

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 4. — APRIL, 1888.

I. THE LOLLARDS.

IN the Middle Ages there were developed two opposite views of the sphere and mission of the church. One was that of Hildebrand and his school, who began with the claim that the church should be independent of the secular power, and ended with the demand that all civil rulers should recognize the successor of St. Peter as their suzerain. The natural outcome of this theory was that the administration of civil governments should be largely in the hands of ecclesiastics, that the hierarchy should be enriched at the expense of the state, and that the whole body of the clergy should be practically divorced from their spiritual functions.

The other view found advocates in William of Ockham and Marsilius of Padua, who held that the sphere of the church was purely spiritual. Not only was the state independent of the church, but the pope, with all ecclesiastics, was of right, in all secular concerns, subject to the civil ruler.

Of this latter view John Wyclif became the champion in England. It was as a member of the Parliament of 1366, which repudiated the papal claim for tribute that King John had engaged to pay, that we first hear of Wyclif's opposition to the pretensions of Rome. From that time forth he was busy refuting her claims, and, by the use of all the means in his power, helping on the efforts, then making under the lead of John of Gaunt, to exclude the dignitaries of the church from secular offices and confine them to their legitimate work.

the majesty of law be set forth than in the words of Hooker's impressive eulogy: "Of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage—the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempt from her power: both angels and men, and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy."

B. M. PALMER.

III. THE WORD OF GOD VERSUS "THE BIBLE OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY."

WE are accustomed to speak of the Scriptures as the Word of God. The Larger Catechism declares: "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, the only rule of faith and practice." Our Lord denounces the Pharisees for "making the word of God of none effect through their traditions" (Mark vii. 13). And David, long before our Lord's day, wrote, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" (Psa. cxix. 105). Thus it will be seen that the application of the title "The Word of God" to the Scriptures is made on the highest authority, and is almost as old as the Scriptures themselves.

THE WORD OF GOD.

I. The grounds on which this application of the title "The Word of God" to the Scriptures is made, is set forth in such passages as the following, viz.: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim iii. 16). "God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son" (Heb. i. 1). "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter i. 21). "We speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" (1 Cor. ii. 13).

In such passages as these the Scriptures unquestionably claim a Divine-human authorship: that God and man wrought together in their production in such a way as to fully entitle them to the name of "the Word of God." This union of the Divine and the human in the written Word furnishes no more occasion for surprise than the union of the divine and human in the living Word, "The Word that was God," and yet "was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John i. 1, 14). The one is no more mysterious or incredible than the other.

1. Dr. A. A. Hodge gives an admirable summary of the truth in this matter in these words:

"God's agency in bringing the Scriptures into existence was four-fold, viz. : (1,) *By Providence*. God from the first designed and adapted every human writer employed in the genesis of Scripture. Paul, John, Peter, David, Isaiah, have been made precisely what they were, and placed and conditioned precisely as they were, and then moved to write, and directed in writing precisely what they wrote. The revelation was in large measure through a historical series of events, led along by a providential guidance largely natural, but surcharged, as a cloud with electricity, with supernatural elements all along its line. . . . (2,) *Spiritual Illumination*. Spiritual illumination by the Holy Ghost, a personal religious experience, was as necessary in the case of such writers as David, John, and Paul, as æsthetic taste and genius are in the case of a poet or artist. The spiritual intuition of John, the spiritualized understanding of Paul, the personal religious experience of David, have, by the superadded gift of inspiration, been rendered permanently typical and normal in the church in all ages. . . . (3,) *Revelation*. Revelation gives additional light which nature does not supply. In every instance where supernatural knowledge of God, his attributes, his purposes, of the secrets of his grace, or of the future of the church in the world, of the life of body or soul after death, came to be needed by a sacred writer, God immediately gave it to him by revelation. . . . (4,) *Inspiration*. This was the absolutely constant attribute of every portion and of every element of the Scriptures, and that attribute which renders them infallible in every utterance. . . . Inspiration is that influence of the immanent Holy Ghost which accompanies every thought and feeling and impulse and action of the sacred writer involved in the function of writing the Word, and which guided him in the selection and utterance of truth—*i. e.*, in its conception and in its verbal expression—so that the very mind of God was expressed with infallible accuracy." (*Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*, pp. 85-87.)

