon earth of God's power and might. Only in one Man, the Man Christ Jesus, has this light shone forth undimmed, and this power been displayed unabated. It was impossible that the cords of Death should hold Him, for He ever spake the words, and did the works of His Father. He ever fulfilled His Will in its entirety. He and His Father were One.

Between the revelation of God in His written Word, and that in His created works, there can be no discord; but man fails too often in his interpretation of these revelations, and not least of all in his interpretation of the book of Creation, as the discarded scientific literature of past generations, nay even of the present generation, testifies. Few scientific books remain up to date for more than a few years. The Bible, on the other hand, is unique in the history of literature both in its composition and its

application. It never grows old or out-worn, and the reason is plain to my mind : the Bible speaks to the heart of man, of every race and of every age, and it speaks with power, because it has been inspired by man's Creator and bears witness of Him who is the Truth.

Finally, let me say that what I have written touches but the fringe of the subject. It is easy to propound questions to which one cannot give an answer, or to point out inconsistencies. Knowledge is relative. Truth is absolute. The more that is known of the simplest works in creation the more complex is their structure found to be. How complex then beyond compare must be the structure of man, the final and masterpiece of creation ? If the visible is so complex, much more so must be the invisible, and infinitely more so the spiritual. Such are the innate difficulties of the subject, and my hope is therefore that the thoughts which I have tried to lay before you may be of some interest and afford matter for further consideration by those who are better able than myself to develop the subject.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said : Colonel Biddulph's paper has given us many seeds of thought, and I can only touch on a few of them. He has alluded to the modern theory of matter, and incidentally to the importance and connection of matter and energy. In this connection I should like to tell you of a quotation made at the Royal Institution only last week, at the conclusion of a series of lectures by an expert professor on the "Effect of High Altitudes on the Human Body." After pointing out the very wonderful self-adjusting powers of the body, powers which, within limits, enabled human beings to live under extraordinary differences of external surroundings, he quoted the words in Eph. iv, "the whole body fitly framed together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth," but he did not quote the previous verse, which closes with "grow up into him in all things which is the Head even Christ."

This important centre of energy—we speak with all reverence—is clearly and definitely ascribed to Him who, according to St. John in the first chapter of his Gospel, and to St. Paul in Colossians, was the Creator of all life. How marvellously the energies of life

in various forms react on other lines is abundantly shown in recent researches in such diseases as malaria, sleeping sickness, cholera, &c.

Colonel Biddulph has traced this dependence and connection in the work and word of the Creator. He has touched upon the very interesting connection between word and thought, and the delicate shades of meaning in the original *logos* and *rhema*. I venture to dwell a little on this matter, as it is one which I have studied with such remembrance of the Greek instilled into me at school and university long ago. Both in the English N.T. are translated "word," yet undoubtedly *logos* is of far wider application than *rhema*. Thus in 1 Pet. i, 23, the Apostle speaks of "the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever"—here it is *logos*, but in v. 24 and 25 the word is *rhema*. So also when our Lord tells Satan "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God," the word used is *rhema*; when He tells His disciples that "the words I speak to you they are spirit and they are life," again we have *rhema*. But in His great High Priestly prayer when He says, "I have given them Thy word," it is *logos*, for He Himself is the Word—the *logos*—"the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of His person." What, then, is the restricted meaning of *rhema*? It is not merely the spoken word, it implies spirit and life. Perhaps one may take an example of earthly warfare. In the famous Pass of Thermopylæ the inscription on the Rock there is (freely translated):—

"Hasten to Sparta, thou who passest by
And tell how faithful to her laws we lie."

Here the word is *rhema*, and is evidently not exactly *law*, but rather "spirit of the nation"—the French *esprit*.

There is yet another Greek word *muthos*, which is the spoken message, such as the oracle of Delphi, but also the ordinary word for a message. Thus in the second book of the Iliad, where Oneiros (the dream) is sent by Zeus to Agamemnon, we have, at the conclusion of the orders of Zeus:—

"He spake, and Oneiros went as soon as he heard the word"
(*muthos*).

But *muthos* is only used in a derogatory sense in the N.T. "old wives' fables" (1 Tim. iv, 7), and this seems to point to the underlying power in the *logos* and *rhema*, the invisible forces in the

revelation of God, not the actual language used as in a heathen oracle.

This touches also on the power of a sinless will indicated by the lecturer—power over mind, power over matter.

Whether there is or is not a gulf between mineral and vegetable matter is so mysterious a subject that I feel we cannot touch upon it. Nor do I think that this concerns the primary object of the lecturer, viz., to indicate the true harmony of man. We know by recent discoveries how endless are the waves of certain forms of energy and how necessary it is to be in harmony with those waves to appreciate their effects. The lecturer has pointed out—what the Apostle Paul had insisted on frequently—that all the members of the body must be in harmony with one another in order to have perfect activity, but that all should be subject to the will of the individual. When that spirit or will departs the body dissolves.

The chain of authority is well expressed by the lecturer (a) Body ruled by mind; (b) Mind by spirit; (c) Spirit ruled by *the* Spirit. This brings the thought of more subtle N.T. Greek expressions, *psyché* and *pnenma*, which are intensely fascinating, but about which if I talk I fear I shall exhaust your patience.

Practically what we may reverently and thankfully learn from this interesting subject is that H₃—the Lord Jesus Christ, who was found in fashion as a man and became obedient unto the death of the Cross—is the Head, the Centre, the Creator, the Source, the Fountain of Life, the Well of Water, and that if we are to live in any degree in the harmony which God intends, it must be by subordinating our will to His and letting His glorious fulness enlighten, purify and occupy our spirits which He has bought.

Lieut.-Col. MACKINLAY said:—Colonel Biddulph has given us a thoughtful and useful paper, but I cannot see (p. 236) that a bridge has been made over the gulf between matter and vegetation; the one has life, the other has not—a radical difference.

On p. 237 I find the expression “*immanent emanation.*” Now *immanent* means *remaining within* and *emanation* means *flowing out*, so at first sight the expression looks like a contradiction.

I agree with our Chairman in warmly appreciating the paragraph

in the middle of p. 240, but there are several others also which are very happily worded.

Colonel Biddulph rightly lays emphasis on spiritual harmony, on our wills being brought into conformity with the mind of Christ.

Dr. THIRTLE declared the paper stimulating and suggestive. He saw no reason why the lecturer should construct a new system of Biblical Psychology. In its own sphere, the well-known work by the late Dr. Franz Delitzsch is still of great value ; it has not been superseded. The object of the paper, as he understood it, was to indicate the basis on which harmony may subsist between man and his Maker. That harmony is not at present actual and universal ; none the less, it is conditioned and provided for in the Divine economy. As to the basis, it is not physical, not natural ; it originates in the realm of spirit ; the Holy Spirit operating upon the human spirit, with results that bring the creature into harmony with the Creator. The process begins from above, not from below ; it is not man that rises into divinity, but divinity comes into man ; so that creatures whose origin is of the earth become " partakers of the Divine nature," having, as the Apostle says, " escaped from the corruption that is in the world." By this process the weak becomes strong, and the earthly are so transformed as to bear the image of the heavenly.

The process, far-reaching though it may be, does not at once manifest itself in the man realizing harmony in the totality of his being, but rather, being first conformed to the mind of God, he is made, or constituted, a new creature, with new relations and new experiences. Being thus brought into agreement with the will and purpose of God, he is enabled in due time to realize agreement in the various departments and faculties of his own being, and then, still further, in the entire range of his environment among men. At length there is established a fellowship between the creature and the Creator ; and with the life and immortality of God flowing into and animating the human vessel, there will be achieved that complete redemption which will invest with a new and enlarged meaning the words of the Apostle Paul, when he said that in God " we live, and move, and have our being " ; we shall live a deathless life ; we shall enjoy a well-adjusted movement ; and we shall realize a fulness of being like unto that of the Lord Jesus, who was " holy, harmless

undefiled, and separate from sinners"—an experience, assuredly, which will place the seal of a truly blessed finality upon the handiwork of God in the creation of man.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS disagreed with the lecturer's suggestion that in the three events referred to on p. 235, our Lord exercised some power over His own body beyond our experience, for that would have taken Him out of the pathway of perfect dependence on His Father, in which alone He could be an example to us of faith in God. He thought John v, 13, meant no more than that our Lord disappeared from the sight of the man He had healed, by mingling in the crowd. He believed that in the other two cases, the Nazarenes who would have cast our Lord down headlong, and those in the Temple who would have stoned Him when He affirmed His eternal Being, were prevented by the moral power which He exercised upon them from carrying out their purposes, just as those who came to arrest Him, awed by His presence, went backward and fell to the ground.