2. The inspiration which the Scriptures claim is *plenary, i. e.*, full, complete. By this is meant, (1,) That "it is not confined to moral and religious truths, but extends to the statements of facts, whether scientific, historical, or geographical. It is not confined to those facts the importance of which is obvious, or which are in-

volved in matters of doctrine. It extends to everything which any sacred writer asserts to be true. . . . As the life of the body belongs as much to the feet as to the head, so the Spirit of God pervades the whole Scripture, and is not more in one part than in another. Some members of the body are more important than others; and some books of the Bible could be far better spared than others. There may be as great a difference between St. John's Gospel and the books of Chronicles as between a man's brain and hair; nevertheless, the life of the body is as truly in the hair as in the brain." (*Hodge's Theology*, Vol. I., pp. 163, 164.) This truth has been aptly expressed by saying that the Scriptures *are* the Word of God; not simply, *contain* the Word of God. (2.) That inspiration extends to the very words of Scripture; that the inspiration is *verbal*, not in any such sense as would make the sacred writers mere amanuenses, but verbal in such a sense as is fairly implied in Paul's words, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" (1 Cor. ii. 13). Men think in words, and the more definitely they think, the more are their thoughts immediately associated with an exactly appropriate verbal expression. Infallibility of thought cannot be secured or preserved independently of an infallible verbal rendering.

II. To this doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture several objections have been urged.

1. It has been thought to be irreconcilable with the marked differences in style of thought and expression which characterize the writings of different sacred writers. Inspiration, in the economy of grace, is the special work of the Holy Spirit. That he should by inspiration secure an errorless record of the truth, through the instrumentality of Moses, or Paul, or Isaiah, without interfering with their own proper spontaneity, so that in their style of thought and expression there should be as characteristic differences as in the writings of Thucydides and Homer and Aristotle, should cause us no surprise. The Spirit, in his regeneration and sanctification of a human soul, does not destroy man's spontaneity, nor obliterate his sinless peculiarities. Peter and John had peculiarities of disposition and temper before their regenera-

tion, and they retained those peculiarities as long as they lived on earth; and, I doubt not, will retain them evermore: that in heaven, after the resurrection of the body has made the work of redemption complete, Peter will be Peter still, and John will be John.

2. Inspiration, according to the teaching of Scripture (*e. g.*, Luke i. 1-4), does not supersede the use of such means of information as, in God's providence, were within the writers' reach. In inspiration, as in regeneration and sanctification, the law obtains: "Work, for it is God that worketh in you." Throughout the greater part of the Pentateuch, Moses records what took place under his own eyes, and what he must have known from personal observation. In the book of Genesis, which records what occurred before his day, he may have made use of traditions current among his people, possibly of historical documents which had been handed down from former generations. All that is meant in affirming the plenary inspiration of the Pentateuch is, that Moses, in making use of such information, was guided by God the Spirit in the selection of the materials used, separating infallibly between the appropriate and the inappropriate, the true and the false. Nothing short of this would make his writings an infallible record of truth.

3. When inspiration is affirmed of the Scriptures, it is of the autographs of the sacred writers alone that it is affirmed, and not of the Septuagint, or the Vulgate, or the authorized English version, or any other version that ever has been or ever will be made. These original autographs, in so far as we know, have all been lost, and to-day we have nothing better than copies, some of them very ancient, and translations into languages other than those in which they were originally written, some of them also very ancient. That errors in transcription have been made is admitted by all. The "various readings," as they are called, are proof of this. That mistakes in translation have been made, in all the versions of the Bible in common use, no one acquainted with the facts in the case will deny. The recovery of the original text, *i. e.*, an exact copy of the autograph of the sacred writers, furnishes abundant scope for the employment of the best critical talent of the church, and the correction of errors in translation a working-

field for the best scholarship of the church in determining, exactly, what the Word of God is; but this once determined, there is for the christian an end of controversy. God has spoken, it is for man to believe and obey.

THE BIBLE OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.

The doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture, especially as it applies to the earlier portions of the book of Genesis, is called in question in our day, on the ground that it is irreconcilable with the results of modern scientific discovery; and certain christian writers, in view of these "oppositions of science falsely so called," as we regard them, seem ready so to modify the doctrine that the inspiration of Scripture is no longer *plenary*, in any proper sense of that term.

Professor Drummond, the author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," in the *Popular Science Monthly* for April, 1886, writes:

"If the student of science will now apply to theology for its Bible, two very different books will be laid before him. The one is the Bible accepted by our forefathers; the other is *the Bible of modern theology*. The books, the chapters, the verses, and the words are the same in each, yet in the meaning, the interpretation, and the way they are looked at, they are two entirely distinct Bibles. The distinction between them is one which science will appreciate the moment it is stated. In point of fact, the one is constructed, like the world, according to the old cosmogonies; the other is an evolution. The one represents revelation as having been produced on the creative hypothesis, the Divine-fiat hypothesis, the ready-made hypothesis; the other on the slow growth or evolution theory. This latter—the Bible of development—is *the Bible of modern scientific theology*. It is not less authoritative than the first, but it is differently authoritative; not less inspired, but differently inspired. . . . The Bible is not an oracle which has been erected; it has grown. Hence it is no longer a mere word-book, nor a compendium of doctrine, but a nursery of growing truth. . . . The Bible is absolutely free from natural science. There is there history, poetry, moral philosophy, theology, lives and letters, mystical, devotional, and didactic pieces, but science there is none. Natural objects are, of course, repeatedly referred to, and with unsurpassed sympathy and accuracy of observation; but neither in the intention of any of the innumerable authors, nor in the execution of their work, is there any trace of scientific teaching." (P. 107.)

In an article on "The Reformation Theology in the Light of Modern Knowledge," published in *The Presbyterian Review* for April, 1887, Professor J. S. Candlish gives expression to views respecting the inspiration of Scripture, not as pronounced as those

of Professor Drummond, quoted above, but yet having the same trend. He writes:

"Some of the earlier records of the Bible are not properly historical, nor meant to be taken as literally true, but analogous to the myths of other nations, though differing from them in their pure theistic and moral character in a way quite worthy of Divine guidance and inspiration. . . . What inspiration gave to the writers of the sacred books may not have been minute or literal exactness on points not essential for their main purpose, but perfect truth and soundness in the great religious lessons that they teach, and in the historical events in which God's revelation of himself is conveyed." (P. 230.)

"God's calls and commands to the patriarchs may possibly not have been single, instantaneous utterances, as the first reading of the narrative might suggest; it is enough to indicate their substantial truth that, in some way or other, God's will was unmistakably conveyed to the recipient of his revelation. Such theological notions as Divine legislation, covenants, judgments, and the like, may be not the less real and important, though they may not be regarded as denoting express and definite transactions, occurring at particular epochs, but rather certain relations or states brought about, or brought into consciousness, by slow and gradual processes." (P. 232.)

"The successive discoveries by which the present wonderful advance of science has been attained have seemed, when first made, in many cases, to conflict with the doctrines of theology or the teachings of Scripture; and have therefore been sometimes keenly and obstinately opposed, as is seen in the persecution of Galileo by the Inquisition, and in the alarm aroused, even among Protestant theologians, by the discoveries of geology, and by Darwin's theory of the origin of species. But clearly no such opposition could arrest the progress of science, or prevent the acceptance by all intelligent men of the facts and laws based on sufficient evidence. These must be accepted whatever may become of theological doctrines, and if any theology comes in collision with ascertained facts, so much the worse for the theology. In most of these cases, however, it came to be seen that what science controverted was some of these theories founded on a too literal interpretation of Scripture, or pressing its statements too far. The general principle on which we must ultimately fall back in all cases is, that the Bible contains a revelation of religious truth, and not of science at all, and in all its references to the physical world speaks according to the appearances of things and the current ideas of the times." (P. 231.)

"The idea of evolution has in modern thought come to supersede that of creation in many cases; but if the power at work in it is believed to be that of a supreme, wise, and beneficent Mind, evolution is, for all practical purposes, the same to the theologian as creation. We are taught in Scripture to recognize God as the Creator of our bodies, though his direct agency in giving us being is at least as far back as Adam; and if science shows that it must be put still further back, it makes no essential difference; it is still true that God is our maker, and we are the sheep of his pasture and the people of his hand. The notion of a gradual development instead of a sudden, abrupt act, gives a different form to some doctrines, but does not alter their essential meaning." (P. 232.)

I have quoted these articles thus fully, that the reader may have, in the very words of its advocates, the doctrine of inspiration which some are seeking to substitute for that of the plenary inspiration of Scripture as hitherto held by the church. The two doctrines are certainly very unlike, and they have their outcome, as Professor Drummond has well said, "in two very different books," and he has appropriately designated these books as "the Bible accepted by our forefathers," and "the Bible of modern scientific theology." The demand for the substitution of this new doctrine of inspiration in the place of the old is made, mainly, on the ground that modern science requires it. Does science, indeed, make this demand?

I. Is it true that "the idea of evolution has in modern thought come to supersede that of creation, in many cases," and more especially the idea of evolution as embodied in Darwin's theory of the origin of species? Prof. Candlish takes it for granted that it has.