He wished the lecturer had dealt with the influence which the presence of the Holy Spirit in this world exercised in producing harmony between man and man in the Christian Church—apparently a more difficult task than bringing man into harmony with God. The law of Moses forbade ploughing with an ox and an ass together, because it would be cruel to put animals of such different natures under the same yoke. When we consider their respective upbringings, it would seem impossible for Jew and Gentile to work together in the same community, but this is what the Spirit of God effected when these two divergent nationalities were baptized "by one Spirit into one body" (1 Cor. xii, 13). However much Christians had failed to work in harmony, we must ever remember it was our Lord's Prayer that they should all be one, even as the Father was in Christ and He in the Father (John xvii, 21), for this would be the triumph of the Gospel.

Pastor W. PERCIVAL-PRESCOTT :—The opening sentences of Colonel Biddulph's paper, "Life as we have experience of it is linked inseparably with matter, body and soul are intertwined," bring to my mind the words of the poet Milton. In his *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, vol. I, he says: "Man is a living being

intrinsically and properly one individual, not compound and separable, not, according to the common opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different natures, as of body and soul, but the whole man is soul and the soul man ; that is to say, a body or substance, individual, animated, sensitive and rational."

Colonel Biddulph seems to affirm the same thing on p. 236 : " Soul, therefore, in this connection has no existence apart from an organized body." On the other hand, I think it is perfectly clear from his paper that there is a trinity—body, soul and spirit—in this unity.

This trinity was intended to be harmoniously blended together, with no friction between the material and the spiritual. However, a strong irritant has arisen in our nature called sin. This produces an inward antagonism against good, so that when we would do good evil is ever present.

The object of God is to bring back the original harmony in man, and in order to do this He gave His only begotten Son to bring in reconciliation for sin, and to make us harmoniously one in Christ.

Thus even " physical death," said by Colonel Biddulph to be caused by the " loss of rhythm," was to be eventually banished.

Or we might state the matter briefly, thus : Life consists in the correspondence of a living organism with its environment ; granted that we have a perfect organism and a perfect environment, and that we could perfectly correspond with this environment we should not die.

But man does not possess this kind of organism or environment or the ability to perfectly adapt himself to such an environment, and so he intuitively looks to some power outside himself to aid him to reach this ideal.

These perfect conditions Christ holds out to mankind through a new creation or new birth.

While this change is a great mystery, it is no greater marvel than the analogous transfer from a lower to a higher kingdom taking place continually around us, and is governed by the same law, namely, unreserved responsiveness to the higher kingdom. To illustrate : A particle of inanimate matter responding to a living rootlet is incorporated into the vegetable kingdom. The vegetable surrendering to an animal is incorporated into and becomes an essential part of the animal kingdom. And so from the animal and

human to the Divine Kingdom ; a mind and heart yielding to the Spirit of God is reborn into the family of God—the Spiritual Kingdom from above.

Nature illuminates the mystery of God and reveals to the thoughtful mind how “The True Harmony of Man” may be restored.

Mr. LESLIE said:—That man’s life at its highest and fullest involves harmonious relations with his Creator all will agree. In working out his thesis, however, the author has inevitably introduced certain elements of Biblical psychology. The Scriptures obviously do not contain a formal system of psychology, nor do they present us with strict definitions. The author had, therefore, to collect a sufficiency of the Biblical expressions, translate them into the language of to-day, and construct from them the psychological elements his thesis required. Unfortunately, instead of undertaking such a critical analysis, he appears to have referred to Delitzsch, whose psychology is now of historical interest only.

Among many minor points which are open to criticism the following may be mentioned:—

Page 234.—The application of the term “conjuring trick” to a possible Divine act is unfortunate.

Page 236.—That animals are self-conscious is very doubtful. What is the effect of the qualifying terms “in this connection” and “in essence” applied to soul and body respectively? It is not, in practice, easy to draw a dividing line between animals and vegetables.

Page 239.—Does not the term “arbitrary” become meaningless when applied to Divine acts? Surely the withdrawal of any angelic protection could not convert “an accident” into “an inevitable consequential result.”

Page 240.—Is it not a mistake to lay emphasis upon the consciousness rather than the reality of spiritual dependence?

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said:—The remarks I wish to make to-day are more by way of friendly suggestion than of criticism. The subject of the lecture is “The True Harmony of Man.” This condition of things was, of course, realised in Eden before the Fall, when man worked in happy and unbroken fellowship with God.

Now, the lecturer very rightly shows on p. 7 how that harmony was “disturbed” (I would say interrupted or broken) by sin.

But, apart from a brief reference to the millennium and "the work of Christ," he does not show how that harmony is to be restored. In other words, he does not mention the necessity for the new birth, without which man, however refined and cultured, must remain for ever out of harmony with (which means separated from) God. Whereas at conversion, when man is born again of the Spirit, he is created anew (Col. iii, 10) and becomes a new creature (2 Cor. v, 17) capable once more of holding communion with God.

Dr. ANDERSON-BERRY writes :—A slight accident prevents my attending the meeting and hearing Colonel Biddulph's thought-inspiring paper.

There are several points with which I cannot agree with the lecturer.

For instance, his interpretation of Heb. xi, 3.

Μὴ negatives the clause taken as a whole. In other words, the proposition denied is, *that which is seen* (the better MS. reading) *arose out of visible things*. By early interpreters, Chrysostom, Œcumenius, etc., μὴ was transposed and construed with φαινομένων alone, meaning "that which is seen has arisen from things which do not appear." These things being explained as chaos, the invisible creative powers of God, etc. But for this there is absolutely no MSS. authority, and cannot be upheld.*

Thus there is no Scriptural authority for the lecturer's statement.

Then his explanation of Creation is simply Hegel's :—

"Why, then there is something *before* the beginning *that gives* the beginning! Well, yes; but that is not the way to put it. There is thought, and there is nothing but thought; thought is the All, and, as the All, it is, of course, also what we mean by the term *the prius*—it is the first . . . when we use the expression God, we are just saying the same thing, for God is obviously thought; or God is Spirit, and the life of the Spirit is thought. Creation, then, is thought also; it is the thought of God." (Stirling's *Hegel*, p. 56.)

Although admiring much that is Hegelianism, yet I must acknowledge that his doctrine is not Scriptural in its method or end.

Our lecturer seems to have a tendency to reduce the material world to forms of energy and to motion. True motion requires

* Robertson's *Grammar of N.T. Greek* 3rd Ed., 1919, pp. 423, 1003.

energy to set—what in motion? Matter, of course. And when we reach negative corpuscles which are related to atoms as a cricket ball is to St. Paul's Cathedral, we still find something material, for when they bombard a hard surface in a partial vacuum they change into X-rays which are waves in the ether, and ether is material, for it has weight, extension, etc. To say they are electrical is still to say the same thing, for electricity is simply movement in the ether—that is to say, of the ether. And ether is matter.

Perhaps it is not strictly correct to say that God made the world out of nothing, for Hegel says, "Pure Being and pure Nothing is, therefore, the same."

But if we say that we mean by nothing that which has no existence, then it is true, if we believe the Word of God, that "In the beginning God called into existence what hitherto had no existence."

Otherwise it would be no beginning. And to say that God made the universe out of Himself would be to degrade His Being, and to limit Him who is infinite.

There would be no difficulty in accepting Gen. i, 1, in its simple, plain sense, were we not obsessed by the old pagan axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. That is axiomatically true of Humanity and, consequently, of the gods men have made, but not of the living and true God who spoke and it was done.