On the other hand, "At the late ter-centenary of the University of Edinburgh, in the presence of the assembled magnates of Europe, Prof. Virchow declared, with great emphasis, that evolution has no scientific basis," (*Christian Thought*, July, 1884, p. 74.) A year later, Principal Dawson, who was called to preside at the annual meeting of the British Scientific Association, in 1886, wrote: "The doctrine of evolution as held by a prominent school of German and English biologists, I regard as equally at variance with science, revelation and common sense, and destitute of any foundation in fact. It belongs, in truth, to the region of those illogical paradoxes and loose speculations which have ever haunted the progress of knowledge, and have been dispelled only by increasing light. For this reason, I have always refused to recognize the dreams of materialistic evolution as of any scientific significance, or indeed as belonging to science at all," (*Philadelphia Presbyterian*, July 11th, 1885.) And later still, I find the following testimony in *Christian Thought*, April, 1887: "That British thought, says the *Christian Commonwealth*, London, is arriving at a transition period has just been powerfully demonstrated by a high authority. Savants of different schools will acknowledge the weight attaching to the opinions of such a thinker, lecturer, teacher

and writer as Henry Calderwood. This learned Edinburgh professor has, in a most interesting essay in a late number of the *New Princeton Review*, proclaimed his conviction that the reign of the evolution idea is near its close. Prof. Calderwood remarks of the whole sensational or experiential philosophy, that it gained largely in popularity because it has connected itself with the evolution theory. He adds, in a very striking sentence, that he is unable to regard it otherwise than as *a passing, though prominent feature of nineteenth century thought*. Such a deliverance as this from one of the very highest authorities on modern metaphysics is a sure sign that a fresh era of scientific sentiment is very near, and that evolutionism will presently be seen receding on an ebbing tide." In view of such declarations as these, one may reasonably be pardoned for refusing to surrender the old doctrine of plenary inspiration at the demand of evolution, at least until it shall be known more surely whether its "oppositions" are those of science, or of "science (*γνώσις*, knowledge) falsely so called."

II. Is it true, as Prof. Candlish affirms, that "if the power at work in it is believed to be that of a supreme, wise and beneficent mind, evolution is, for all practical purposes, the same to the theologian as creation"; that "though it gives a different form to some doctrines, it does not alter their essential meaning"?

1. This may be true, in so far as mere theism is concerned. But theology, the theology of Scripture, is something more than mere theism, and embraces other doctrines than those of the existence and nature of God the Creator. What is distinctively called christian theology—and without this, mere theism is of little practical value to man—is derived immediately from the teachings of Scripture. Indeed, no class of writers insist more frequently than that to which Profs. Drummond and Candlish belong, that it was for the very purpose of teaching man christian theology, teaching him religion and not science, that the Scriptures were written. Is evolution, as taught by Darwin in his "Origin of Species," for all practical purposes, the same with creation to the christian theologian?

2. Can the account of the creation of man, "male and female," given us in Scripture be made to harmonize with Darwin's theory

without utterly destroying, not their historic character alone, but their veracity as well? In Gen. ii. 21, 22, we read: "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman, and brought her unto the man." This is, confessedly, a literal translation of the record as it stands in the inspired text. In what Prof. Drummond calls "the Bible of development, the Bible of modern scientific theology," it will read: "And the Lord God, by a very gradual process, extending possibly over millions of years, evolved woman from 'an animal which seems to have been more like the larva of our existing ascidians' (sea-squirts) 'than any other known form.'" (See Darwin's *Descent of Man*, Vol. II., p. 372.) To justify this reading of the Bible of scientific theology, I will be told the Scriptures were not given us to teach science. How far, and in what sense this is true, we shall see hereafter, but in the present instance it has no relevancy. The statements are statements of facts, and Prof. Drummond admits that when the Scriptures refer to natural objects, they do so "with unsurpassed accuracy of observation."

3. According to Darwin's "Theory of the Origin of Species"—and it is evolution as embodied in that theory that Prof. Candlish specifies—what was the character and condition of primeval man? In the words of one of its advocates, "If there be any truth in science at all, there was a time when our ancestor—whom, for want of a better term we call primitive man—was removed from the brute only inasmuch as he had a more erect carriage, a little bigger brain, and more completely differentiated members. Of religion, morality, decency, pity, social law, patriotism, he understood no more than the ape, his brother. He was as much outside the pale of the moral law as the spider or the vulture. In his murders, his cannibalism, his bestialities, was no sin, because there was no knowledge. He was simply a brute, inclosing in himself potentialities of future development. The product of the law of evolution, he had in himself the power of evolution." (*Order of*

¹ *The Order of Creation* is a volume, recently published, containing the papers of the late Gladstone-Huxley controversy, together with others on the points in debate, by Max Müller, Reville, and Linton.

Creation, pp. 168-9.) Such is the latest full-length portrait of Adam Bar-Simia I have seen, drawn by the pencil of a friend who believed in him.