Dr. SCHOFIELD writes:—I much regret not being present to hear this thoughtful paper, the main thesis of which is undoubtedly true. This appears to be that harmony is life, and that there can be no true human harmony that does not include harmony with God.

In other words, most of this was laid down by Herbert Spencer in his dictum to the effect that harmony with the environment was life, any failure in this, ill-health, and its absence or discord was death.

This thesis is only fully developed at the close of the paper, and room is left for one or two remarks upon its earlier statements.

The writer, on p. 233, appears to make a very curious remark. Quoting Heb. xi, 3, he affirms that Paul (?) states that the visible was made out of the invisible. But Paul makes no such statement. He merely asserts they were not made of the visible. The only positive statement is that the world was "framed by the utterance (*rhema*) of God." Ten times repeated in Gen i, which comes very near the

statement repudiated by the writer, that "God made the world out of nothing." The deduction on p. 235, that the walls of Jericho fell down through spiritual energy, which had power over all forms of material energy, seems hardly warranted.

By whose faith did its walls fall down? Surely that of Joshua and his host.

And how was it shown? In an apparently meaningless shout.

The co-ordinating of the three *bara's* of Gen. i (p. 236) with body, soul and spirit is very happy, and it is to be regretted that it is immediately followed by a statement that cannot be defended. The unbridgeable gulf is between the mineral and vegetable, for the gulf is between life and no life; and life begins in the vegetable world. No mineral possesses its essentials, powers of selection and assimilation and of reproduction. On the other hand, there is no impassable gulf between vegetable and animal, for science shows the one passes insensibly into the other.

On p. 237 the interpretation of Col. i, 17, is felicitous, and the more so an account of its difficulty; p. 239 seems wrongly to regard death in Eden as mainly physical, whereas it was primarily spiritual, and only physical in a secondary sense; expulsion from Eden barring the way to the tree of life. I am glad, on p. 240, the author does not assert physical immortality, "but only its 'capacity.'"

We must congratulate the Institute on this paper.

Mr. H. O. WELLER, M.I.C.E., forwarded a diagram showing that if the date of each Patriarch's birth be set along a horizontal line, and from each point so found the man's age be set up as ordinate at that point, the result will approximate to an S-curve, rising a little from Adam, then falling sharply, and lastly going horizontal, with a change of direction of about 10 degrees in the Deluge year. He writes:—I wish merely to express agreement with the author (p. 242), where he says that he sees no good reason to doubt that the gradually diminishing ages of the patriarchs, from over 900 years downwards, as related in Genesis, are records of fact, and to show in the form of a curve what is brought out by an analysis of those ages.

The indication of these curves appears to be that the age of man was rapidly going down to zero, *i.e.* that mankind would have

disappeared off the face of the earth at the point where a continuation of the first curve would strike the horizontal line, say, 500 years after the Deluge. The Deluge, however, intervened, and apparently stopped this race suicide, because the second curve, though falling at first, has a distinctly upward curvature from the first, and rapidly turns away from the zero line to a position roughly parallel to it, at a distance of about eighty years, where it remains to-day. The Deluge, therefore, would appear to be, not a catastrophe, but an urgent measure necessary to the preservation of human life on the earth.

Much may be learned from an inspection of a graphic chronology of this early age, such as that of Dr. Bullinger, which I have used as the handy source of my figures. For instance: Abraham was a contemporary of Shem for 150 years, while between the death of Joseph and the birth of Moses was a period of only 64 years; there is little space for the vague handing down of tradition and myth, through countless generations, such as we are asked to give modern scholars for the manufacture of "folk-lore."

Reply by LECTURER:—I am glad to see the large measure of acceptance accorded to the paper, the helpful and instructive comments made by many,* and the few serious criticisms, to which latter I now reply. I preface my answer by saying that in a matter of such complexity as that dealt with it is difficult to make oneself always so clear as to avoid misunderstanding, without undue prolixity, for on such subjects words are often indifferent exponents of our thoughts.

Dr. Schofield and Dr. Anderson-Berry both query my interpretation of Heb. xi, 3 (the latter in some detail). It is quite true that a "proposition denied is, that which is seen arose out of visible things"; but the question is, what is the whole meaning of the verse? If we refer to the Peshitto, the old Latin, and the Vulgate, all written when Greek was a spoken language, we find that the Peshitto runs, "these things which are seen were from those which

* I cannot forbear to express my own loss at the death of my former chief and ever-revered friend, Sir G. Scott-Moncrieff, who occupied the Chair on May 26th, and whose apt and suggestive remarks are printed above. He passed to his rest nine days later, on June 4th, while travelling to Poland in connection with the work of the London Jews' Society.

are not seen"; and the O.L. (with which the Vulgate agrees) is "the visible things were made out of invisible things." Delitzsch, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, devotes nine pages to a consideration of this verse, discussing the variant MSS. readings, the grammar of the passage, the interpretations of the Greek Fathers, and others, both ancient and modern. He points out that if the interpretation were "out of nothing," or "not out of anything," "the expression chosen could hardly be more unsuitable or less ambiguous; for that which does not appear, or is not obvious to the senses (the antithesis shows that such must be the meaning here of *μη φαινόμενον*) is not, therefore, unsubstantial or absolutely non-existent. The very opposite to this is the fundamental assumption on which the doctrine of this Epistle rests, viz., that the supersensual alone has true being or reality in accordance with the Pauline axiom (2 Cor. iv, 18)." Space forbids lengthy reference to Delitzsch's examination of this passage, but what I have given seems to warrant the great probability of my interpretation, supported as it is by the earliest interpreters we have, by eminent modern scholarship, and by Biblical argument. If I err, I err in very good company; and Dr. Anderson-Berry's sweeping remarks that "it cannot be upheld" and "there is no Scriptural authority," seem to be more dogmatic than authoritative. Finally, in discussing this text, I would repeat the wise words of Delitzsch, "At the same time we would make no rash assertion as to the inner thought of the sacred writer here." With regard to Dr. Anderson-Berry's statement that my "*explanation* of Creation is simply Hegel's," I must point out first of all that my paper does not profess to give any explanation at all of a subject which (I believe) is beyond the grasp of man; but as the whole tone of the paper shows, it is merely an attempt to throw a few side-lights on matters, the totality of which is beyond our ken, and it is possible that Dr. Anderson-Berry may have blended my quotations with my own remarks, for I cannot make that identity of my words or my thoughts with his brief extracts from Hegel, which apparently he does. Hegel and I do not go very far along the same path. With regard to energy, motion, matter, does not Dr. Anderson-Berry tend to postulate finality for the scientific investigations of the day? But we have arrived at no finality as to the composition of

matter, energy itself may not be entirely incorporeal, and ether (if I mistake not) is really a word to conceal man's ignorance. My suggestion as to the composition of matter is based upon the general trend of modern investigation, which has not reached its goal, if, indeed, it ever will.

I accept without hesitation Dr. Schofield's statements (to which Colonel Mackinlay also refers) that there *is* an unbridgeable gulf between mineral and vegetable, &c., but the question in my mind is not what is the gulf to-day, but what will it be to-morrow? The suggestion put forward is that perhaps some day it may be found that no unbridgeable gulf exists between mineral and vegetable, but that it does exist between unconscious and self-conscious life, *i.e.*, life without mind and life with mind, for I avoid purposely the definition vegetable and animal.

As regards Dr. Schofield's remarks on the walls of Jericho, it seems to me that all exercise of faith is a display of spiritual energy or power, and that in this case the faith (spiritual energy) of Joshua and the people, evidenced to all by the loud shout, caused the material walls, in which the Canaanites trusted, to fall before them. I concur entirely with Dr. Schofield in his remarks on Eden; the threatened penalty of death was death temporal, death spiritual and death eternal. I confined myself to the immediate matter under consideration.

Mr. Theodore Roberts disagrees with my suggestion with reference to Luke iv, 30, &c. Long ago I had noticed the somewhat curious phraseology of these passages, and it was a book of Professor Swete, on the appearances of our Lord after His Resurrection, that linked them up in my mind with the subject in question. Here, again, it is far from my wish to dogmatise; but I must say that Mr. Roberts' explanation of John xviii, 6, appears to me to be a little forced, and that perhaps all these cases (like the miracles) were instances of the display of spiritual power. With Mr. Roberts' concluding remarks and with those of Mr. Sidney Collett I am in full accord; and had I the leisure and the space, the paper could be improved vastly by enlargement on the lines indicated.

In answer to Colonel Mackinlay, I would say that the explanation of the phrase "immanent emanations" appears to be as follows:—"Everything existing is an emanation from God, but as

it must ever be with Him and in Him to be maintained in existence, it is immanent in Him." This, of course, is not my phrase or belief; it is that of the Kabbalists whom I quote.

Mr. Leslie appears to have misunderstood the scope of the paper, which professedly does not attempt a critical analysis of, nor propound a formal system on, matters which lie in their entirety beyond man's understanding, but tries to throw a few lights on a very complex subject—in fact, his main criticism is really that the paper confines itself to its objective. Mr. Leslie's belittling of Delitzsch has been dealt with sufficiently by Dr. Thirtle and Mr. Coles, and any general defence of such a pre-eminent Biblical scholar by myself would savour of the ridiculous. I would merely remark that Mr. Leslie does not even point out as erroneous (much less refute) a single statement of Delitzsch's which I have brought to bear on the suggestions put forward, nor does he tell us the name or the writings of any psychologist, Biblical or otherwise, who has made him obsolete or rendered him of historical interest only. Mr. Leslie's minor criticisms do not seem to call for answer.

Mr. Weller's remarks on the antediluvians, and the graph of the Patriarchs' ages which he gives, are most interesting. Another Biblical instance of enormous sins leading to race-suicide is given in Lev. xviii, 25-28, and it shows that the destruction of the Canaanites by Israel (as in the case of the Deluge on a much vaster scale) was not only a blessing to the earth, but was merely the antedating of a judgment which they had passed upon themselves. A consideration of these matters is perhaps not altogether unsuitable at the present time.

668TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, JUNE 16TH, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED W. OKE, ESQ., B.A., LL.M., IN THE CHAIR.

At the outset the CHAIRMAN made reference to the sudden death of Major-General Sir George K. Scott-Moncrieff, who presided at the last meeting, and who had often rendered valuable help to the Institute by presiding and reading papers, and also read a telegram from Dr. Schofield, announcing his inability, by doctor's orders, to take the Chair, as had been arranged.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the Hon. Secretary announced the election of the following:—The Rev. E. Morris Wherry, D.D., as a Member, and H. J. Pierce, Esq., and Miss N. Gulland as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. Charles Gardner, B.A., to deliver the Annual Address on "The Philosophy of Modernism."

ANNUAL ADDRESS.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERNISM.

By the REV. CHARLES GARDNER, B.A.

WHEN speaking on Modernism one becomes aware that the word is tiresomely vague. Strictly speaking, Modernism was a recent movement in the Church of Rome which was speedily crushed. But it is used generally in a much wider sense for the modern mind, which is at least 300 years old. It includes Biblical criticism; but the critics have always an *a priori* philosophy, and that philosophy is always more or less pantheistic. I am dealing with the Dean of St. Paul's in this paper, not because he is really a Modernist (he is not), but because he touches Modernism at all points, and proposes a way out of its difficulties. I shall here pass over his Bampton Lectures on Mysticism and the Lectures on Plotinus, assuming that you know that he is a Neoplatonist.

Describing an age by its dominant spirit, we may call the nineteenth century determinist, and the twentieth (so far as it has gone) subjective-idealist. Dr. Inge can give a dozen cogent reasons for refusing the first. It regarded the world "as an independent, objectively existing system, and ignored the part

played by the perceiving mind." To explain the nature of things, it forsook the fruits, which Aristotle considered to be the index, and grubbed among the roots. It was pitifully unable to account for the observed facts of life and mind. It was aggressively derisive of the miraculous and supernatural. Dr. Inge has retained this last. Good Platonists like Coleridge and Frederick Denison Maurice had by the aid of Plato withstood the stiff determinism of their time, and passing, like many Platonists of the early centuries to Christianity, gladly accepted its pure and beautiful teaching of the supernatural. But while criticizing mechanical determinism, Dr. Inge is no better pleased with the new idealism. On the surface it seems to defend his monism, but really it divides the world into two—the world of science and the world of the perceiving mind—and to the Dean, as we already know too well, any kind of dualism is a red flag. His escape from the dilemma is by the graduated system of Plotinus, who, by regarding the world as a propulsion and reflection of the soul, and the soul of the spirit, preserved the unity against the background of the Absolute.

Dr. Inge's position is seen more clearly when we study his attitude to the Roman Catholic Modernists and their friends in the Anglican Church. France appears to have produced the largest crop of Modernists. There are the two Sabatiers, Le Roy, Brémond, Laberthonnière, Inge's *bête noir* Loisy, and many others. The best-known English Catholic Modernist was George Tyrrell.

The first difficulty of the Modernists arose from the Higher Criticism of the Bible which could no longer be ignored. Germany had been at work for a hundred years, using her heaviest guns of learning and research. The Bible was found to be so bristling with errors, inconsistencies and contradictions that it was wholly incompetent to carry the weight of its supernatural origin and supernatural story. The result was that the critics set to work to treat the books of the Bible like literature, and to read their story on a naturalistic hypothesis. So long as their attention was fixed on the Old Testament they were not much regarded. But to eliminate the supernatural from the Gospel story leaves a remarkably small residuum. The Virgin birth and the lovely stories of the Infancy, the miracles, excepting some of the miracles of healing which were really natural, the Resurrection and the Ascension, could no longer be regarded as history. It became the ambition of each critic in turn to con-

struct the true story of Jesus and supply the natural reason of His actions. Schweitzer has enumerated all the ways that the critics have tried to tell a coherent story. His own way was the most coherent and least acceptable.

The higher critical results were accepted by the Modernists ; but since they were Roman Catholics, and Catholicism can live only in the atmosphere of the supernatural, they found themselves in an impossible position which they tried to evade by extensive borrowings from the new philosophy.

The supernatural stories were not untrue, and therefore to be dismissed. They were a religious wrapping of what was true in experience. Man's spiritual life involves a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, and this is the inner truth of the legend of Jesus Christ's death and Resurrection. The dogma of the Resurrection is not an historical but a religious truth ; and the Modernists enunciated a theory of two Christs—the Christ of history and the Christ of faith. It was troublesome that a dogma was less true than it was formerly supposed to be. But Le Roy discovered that dogmas can never be an adequate expression of man's deepest religious feeling, and he further remembered that Newman had admitted something like this. If dogma could not in the nature of things express the absolute truth, it was unreasonable to demand that it should be wholly true.

The attempt to make Newman the father of Modernism is a venture of faith rather than a fact. Dr. Inge, Dr. Newman and the Modernists alike insist on the inadequacy of dogma to express the whole truth. But that was no innovation. St. Anselm, to mention only one orthodox theologian of the Middle Ages, affirmed the same thing. The inadequacy of dogma forced St. Anselm and the Modernists to opposite conclusions. He considered that dogma was less than the truth : they, though they do not say it, that truth is less than the dogma.

The representational nature of dogma led, in France, to the formulation of the Modernist school under the name of Symbolo-fidéisme, Auguste Sabatier and Ménégoz being reckoned the chief founders. The modern use of the word symbol changed its primitive meaning that a symbol is the thing symbolized. To-day a symbol is *not* the thing symbolized ; if it were, there would be little to criticize in the new symbolism. Dogmas are symbols, and so are those events in the career of the whole Christ that cannot be brought under the heading of the natural.

The separation of the symbolical Christ of faith from the true Jesus of history was a crass bit of dualism, scarcely atoned for by the assertion that the unity lay in the symbolism.

Modernism, which was nothing if it was not radical, proceeded to criticize Plato and, by the mouth of Laberthonnière, declared that Plato's ideas were of things and not of life, that his philosophy was mechanical, since it made history the gradual unrolling or revelation of what was written in the scroll. This departure from Plato led to an exclusive emphasis on life and will. The real world was the will-world, the force was ever-changing life. The will to believe became an autonomous life-will process grandly immune from the shafts of history and criticism. Here was Modernism bowing to Bergson and throwing itself into the arms of a Pragmatism that brilliant William James, with the aid of Fechner, was already pushing towards pluralism.