Will not this idea of the character of our first parent, if received as true, require a modification of certain doctrines we are accustomed to regard as fundamental, amounting to more than a mere "difference in form which does not alter their essential meaning"? Take the doctrine embodied in Ans. 12 of the Shorter Catechism, for example: "When God had created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience; forbidding him to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, upon pain of death." Was it with this creature, who "of religion, morality, decency, pity, social law, patriotism, understood no more than the ape, his brother," that God "entered into a covenant of life on condition of perfect obedience," and this, "not only for himself, but for his posterity"? And, was this the creature that in his covenant relations to his posterity was "the figure (*τύπος*, the type) of him that was to come?" (Rom. v. 14.) Or, take the doctrine embodied in Ans. 13 of the Shorter Catechism: "Our first parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate in which they were created, by sinning against God." "*Sinning against God!*" Why, to them, even in "their murders, their bestialities, their cannibalism, there was no sin, for there was no knowledge. They were as much outside the pale of the moral law as the spider or the vulture." "*Fell from the estate wherein they were created!*" How could they fall? Already at the lowest point at which humanity can exist, "simply brutes, inclosing in themselves potentialities of future development," there is no lower point to which they can descend and yet retain their humanity. Surely, if this Adam Bar-Simia is the Adam of the "Bible of development—the Bible of modern scientific theology," that Bible must teach doctrines on these points very different from those which, by common consent, are taught in the "Bible accepted by our fathers."

III. Prof. Drummond writes: The Bible "contains history, poetry, moral philosophy, theology, lives and letters, mythical, devotional and didactic pieces, but science there is none. Natural

objects are, of course, repeatedly referred to, and with unsurpassed sympathy and accuracy of observation; but neither in the intention of any of the innumerable authors, nor in the execution of their work, is there any direct trace of scientific teaching." And Prof. Candlish: "The Bible contains a revelation of religious truth, and not of science at all." And this statement, in substance, has been repeated time and again by writers of the school to which they belong. There is a sense in which this statement is unquestionably true; but, in the sense in which it must be understood in order to serve the purpose for which it is made, if I mistake not, it is utterly devoid of truth. It belongs to the category of those equivocal statements in which error finds its safest lurking place. For this reason I will ask the reader's attention to a more careful examination of it than would otherwise be necessary.

1. God's great purpose in the Scriptures is to teach man the true religion. In the words of the Shorter Catechism: "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man." (Answer 3.) The true religion is practical in its nature. The lessons contained in the Bible are intended to direct and control man's life and conduct. Practical truths are always best taught by illustration and example. For this reason, the Bible consists largely of biographies of saints and sinners, and the history of the execution of God's scheme of redemption for sin-ruined man, and especially of the life and teaching of Christ Jesus, "God manifest in the flesh." Hence it comes that the Bible, on the one hand, and geography, history, chronology, and science, physical and metaphysical, on the other, must often cover the same ground and deal with the same facts.

As an instance in point, take the cosmogony contained in the first chapter of Genesis. The statements there made are statements fundamental in religion, and, in the light of the subsequent history of our race, we can see how all-important these statements are. From the very beginning of human history, practical atheism among philosophers and idolatry among the ignorant masses have been the two forms of error which have taken the place of the true religion most widely in the minds and hearts of men. The eternity of matter, that the heaven and the earth had no beginning, is a

necessary postulate of philosophical atheism, and the declaration, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. i. 1), effectually and for ever sets aside such atheism as a possible faith for one who receives the Bible as true. Idolatry, in its earliest and purest form, consisted in the worship of the heavenly bodies, the sun and the moon. In the declaration, "God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also" (Gen. i. 16), the irrational character of such worship is clearly set forth. Why should man worship the sun and the moon, if they be but creatures of God like himself? Idolatry in its grosser forms has usually consisted in the worship of beasts of the earth, and even creeping things, or their images. When, in Gen. i. 25, 26, we are told that God created "the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind"; and furthermore, that, having made man, "he gave him dominion over them" all, "the axe is laid at the root" of idolatry in its grosser forms. God made man to have dominion over the creatures of his hand, and not they over him. Thus it will be seen that this cosmogony is not simply a curious piece of information to satisfy the curiosity of the multitude, or please the fancy of the poet, like the cosmogonies of the Greeks and Egyptians, but a most important part of a revelation of the true religion. In the words of Matthew Henry, in Gen. i. 1 "we find, to our comfort, the first article of our creed, that *God, the Father Almighty, is the maker of heaven and earth, and as such we believe in him.*"

That cosmogony is a proper subject of investigation to the scientific geologist no reasonable man will deny. It is impossible that he should pursue his science beyond the narrow limits of its practical application to agriculture and mining, without questions respecting the origin of the present order of things presenting themselves; and, in the careful study of the agencies now at work in effecting changes in that order, he has the means at command of pushing his investigations in a legitimate way back into the history of the long past. Here, then, is a field in which the Scriptures and science must cover the same ground, and the scientist and the divine must meet in the study of the same facts and phenomena.