The Modernist revolt against Plato scatters the last remains of the New Testament left by the German critics. Loisy, outdoing the Germans, expunged the synoptic story until very few authentic words of Jesus were left, and Jesus Himself appeared the most pathetic of those enthusiastic and deluded men at the beginning of our era who supposed themselves to be the Messiah. The death of Jesus on a cross was a tragic climax to His career. The casting of His body along with those of the two thieves into a ditch may touch our pity, but it should have put an end once for all to the obstinate Jewish expectation of a Messiah.

Loisy has written an elaborate treatise on the Fourth Gospel. This, of course, cannot be brought into harmony with the synoptic gospels interpreted according to Loisy, Tyrrell, Schweitzer and the whole eschatological school. But it was for a time supposed by the Higher Critics to have some religious value. It is this remnant respect for an allegorical book that the revolt against Plato has destroyed. With the passing of Plato, the magnificent Logos-Christianity passes too. Cut the Platonic parallels out of St. John's Gospel and Epistles, out of St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, out of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the wreckage of the New Testament is complete indeed.

Dr. Inge feels as deeply as any Modernist the Bible problem. He has looked at the pitiful figure of a deluded Christ left by the critics, and he will not for one moment accept it. Such a Jesus would have been an impotent cause for the actual effects

in history. But here comes his difficulty. The synoptic authors represent Jesus saying repeatedly that the Kingdom of God will come with power, and that He Himself will return in His own generation. If Jesus really spoke thus, He was deceived in a matter of supreme importance, and is, therefore, to be discredited like all fanatics. If He did not expect the immediate end, He has been mis-reported, and the problem shifts to an examination into the credibility of the Gospel narratives.

We have already seen that Dr. Inge is scornful of any kind of supernaturalism or dualism. Therefore, when he reads the synoptic gospels he has to discount the stories of the Birth and Infancy, Resurrection and Ascension, most of the so-called miracles, and many of the words attributed to Jesus. This drastic treatment leaves, perhaps, the Sermon on the Mount, a few parables and a few isolated sayings, but the residuum is far too slender for the vast superstructure of historical Christianity, and too narrow a basis even for a more *récherché* scheme of religion or philosophy.

With these grave difficulties Dr. Inge looked yearningly at the French Modernists, and at the sharp distinction which they made between truths of faith and truths of fact. For a moment he thought that they had "laid the foundations of a new apologetic on this distinction."* But only for a moment. Perhaps his English sense of truthfulness rose in revolt. Anyway, he dismissed symbolofidisme because of its dualism of faith and science, and also because he remembered that when the gods become symbols they are already in the twilight, and it is the twilight of sunset and not of sunrise.

Dr. Inge's teaching of the representational nature of dogma, together with his acceptance of much Bible criticism, were the reason of his being mistaken for a Modernist in the early years of this century, and the coupling of his name with that of Loisy by Archdeacon Lilley in his *Modernism: a Record and Review*.

Archdeacon Lilley quotes from Dr. Inge's *Faith and Knowledge* passages about dogma which might have been written by Loisy himself. He says: "If I had been asked to name an English theologian who would unreservedly appreciate what I had taken to be the position of M. Loisy, I should at once have named Mr. Inge."†

The Archdeacon, who has more right than any other English

* *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, p. 99.

† *Modernism*, pp. 76-87. (Pitman.)

theologian to speak with authority on the French Modernists, says that Dr. Inge has, in fact, misunderstood M. Loisy when he accuses him of separating faith and science. M. Loisy, he insists, "so far from proclaiming a complete separation between faith and science, is insisting upon their consentient witness. They are indeed for him different modes of apprehension, each valid in its own sphere. But for one who believes in a Divine activity in the facts of history, and in a supreme expression of that activity in the life of Jesus of Nazareth culminating in the manifestation of His risen life as Lord and Christ, their witness must agree."* That is well said, and recalls the fond hopes of our English Modernists that they had unified the life of Christ and the life of history in the light of immanence. Yet Dr. Inge was right in saying that Loisy had separated two kinds of truth. If faith says that Jesus Christ rose again from the dead and history that He did not, the dualism can be overcome only by weakening one of the truths, and the Modernists pushing on into pragmatism kept the faith and its implied will and denied the validity of history.

No doubt it was irritating to Dr. Inge to have his name coupled with Loisy's, and it accounts for his touch of temper whenever at one time he referred to Loisy. I remember, at the Religious Thought Society, Baron von Hügel gently rebuking him for the way he spoke of one of his, the Baron's, friends. Dr. Inge accepted the rebuke, and has since refrained his impatience.

The truth is that Dr. Inge is in no sense of the word a Modernist except in the matter of Biblical criticism; and even here he is only half-modernist. He takes refuge in Plotinus, and since Platonism enters so deeply into the New Testament, he is able to keep the religious value of those books which the anti-platonist Modernists have cast aside. With them he rejects the Messianism of the synoptic gospels: unlike them he keeps the Logos Christianity of the Fourth Gospel.

Dr. Inge, then, is primarily a neoplatonist. Plotinus, criticized and straightened here and there, gives him a system, at once mystical, idealist, realist, intellectual, and most reasonable. With its aid he can gather up the fragments of the three Messianic gospels, and with a little readjustment he can accept the substance of the Logos Fourth Gospel. He can even admit "that the Johannine Christ may well be a truer historical picture than is often supposed. The deep congruity between this portrait and

* *Id.*, p. 81.

those of the synoptists has long ago been settled by the Christian consciousness."* But he will not accept the catholic faith that Jesus Christ is the Saviour-God. The Saviour-God cycle of ideas, which included the notion of His death and resurrection, is Greek, and was inevitably hoisted on to the gospel when it was believed that the body of Jesus rose again from the tomb. For Dr. Inge Jesus was a Prophet and Teacher who told His countrymen "that their millennium was not coming at all . . . that He had been commissioned to bring them . . . a spiritual and moral emancipation which would make life happy and blessed for them. . . . This 'unpatriotic pessimism' was too much for His countrymen; so . . . they crucified Him." †

Dr. Inge retains the dogma of the Resurrection as that of the Incarnation so long as they are not defined. "For my part," he says, "I think that questions as to the *manner* of the Incarnation and of the Resurrection may safely be left alone by those who are convinced that the Word was made flesh and tabernacled among us." ‡

Let us gather what such great words as church, authority, revelation, sacraments, experience, ethics, mean for Dr. Inge.

The Church was not "founded" by Christ. The famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church," was an ecclesiastical interpolation. Jesus was concerned with the inner Kingdom of God, and not with the Church. Still, a body of men and women grew around Him which may not unfitly be called the Church. "The true 'Church' as the depository of inspiration in matters of belief and practice is the whole body of men and women who have any enlightenment in such matters. This Church has no accredited organ and claims no finality for its utterances. It does homage to the past . . . to preserve the knowledge and experience already gained. . . . Ideally, this Church is the Divine Spirit immanent in humanity." §

The true Church reaches far into the past before the time of our Lord, and with it Authority, which is "the principle of continuity, the memory of the race." ||

* *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, pp. 132-133. (John Murray.)

† *The Church and the Age*, pp. 22-23. (Longmans.)

‡ *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, p. 115.

§ *Faith and its Psychology*, pp. 105-106. (Duckworth & Co.)

|| *Id.*, p. 71.

Revelation is the unveiling of what is written in man's purest spirit, or, in the words of Emerson, quoted and approved of by Dr. Inge, "the announcements of the soul, its manifestations of its own nature."*

The sacraments, whether ordained by Christ or not, are symbolic acts. "A sacrament . . . has no ulterior object except to give expression to, and in so doing to effectuate, a relation which is too purely spiritual to find utterance in the customary activities of life."†

Experience, not of one individual, but of the whole human race, is the rock foundation on which the vast superstructure rests.

"Rational ethics" are the moral dictates of experience. And since it is a truth of experience that man may know the Absolute, God, and God is good as well as beautiful and true, morality rests finally on an ultimate good which preserves it from relativity and subjectivism.

So far all the extracts are from the Dean's books published before the war. The Great War seems to have thrown the beginning of the century into the remote past. To the majority of people it was a trial by fire of their faith. Only those with a robust faith faithfully won emerged unshaken. Among these was Dr. Inge. He knew his mind from the beginning, and had no need to belch his smoke in the face of the public like Wells and some younger writers. Neither has he wasted his intellectual energies passing from phase to phase like others whose knowledge is too slender to be a guide. The years, if they have not brought, have confirmed the philosophic mind, which has radiated out in many directions until Dr. Inge could speak with authority on the intricate problems of Civilization and State, on White and Yellow Races, and, most unclerical of subjects, Eugenics.

His two post-war books are his *Outspoken Essays*, first and second series. The first has gatherings from his pre-war period like *Bishop Gore and the Church of England*, *Roman Catholic Modernism*, and *Cardinal Newman*. The Gore essay, while critical, is an attempt to do justice to a man from whom the Dean deeply differs. As we all know, the Bishop needs no defence, since no one is so competent to defend him as himself.

* *Id.*, p. 26.

† *Christian Mysticism*, p. 255.

The essay on Cardinal Newman pays a dignified tribute which anyone might well be proud to receive.

The second series of *Outspoken Essays* contains the Dean's own *Confessio Fidei* and *The Victorian Age*, which shows a slight stiffening of his mind and odd remnants of Victorian prejudice. Of the essays generally we may remark that they show increased intellectual vigour and concentrated power. In the earlier days he allowed himself to write of the "roaring trade" of Lourdes, to call the faith-healer a "medicine man" (was Christ a medicine man?), and to jibe at things that touched his prejudices in language not always dignified. Now, with the exception of the word *Outspoken* to catch the ears of the people whom he usually disdains, he has reached a high level of literature. It is noticeable that, whereas many have to struggle from the *via dolorosa* of journalism into literature, the Dean, who holds the literary plane by eugenic right, looks wistfully at journalism, and even condescends to walk on its dusty highway.

The Outspoken Essays betray the immense range of Dr. Inge's learning, not ostentatiously, but by the power of his sentences, which are packed full. The sometimes cheap satire has become ironic strength, the heavy humour grim and often deadly.

Confessio Fidei is a marvellously condensed statement in 59 pages of what might easily have gone to 1,000. He reiterates his Christian Platonic faith, adding details here and there which leave the implications of earlier statements no longer in doubt.

"The Incarnation and the Cross are the central doctrines of Christianity. . . . The Cross is not so much an atonement for the past as the opening of a gate into the future."*

Since Dr. Inge will have none of the supernatural, he looks for light on some of the miracles in the gospels to the new psychology and its pronouncements on the power of mind over matter.†

On the question of Biblical criticism, while admitting that "the Johannine writings may be called an inspired interpretation of the person and significance of Christ,"‡ he places them subsequent to St. Paul, not only in date of composition, which is orthodox, but also in idea, which is heterodox, and so makes the problem of the Fourth Gospel to some of us more difficult than ever.

* *Outspoken Essays*, pp. 46-47.

† *Id.*, p. 50.

‡ *Id.*, p. 40.

To conclude, here are a few aphorisms :—

“The controversy between realism and idealism is solved in the Divine knowledge.”

“True philosophy is theocentric.”*

“Imagination is the objectifying contemplation of the Platonist.”†

“Secularism, in promising us a delusive millennium upon earth, has robbed mankind of the hope of immortality.”‡

“True faith is belief in the reality of absolute values.”§

Dr. Inge's mysticism and neoplatonism give him a position that would be impregnable if he were a professor only and not a priest of the Church. Mysticism has shown itself to be independent of creeds and countries. It may take a special colour from a special country during the stages of the neophyte's flight to the One. But the union once achieved, accidents of colour and form, illusions of time and space, divisions of country and sphere vanish, and mysticism, which gives no credence to time, remains the most perdurable thing in time. If Dr. Inge were a true mystic only he would be safe in his ark. But he is a Platonist too. Plato, like Aristotle, has been attacked so often, and has prevailed so constantly, that we may suppose that his philosophy represents a permanent human state, and that it would have got formulated sooner or later even had Plato never lived. Anyone who realizes the strength of Plato must scorn the Modernist attack. The Dean is safely ensconced, he is assured the foundations are secure, and therefore when the Modernists, and Supernaturalists and Irrationists and Anglo-Catholics furiously rage together and imagine a vain thing, the Dean laughs them to scorn, and has them in derision.

Since, however, the Dean is a priest of the Church he must either measure the faith or be measured by it. He prefers to do the measuring, and those who hold the faith are left to apply their test.

We maintain that the faith is Christ, and that Christ is the whole Christ—living, dying, rising, ascending, speaking by the Holy Spirit. Further we believe, as His disciples came to believe, that Christ is God. We find ourselves utterly unable to believe that the coming of God into this world was a natural act ; but since God did not bind His Will in subservience

* *Id.*, p. 20. † *Id.*, p. 21. ‡ *Id.*, p. 33. § *Id.*, p. 35.

to the world that He made, we find it easy to believe that the Birth of God was a supernatural act ; we do not stumble to find that His lowly life was attended by signs of His origin ; we expect His Resurrection and Ascension to follow in a higher-logical sequence ; and afterwards when the Scriptures testify to different aspects of His incarnate glory, and are marvellously one in their convergent testimony, it seems to us the most natural thing in the world.

Since Christianity is a faith in God's coming into the world, it is essentially supernaturalistic. To deny the supernatural is to sever the plant from the root. Cut the supernatural element out of the story of Christ, and it becomes the most terribly pathetic story of an illusional dreamer the world has ever heard.

What shall we say, then, of Dr. Inge's great and persistent denial of the supernatural ? We think that he has yielded to the time-spirit—the spirit of the age, and just when he had withstood its most subtle shafts in the name of Plotinus, he throws Christ to it in the name of a uniform nature.

There is much to be said in excuse. Again and again theologians have made a crude dualism between nature and supernature. Nature has been called bad names as if it had a different origin from supernature. The best modern thought has vindicated nature, and discovered in it a Divine process.

It is often those who have seen the footprints of God in nature most clearly, who are loudest in their refusal of supernature. But when we accept the divinity of nature and perceive in her God's continuous mediate work, we still need a word to express His immediate acts which we think of as personal rather than legal. St. Paul, St. Thomas Aquinas, our eighteenth-century Bishop Butler were able to build their supernatural on the natural because they traced the natural back to God. Granting that Bishop Butler may have left the edges of the natural too sharp, that we may with profit soften the transition from the natural to the supernatural, that the two are ultimately one, yet since we are creatures of time we must not behave as if we had left time behind, but accept the fruitful dualism until it is transcended in God.

The controversy might be discussed as a fight about words until we apply it to the Gospels when the issues suddenly become immense.

Dr. Inge affirms his faith in the Incarnation and Resurrection,

but thinks the *manner* of these stupendous acts may safely be left alone* In reality he does not leave the *manner* alone since he has rejected the supernatural, and there are but two alternatives. If the Birth of Jesus was not supernatural it was natural, and He was born like the rest of us. For a natural explanation of the Resurrection one must say either that Jesus had only swooned on the Cross and recovered in the cool sepulchre or that His body, as Loisy suggests, was thrown into a ditch and returned to dust.

Dr. Inge thinks that some of the miracles were triumphs of mind over matter and therefore natural. He can hardly suppose that the raisings from the dead, Christ walking on the water, the feeding of the five thousand, the turning of water into wine, the stilling of the storm, were examples of mind controlling matter. They were either supernatural or they did not happen.

Dr. Inge, then, is an anti-supernaturalist. He approves of Carlyle's supernatural-natural. His Christ is part of the natural. He quotes the modern rejection of the supernatural in support of his position.