2. The scientist and divine must often study the same facts and phenomena; but they differ in this study, both in the object they have in view and in the methods and instruments they employ. (1.) The scientist contemplates man simply as a rational being having a life to live in the world, and he seeks to ascertain general laws, and to classify facts, with a view of satisfying man's natural and laudable curiosity, or of subjecting nature to his service in providing for the daily recurring wants of the body. The divine contemplates man as an immortal creature, and he pursues his studies with the especial purpose of solving the great questions of religion, questions respecting man's duties to his fellow-man and his God, and his relations to the world to come. (2.) In the study of the scientist, observation and experiment are the means by which he seeks to ascertain the truth he is in quest of. In the case of the divine, his appeal is to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which he receives as the word of God, "the only rule of faith and obedience," and literary criticism and exegesis are the means he depends on in prosecuting his research. To say of the divine, as has sometimes been done, when, by a careful and critical study of the original Hebrew of the first chapter of Genesis, he seeks to settle a true cosmogony so far as it is there revealed, he is trenching upon the territory which belongs to the scientist; and of his conclusions, when he has reached them, that they are scientific deliverances, betrays great confusion of thought on the part of him who brings such charges.

Is the question asked, Is there any scientific treatment of facts in the Bible; scientific in the purpose and means of treatment? We must answer, No. In this sense the statement "the Bible is absolutely free from natural science," is true. But is the question asked, Do the Bible and science often deal with the same facts, each for its own purpose and in its own way? The answer must be, Yes. Prof. Drummond himself writes: "In the Bible natural objects are repeatedly referred to, and with unsurpassed sympathy and accuracy of observation." Yet it is in this last sense the statement under consideration must be understood, a sense in which it is not true, if it is to serve the purpose for which it is made. Recurring to the case already partially examined, the case of the

creation of woman, as given us in Gen. ii. 21-25, I remark, the statement here given is plainly to be considered a statement of fact. Neither in form nor in substance has it any resemblance to a myth. The Apostle Paul evidently understood it as a statement of fact when he wrote: "The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man; neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.) And so also does our Lord, when teaching that most important lesson of christian morals, the sacredness of the marriage relation, and with the evident intention of throwing the sanction of Jehovah around the family, the corner-stone of christian civilization, as all history testifies, he says: "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female; and said, For this reason shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh" (Matt. xix. 4, 5), thus quoting the very words of Gen. ii. 24. When Darwin tells me that woman is the evolute of a sea-squirt, he gives what purports to be a statement of fact. And these two statements of Moses and Darwin are irreconcilable the one with the other, and the proposition, "the Bible is absolutely free from natural science," "the Bible contains a revelation of religious truth and not of science at all," in the only sense in which it is true, does not touch the difficulty.

IV. Prof. Candlish writes: The Bible, "in all its references to the physical world, speaks according to the appearances of things and the current ideas of the times." Here, as in the statement just considered, there is a mixture of truth and error, and we must carefully distinguish the one from the other if we would not be led astray.

In the controversy between Galileo and his judges of the Index, often very unfairly represented as a controversy between science and revelation, in reality a controversy between the old Aristotelian philosophy and the new, Galileo defended himself on the ground that the Scriptures are written in the language of common life and not that of science, and, when interpreted as so written, they are not in conflict with the Copernican doctrine of the solar system which he advocated. This principle is of wider

application than at first sight appears; and the fact that it did not at once secure universal acceptance can be explained only by taking into account the influence of prejudice, prejudice of long standing, and having the countenance of great names. In the course of time, however, it has come to be universally accepted, and, fairly applied, it answers many of the objections which scientists, in our day, are accustomed to urge against the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture.

1. The language of common life, as contradistinguished from that of science, is marked by two particulars, viz.:

(1,) It is phenomenal; it speaks of things as they are made known to us through the senses. In the language of common life the sun is said to rise and set, although we know that its motion in the heavens is apparent, and not real; and the dew is said to fall, although we know that the dew-drop is formed by the condensation of the moisture of the air at the very point at which we find it. When the sacred writers tell us, "And as Jacob passed over Penuel the sun rose upon him" (Gen. xxxii. 31), and "when the dew fell upon the camp in the night the manna fell upon it" (Numb. xi. 9), they are simply using the language of common life.

(2,) It uses words and expressions in the current sense of the time at which it was written, without any reference to their etymology, and without any endorsement of erroneous beliefs in which their etymology shows them to have originated. We are accustomed to speak, and so are the sacred writers, of certain persons as lunatics (*σηλιξομενους*) without a thought of thereby endorsing the exploded error that madness in man must be traced to the disturbing influence of the moon. The kind of movement common to quadrupeds, as distinguished from that of man, we are accustomed to speak of as "going upon all fours," and Moses, using the language of common life, writes: "All fowls that creep, *going upon all four*, shall be an abomination unto you." (Lev. xi. 20.) From verse 22, it is evident that among the "fowls that creep" locusts were included. From this language to infer that Moses was ignorant of the fact that locusts have six legs, or to impugn the verbal inspiration of Scripture, is to disregard the settled truth that the Scriptures are written in the language of common life.

The authorized English version reads: "All fowls that creep, going upon all four." From this it is evident that at the time our English version was made the word "fowl" (from the A. S. *fleoƿan*, to fly,) was used in a much wider sense than it is in our day, the wider sense of "flying creature." The New Version substitutes the "flying creature" for "fowl" in this passage. How ridiculous it would be for a critic, restricting the term fowl, as we now do, to the gallinæ, to conclude, on the authority of their translation of Lev. xi. 20, that the venerable authors of our English version believed that hens had four legs.

2. Respecting the language of common life, I remark :

(1,) It is the language used by scholars of the highest standing in writing history, biography, poetry, and by learned statesmen in writing the laws of the land, where the greatest accuracy is demanded.

(2,) It is the only language intelligible to the great mass of the people. The language of science is intelligible to scientists alone, and often that peculiar to one department of science is unintelligible to the scientist devoted to the study of a different department, *e. g.*, the language of chemistry to the mathematician.

(3,) The language of science almost always embodies more or less of current theories, and so will vary as current theories vary. The ferric oxide of the chemistry of to-day was called dephlogisticated iron eighty years ago. According to the chemistry of that day, ferric oxide was the simple substance, and iron the compound, the last-mentioned being transmuted into the first-mentioned by the loss of its phlogiston. So variable is the language of science, of chemistry for example, that could the once celebrated chemist Stahl rise from his grave and enter the lecture-room of some professor of chemistry of to-day, he would find himself "a barbarian to the speaker, and the speaker a barbarian to him."

(4,) The language of common life, for the purpose for which it is ordinarily used, and for the purpose for which it is used in Scripture, is as accurate as the language of science. What is desired is, by means of language, to convey a truth respecting things as they present themselves to us in the ordinary business of life; this, and nothing more. And this is just what the language of

common life does. In view of such facts as these, it must be admitted by every thoughtful person that the Scriptures, intended as they are for the instruction of "the common people," ought to be written in the language of common life; and the fact that they are so written, instead of furnishing ground for questioning the divine element in their authorship, furnishes a strong argument in support of their inspiration of God, and that their inspiration extends to the very words in which they are written.

3. The Bible, "in all its references to the physical world, speaks according to . . . the current ideas of the times," writes Prof. Candlish. If by the current ideas of the times is meant the scientific ideas current at the times, I remark, this is just what the Scriptures do not do. Translators have sometimes done this: as where the Hebrew שָׁמַיִם (expanse) Gen. i. 6, is in the Vulgate translated *firmentum*, and unfortunately in our English version the Vulgate, and not the inspired Hebrew text, has been followed; and so the exploded idea of the ancient astronomers that the sun, moon, and stars were fixed in crystal spheres, has been foisted into the Scriptures. In the inspired Scripture this is never done. God has adapted his revelation to the necessities of the case in a manner far better than this, by "leading inspired men to use such language that, without revealing scientific facts in advance, it might accurately accommodate itself to them when discovered. The language of Scripture is so elastic and flexible as to contract itself to the narrowness of ignorance, and yet expand itself to the dimensions of knowledge, like the rubber bandages so invaluable in modern surgery, which stretch about an inflamed and swollen limb, yet shrink as the swelling abates. It uses terms and phrases which, without suggesting puzzling enigmas, contain in themselves ample space for all the demands of growing human knowledge; it selects from imperfect human language terms which may hold hidden truths till ages to come shall disclose their hidden meaning." (*Pierson's Many Infallible Proofs*, p. 116.) As instances in point, take Eccl. i. 7.: "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again"; and Job, xxvi. 7, 8: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the

earth upon nothing. He bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them."