The modern mind began to get restive under supernaturalism rather more than a hundred years ago. Goethe, Carlyle, Matthew Arnold, and a large company in Germany and France, affirmed the whole natural process to be Divine, and in the change of philosophy involved found themselves at the feet of Spinoza. We think that they were right. The alternative for those who rejected historical Christianity was Spinoza or Comte, Pantheism or Positivism. Positivism suited best the uncompromising determinism of the time. Supernaturalists shaken in their faith frequently forsook their position for a determinism that Inge and most thinkers to-day declare to be untrue. Dr. Inge is equally opposed to the anti-intellectualism of yesterday, which allowed the supernaturalists once more to lift up their hands.

Dr. Inge's aristocratic, philosophic, individualistic mind certainly drives him into an exclusive position. The supernaturalists, the determinists, the pantheists and the anti-intellectualists are all wrong. The majority may be useful when they strengthen his contention for a natural Christianity; at other times they and all democrats and socialists are merely victims

* *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, p. 115.

to the spirit of the age to be anathematized by the select little group grounded in the philosophy of Plotinus.

Allied with Dr. Inge's anti-supernaturalism is his exaltation of reason to the foremost place. When he affirms that the higher reason, together with all the faculties and feelings of man, perceive the truth we agree with him. The Logos includes the reason. The modern notion that reason can only make diagrams of the perceptions received through intuition is also, we think, untrue. But we do not think the reason is the highest faculty. William Blake declared that there were four mighty ones in every man. The reason he called Urizen, the imaginative intuitional Los. In perfect man Los is supreme, Urizen a servant of Los. Dr. Inge has reversed the order. He is Urizen pounding away with his intellect, and only in the intervals of his sledgehammer strokes, when his right hand is a bit weary, does Sol shine on his snows and reveal the beauty of his crystals.

Dr. Inge's higher rationalism works hand in hand with his anti-supernaturalism on the Scriptures and the dogmas of the Church. He believes in the Incarnation, the Cross, the Resurrection. These stupendous acts of God are called by the Church mysteries. The acts of God cannot be fully explained, eternity cannot be equated with time, and, therefore, the supreme events in the life of Christ remain mysterious. If the reason deals with them, it must first modify them. This is what Dr. Inge has persistently done. The Incarnation, which means that God became man, becomes the cosmic principle of life and reason—the Logos, which ever strives to become incarnate in man, becoming incarnate in Jesus, so that He may be called *the Incarnate Word*. The Atonement, which means that God took on Himself the responsibility of the sins of His creatures and died for them on the Cross, thus opening the gate of life, becomes not an expiation of man's sins, but the cutting of a new path. The Resurrection which means that God, by His great power, raised again the body of Christ, becomes Christ's survival of bodily death. The message of the Messiah to His ancient people and the offer to them of the Kingdom becomes a bit of obsolete messianism. The coming again of Christ becomes the foolish illusion of His first disciples. The Church, of which Christ is the Foundation, becomes a Pauline institution of which Christ knew nothing. And Jesus Himself? What think ye of Christ? Jesus the prophet and teacher, God incarnate, becomes a successful incarnation of the Word, so that

the difference between us and Jesus Christ is not ultimately the difference between the creature and the Creator, but a difference between our partial and His complete attainment to God's thought about man. Jesus Christ may no longer be the lawful object of our worship ; He is an elder brother who has trodden the path of immortality that we may follow after.

That for all its solid worth is a poor substitute for historic Christianity. Is the whole blame to fall on Dr. Inge ? We think not. Much of his criticism, much of the higher criticism, has not yet been answered. Apologists have recourse to old and worn-out arguments. Everyone to-day is crying out for a restatement. We are weary of the demand. What is needed is not a restatement, but a new apologetic. Here let me say, in conclusion, that Dr. Inge, under the tutorship of Plotinus, has built, if not a temple, a considerable edifice, on the foundation of human experience. We know how rich and full the store of experience is, reaching as it does into the far past. Yet it is the experience of men and women who have all come short of the glory of God, and it must have remained incomplete unless God had shown us His face in a Perfect Man. We may build on the whole Christ and find our foundation complete and sure ; otherwise we shall just pitifully fail in the crucial probation of life.

Dr. Inge's love of Plotinus has saved him from the determinism which cramped so many great spirits in the nineteenth century ; it has saved him from the pragmatism, subjective idealism, and anti-intellectualism of our own time. He holds a place that was temporarily held by Augustine before he became a Christian. Let him, like Augustine and a goodly company long ago, take the final step to the whole Christ, and he will find that all those precious things that he holds most dear will not be lost, but safely garnered in Him who is not only the Way, but also the Truth and the Life.

For, and it must be said, he reads Christ in the light of Neoplatonism, instead of Neoplatonism and all other things in the light of Christ. He has the genius of philosophy, but somehow has missed the genius of Christ's Christianity. There is in the undiluted Gospel story a divine simplicity, an artless beauty, a terrible splendour, a springing joy, the secret of which is whispered not to the wise and learned, but to those who, leaving all things, even their thoughts, abandon themselves to the foolish Lamb of God and follow Him whithersoever He goeth.

DISCUSSION.

Lieut.-Col. MACKINLAY said : " I desire to add my thanks to those already given to Mr. Gardner, particularly for the service he has done in pointing out the fallacy of those who deny the supernatural in the Bible, yielding to the spirit of this age ; but has not our author himself yielded to the same spirit, though on a much smaller scale, by his use of such long words as *perdurable*, *subjective-idealist*, *neoplatonist*, etc., making it somewhat difficult for the ordinary man readily to comprehend his meaning—a difficulty augmented by the mysticism of many of the leading modern popular theological teachers.

On the other hand, the phraseology of the paper before us is valuable, because it is written from the standpoint of the day, and we welcome the fact that a leading evangelical theologian can meet the modernist on his own ground, so that it cannot be said with truth that those who accept the inspiration of Scripture, and the full Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ are only to be found among the ignorant and uneducated.

The paper before us is evidently the result of considerable thought, and its careful study in its printed form will well repay the reader. I understand that the author is writing a book on the same subject ; may it have a wide circulation."

After acknowledging the interest and general usefulness of the paper, Mr. C. F. HOGG, speaking of the Chairman's reference to the Roman Catholic attitude to the Scriptures, remarked that while he, (the speaker) had no sympathy whatever with that community, yet it was only fair to say that some Jesuit Fathers had been engaged for several years past in translating the Scriptures out of the original tongues into English. Considerable portions have already been published. This is probably the first time in history that the Vulgate has been set aside by Rome.

In the paper there are references to the Birth of the Lord Jesus as "supernatural" (pp. 268, 269). Scripture, however, speaks not of a supernatural Birth but of a supernatural Conception. The Divine intervention, that is to say, was at Nazareth, not at Bethlehem ; it is recorded in Luke i, 31-35, not in Luke ii, 6, 7. The words of the writer represent rather the Romanist doctrine than the New Testament statements.

Mr. Gardner's words at the head of p. 262 may well be taken as his summary of Modernist teaching, but those at the foot of p. 267 are a declaration of his own belief. Why then does he speak of "Christ . . . coming in the power of the Holy Spirit"? The language of the Lord and of His Apostles concerning His return is as concrete as is that concerning His Resurrection and Ascension. The Spirit was to come, and He came; the Lord was to come—why not keep these as distinct as did the Lord Himself? Why not expect the one to be as literally fulfilled as the other has been?

It is part of the Modernist position, indeed, that there is no historical foundation for the story of the Fall recorded in Genesis, but is not the fallen condition of the men and women to whom He spoke the presupposition of the teaching of the Lord? And if He said that "this generation shall not pass away, till all things be accomplished" the quite usual reference of the word to moral characteristics, *vide* Ps. xiv, 5; lxxviii, 8; lxx; and Phil. ii, 15, gives a good meaning here also.

The criterion of the Christian position is twofold. What is the right attitude to the Bible? To Christ?

Is the Bible a record of the experiences of certain religious persons seeking after God? Or is it the record of God's revelation of Himself to men? Is it the reaching out of superior men after God, or is it the Hand of God outstretched to His rebellious creature? As I understand it, the former is the rationalistic, the latter the Christian line of approach to the Scriptures.

Is Christ the Teacher and Exemplar of men merely, or is He Saviour as well? This involves the further question whether man needs only to have suitable guidance and stimulus afforded him upon his long and difficult upward path, or whether, being a sinner, he needs, before all things, a Deliverer? Here again the rationalistic answer, at its best, is the former, whereas the Christian owns JESUS as Saviour and Lord, saying to Him with conviction and with joy "My Lord and my God."

It is all to the good that Mr. Gardner should draw attention to the pressing need of a new apologetic. The diligence of Higher Critical scholarship must be acknowledged, whereas the saner (in my judgement) school is supplying few investigators, and few expositors. Indeed, it may be surmised that the decay of expository preaching

has left a soil favourable to the dissemination of ideas antagonistic to the authority of Scripture. Denunciation is but a confession of weakness ; ignorance in assertive mood does not provide what St. Paul calls " the defence and confirmation of the Gospel."

Lieut.-Colonel F. MOLONY said : With reference to the paragraph at top of page 262, giving Dean Inge's opinion that Jesus said He would return in His own generation.

We should surely bear in mind that He also said " But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

We have every reason to believe that this last was really said by Jesus Christ. It apparently detracted from His divinity, and therefore would never have been invented by His disciples.

Surely all the statements made by Christ Himself and His followers about the time of the Second Coming, must be considered in conjunction with the Master's Own statement that He did not know the time.

We cannot reasonably hold that " He was deceived in a matter of supreme importance, and is, therefore, to be discredited like all fanatics," when He Himself stated His lack of knowledge ; a thing, by the way, which no fanatic would have done.

The point is important because many modernists and sceptics make this a test case.

Pastor W. PERCIVAL-PRESCOTT said : In the last four lines of page 261, and the first eight of page 262, the Rev. C. Gardner presents Dr. Inge's difficulty.

Now, I think the lecturer should have made it quite clear that Dr. Inge need not have come to any such conclusions, for in none of the Gospels does Jesus say that He would return to set up His Kingdom " in His own generation."

The word " generation " and the phrase " this generation," are used by Christ several times in the Gospels, but nearly always in connection with the character of the generation in which He lived. It was a " wicked generation," a " faithless and perverse generation," an " adulterous generation." It was a " generation of vipers " upon which would come " all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharius, son of Barachias. . . . Verily I say unto you, *all these things* shall come upon *this generation* " (Matt. xxiii, 34-36).

Attention is directed to the two expressions in this passage, "*these things*" and "*this generation.*" "*These things*" has reference to the punishment for all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, and there can be no dispute that "*this generation*" has reference to the generation living when Christ uttered these words. When upon the mount of Olives, Jesus gave His disciples something additional, regarding the Temple, saying: "There shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down" (Matt. xxiv, 2), and this elicited from them, *two* supremely important questions: "Tell us when shall *these things* be? and what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and the end of the world?"

Jesus proceeded to answer *the first question*, giving the indications, one by one, of the approaching destruction of the city and Temple, and finally He gave them the sign by which they were to know when to leave the city to escape its destruction. When they should see Jerusalem compassed with armies (Luke xxi, 20) they were to flee to the mountains. They looked for this sign, and by heeding it when it first appeared the Christians made good their escape from the doomed city. Afterwards, the Roman armies entirely surrounded the city and took it, putting the inhabitants to the sword and destroying the Temple.

Having now answered the first question of the disciples concerning the time when "*these things*" would come upon "*this generation,*" Christ begins to answer the *second question*, "What shall be the sign of Thy coming and the end of the world?" The Master replied, "There shall be signs."

This is a straightforward answer without modification or evasion. The signs were to be given to reveal the time when "all who love His appearing" might look with assurance for their Saviour.

* * * * *

To summarize, it is as though Jesus said to His disciples: *First* Jerusalem and the Temple shall be destroyed. *Then* will come great persecution upon Christians—"these are the beginning of sorrows." "But the end is not yet." The oppression will go on for a long period of time, but for the elects' sake it will be divinely shortened. *Afterwards*, there shall be signs in the heavens, and *succeeding these* there shall come signs upon the earth. *Finally*, there shall appear the sign of the coming of the Son of Man.

The generation that saw these last signs upon the earth would not pass away till Christ returned to set up His Kingdom of Glory.

Lient.-Colonel HOPE BIDDULPH said: With reference to the use of the word generation on page 262, and remarks made thereon in this discussion, the expression "generation" does not, I think, necessarily mean a period of 30 or 40 years.

Many commentators recognise a wider significance to the word, such as a particular class, or in this case even the Jewish race. This would appear to be borne out by many texts of Scripture, *e.g.* :—

"There is a generation that curseth their father"; "there is a generation that are pure in their own eyes," &c. (Prov. xxx, 11, 12, 13, 14).

"This is the generation of them that seek Him" (Ps. xxiv, 6).

"I should offend against the generation of thy children" (Ps. 73-15).

"Whoever shall be ashamed of Me in this adulterous . . . generation" (Mark viii, 38).

"Ye are a chosen generation" (1 Pet. ii, 9).

"It shall be counted to the Lord for a generation" (Ps. xxii, 30).

All the above, and others besides, seem to indicate a *class* of men.

Dr. SCHOFIELD, who was unable through illness to take the chair, as arranged, has sent the following critique of Mr. Gardner's paper: "The title of this paper hardly foreshadows such a detailed criticism of Dean Inge as practically fills it; and I judge the subject would gain in interest if more occupied with principles which are immortal rather than with a personality who is ephemeral.

"I think that Dr. Inge is somewhat in advance of his dogmatic standpoint which is here subjected to such a masterly analysis, and this, I think, because he touches in his mysticism a higher point than is reached by his intellectualism. Reason is not wisdom. To be intellectual is not necessarily to be wise. In reason is no love, there is much in wisdom: and love is the most divine form of the Infinite. It is wisdom, not intellect, that is the lamp of love. To quote Maeterlinck here,* 'If you love, you must needs become wise. Be wise and you surely shall love. . . . and those in whom

* *Wisdom and Destiny*, p. 78. (George Allen.)

love never dies must needs continue to love as their soul grows nobler and nobler.' It is along this line, I think, that mysticism may lead the soul into the presence of God, and the above quotation is of interest as showing how far a man, apart from the Christian faith, may reach in seeking God. Now that Christianity has come any passer-by can pick the fruit.

"The writer of this paper, while saying much of the Dean's condensation and concentration, has, I think, himself actually exceeded Dr. Inge. The valuable truths it contains would have gained much in lucidity had they been expanded to double their length.

"There can be no doubt of the value of the paper in so fully carrying out the first Concept of the Victoria Institute, 'To investigate in a reverent spirit important questions of Philosophy and Science, especially those bearing upon Holy Scripture. It is a powerful monograph on a unique figure in the Anglican Church."

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Mr. Hogg objects to my calling the Birth of our Lord supernatural. I call it supernatural because He was born of a virgin. The other objection has arisen because I did not express my meaning quite clearly. I meant that the ascended Lord *speaks* by the Holy Ghost; I was not explaining away His second coming.

Col. Molony has not quite understood what I wrote at the top of page 262. It is not Dr. Inge's opinion that Jesus said He would return in His own generation; he thinks, rather, that that was the expectation of the first disciples. I think I can best answer Col. Molony, Pastor Percival-Prescott, and Col. Hope Biddulph together. There is no need to explain away the word "generation." Our Lord had a very real ministry to His ancient people; for which reason St. Paul called Him the Minister of the Circumcision. We may sum up His ministry to His own by saying that He offered to them the Gospel of the Kingdom on the condition that they repented and believed in Him. His promise was specific. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if you will receive Me the Kingdom will come in this present generation." Instead, they rejected and crucified Him. The offer was not immediately withdrawn. The "ministry of the Circumcision" was entrusted to St. Peter, and he

preached that if Israel would repent and believe, the Lord would immediately return from Heaven. Again Israel rejected the message. Having refused the acceptable year of the Lord, they were cut off from the olive-tree, and believing Gentiles were grafted in. After the apostacy of Israel the full revelation concerning Christ and the Church was given to St. Paul. The Lord had the prescience of His rejection from the beginning of His ministry. St. John says: "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not"; and he proceeds to record the ministry of the rejected Messiah, which the Lord fulfilled side by side with His ministry to Israel.