V. In considering the demands for a modification of the views of inspiration long entertained by christian theologians, we must not forget that many of these demands made in the name of science, are not demands of science at all, but of mere hypotheses adopted by certain scientists. Prof. Huxley defines science in the words: "Every science must consist of precise knowledge, and that knowledge must be coördinated into general propositions, or it is not science." (*Humboldt Library*, No. 21, p. 472.) True science, science in the sense defined above, is fixed and certain, but hypotheses are ever changing; and hence, it is a matter of prime importance that the distinction between the two should be kept in mind, if we would reason safely on questions such as those we are considering. When Prof. Huxley writes in his late controversy with Gladstone, "I am not aware that any competent judge would hesitate to admit that the organization of these animals (whales and porpoises) show the most obvious signs of their descent from terrestrial quadrupeds," (*Order of Creation*, p. 54,) he evidently assumes the truth of the hypothesis of genetic evolution, and of that hypothesis in its most objectionable form, viz., that evolution is as often downward as upward—is a degeneracy as often as an advance. In this form the hypothesis is irreconcilably at variance with the plainest testimony of the fossiliferous rock-strata of the earth; and the objection to the Mosaic order of creation based upon it is not an objection of science, according to Huxley's own definition of that term. It is an objection founded upon a mere hypothesis, and an hypothesis, I will venture to predict, Huxley himself will reject before ten years have passed.

If the reader will take with him the two propositions, the truth of which no thoughtful man can question, (1,) That the Scriptures are written in the language of common life, and (2,) That hypothesis is not science, and should never be regarded as such, he will find in the study of Scripture no necessity to modify "the church doctrine," as Dr. Hodge calls it, of their plenary inspiration, and consequently no need of such modifications of "the Reformation theology," as Prof. Candlish proposes.

VI. Prof. Candlish, in view of what he conceives to be a possible emergency, writes: "Facts and laws based upon sufficient evidence must be accepted whatever may become of theological doctrines; and if any theology comes in collision with ascertained facts, so much the worse for the theology." To this, it is sufficient to answer that true theology, the theology of the Bible, never can come in conflict with ascertained facts if the Bible be the word of God. But interpreting this declaration in the light of the context, and the conclusions reached in the argument in the course of which it is made—the sense in which such language is often used by "modern scientific theologians,"—it would seem to mean that in any case where there was a conflict between the doctrine of Scripture and the commonly accepted doctrine of science, the doctrine of Scripture must "go to the wall." From this conclusion I, for one, entirely dissent.

I receive the Scriptures as the word of God, and therefore, beyond all question, as true, on their own appropriate evidence. In the words of Gladstone, "I have an unshaken belief in divine revelation, not resting on assumption, but made obligatory upon me by reason." (*Order of Creation*, p. 9.) Our Lord says, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." (John vii. 17.) Besides proof from other sources, nearly sixty years ago I took the Lord at his word as above recorded, and began the application of this text; and to-day, if there is anything I feel certain of, anything I *know*, it is that the Bible is the word of God, and therefore "the truth." About the same time I commenced the study of natural science, and have kept it up more or less diligently through all these years, and I know that, in more instances than one, what were regarded as settled truths of science, and taught as such in my youth, are now just as generally regarded as exploded errors, *e. g.*, the infinite divisibility of matter, and that oxygen is the sole acidifier; indeed, oxygen took the name it still bears, as the etymology of the name declares, from this general belief.

Besides this, all the conclusions of the scientist are based upon observation and experiment. As already remarked, these are the instruments by which he prosecutes his researches. Now (1,) ob-

servation may mislead, the apparent being mistaken for the real, as in the Ptolemaic astronomy which dominated scientific thought for many centuries. Even to-day we have a colored minister in Richmond, Va., a man of no mean ability, too, who insists upon it, in public and in private, "that the sun do move." (2.) In the case of what are seemingly the most carefully conducted experiments, there may be some unknown or unnoticed element not taken into account, the neglect of which may vitiate all our conclusions. This has been illustrated, recently, in the elaborate experiments of Dr. Bastian, by which the spontaneous generation of life was, for a time, thought to be established. When Prof. Tyndall repeated these experiments, simply supplying an oversight of Dr. Bastian, the result was altogether different, and the conclusion he came to he states in these words: "No shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life, in our day, ever appears independently of antecedent life."

As the result of his experience extending through a long life devoted to the study of natural science, Professor Huxley writes: "I do not believe in the Ptolemaic astronomy, or the catastrophic geology of my youth, although these, in their day, claimed—and to my mind rightly claimed—the name of science. If nothing is to be called science but that which is exactly true from beginning to end, I am afraid there is very little science in the world outside mathematics. Among the physical sciences, I do not know that any could claim more than that each is true within certain limits so narrow that, for the present at any rate, they may be neglected." (*Order of Creation*, p. 159.) For these reasons, where there is a conflict between a truth or doctrine clearly taught in Scripture, and the generally accepted conclusions of science, sound logic requires that we accept the former, and reject the latter. God cannot err; science may err, in the present, as it often has in the past.

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG.