

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1886.

ART. I.—THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION.

IT is altogether marvellous what a prodigious amount of weak and wild writing, from first to last, has been put forth, professing to have for its object the elucidation of the First Chapter of Genesis. The one point on which friend and foe alike are observed to be at one, is the assumption that they know a vast deal more about the matter than Moses can have possibly known. We are constrained to avow that on this head we entertain a widely different opinion. The latest interpretation of Gen. i. is from a friendly critic: claims to be the result of half a century of meditation on the subject; and professes to have been invented in order to set men's minds at rest, and especially to build up those "whose faith is put to trial" by the contents of that chapter. *How* an utterly unsupported, grossly improbable, and perfectly gratuitous conjecture, which represents the sacred narrative as a weak fabrication, destitute of one particle of truth,—how *this* is to "build up" unbelievers it is hard to imagine.

The way out of the supposed difficulty, according to Professor Pritchard,¹ is to suppose that at some remote period—"remote beyond our knowledge"—somebody "fell asleep, either in the gloom of evening or in the light of noonday," and dreamed a dream. On awaking, he "called his friends and his neighbours together; and sitting under his vine, or in the shade of his olive or his fig-tree"—(as if these circumstantial details could be of any manner of relevancy to the learned Professor's contention!)—"recounted his wonderful dream." The tale, "after the manner of the East, sped its rapid way from city to city, until at length the vision lost its name, and became a Tradition." "To me," proceeds Dr.

¹ In the *Guardian*, Feb. 10, 1886, p. 211.

Pritchard, "this interpretation wears the appearance of so much probability that I accept it as an approximate fact."

We venture to reply that an improbable conjecture unsupported by a particle of evidence, can *never* emerge out of the region of shadows. But, indeed, it so happens that the present hypothesis is contradicted by the known conditions of the problem. The story of the dream (we are invited to suppose) "*after the manner of the East*, sped its rapid way from city to city, until at last *it became a tradition.*" And yet (1st), This kind of rapid locomotion is after the manner of *the West*—not at all of the East. And next (2nd), There happens to be no such tradition elsewhere in existence of a great creative Week. It is absolutely confined to the author of the first page of the Bible, and of the Fourth Commandment. This discovery, to say the least, is inconvenient—if it be not fatal—to the learned Professor's hypothesis.

The expressions which occasion offence, and suggest this wild imagination as an escape from all difficulties, are such as those concerning the Sun and the Moon, which (it is assumed) are spoken of as "*created on the fourth day.*" And yet, nothing whatever is said about their *creation*. Moses does but state that GOD caused the earth to bring forth the green herb—created the vegetable kingdom, in short—before He appointed "the greater light" to shine by day, "the lesser light" to shine by night.

We shall perhaps be asked, But Moses *seems* to say—does he not?—that the Sun and the Moon were both *created* on the fourth day. What then? We claim that "to *seem* to say" is one thing: actually "*to say*" (*i.e.*, to *mean*) is quite another. Every day of his life the Professor of Astronomy *seems* to say that the sun actually "*rises*," and actually "*sets*." But does he *mean* it? Ask him, and he will reply, "Do you suppose I am mad?" Why then is not the same indulgence to be extended to Moses which is freely allowed to Dr. Pritchard? The words of the Astronomer mislead nobody. They claim to be interpreted—they *must* be, and they *are* interpreted—by the known facts of the case. *That* sudden (and sublime) interjection (in ver. 16),—"the stars also," surely may not be strained into an announcement that all those myriad orbs of light which sow the midnight heavens were *the creation* of the fourth day. The Author of revelation, in the first chapter of Genesis, is bent on something of a loftier kind than teaching children the elements of Astronomy. Accordingly, since no one capable of formulating an objection to Scripture can possibly require to be told that, without the Sun, the Earth could not so much as retain its place in the universe for an instant, Almighty God evidently deemed it superfluous to guard His

meaning, when (speaking phenomenally) He caused the record of the fourth day of creation to contain the statement that "God made two great lights." Elsewhere, we read that our SAVIOUR "made" (*ἐποίησε*) twelve Apostles (St. Mark iii. 14); but we have never heard it suggested that those words mean that He there and then created them, in the sense of *making them out of nothing*. "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to divide the day from the night," is the record in verse 14. What else can it be but a *summoning into view* of the two great luminaries?—"And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and years," proceeds the record. And what else is this but the assigning to Sun and Moon of *new functions*?

Yes, eclipses, which serve to mark the date of events, and whereby the timepiece of History is corrected: the periodical phases of the Moon, which regulate the months, and determined for GOD's ancient people the commencement of their solemn seasons: sunrise and sunset, which enable men to distinguish day from day; and lastly, the punctual return of our planet to the self-same point in space from which it started just a year before, whereby the largest division of time is everywhere effectually reckoned off by the inhabitants of our globe—all these are functions of Sun and Moon which clearly can only be proclaimed with reference to *Man*. Until Man was made upon the earth, such things were not, nor in fact could be. So that, in brief, we are, as it were, led by the hand to discern in the very terms of Genesis i. 14-19, nothing more than the summoning into view of the greater and the lesser light, and the assigning to them a new office, with exclusive reference to *Man*.

To return then to Dr. Pritchard, and the objections which he brings against Genesis i. as an authentic narrative, we are constrained to point out that this eminent person, notwithstanding his great mathematical attainments, seems to have unaccountably lost sight of such elementary facts of Sacred Science as the following: (1) That the Author of Genesis (*and therefore, of course, of the first chapter of Genesis*) is a perfectly well-known person—a famous writer named "Moses." (2) That the authorship of the Pentateuch does not rest (like the authorship of the first two Gospels) on tradition, but is vouched for by our SAVIOUR Himself (St. John v. 46, 47). (3) That it happens to be a matter of express revelation that, although to His prophets GOD did sometimes make Himself known in a vision, or spoke to them in a dream, "the LORD spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh with his friend." "My servant Moses" (saith He) "not so. *With him will I speak mouth to mouth*" (Exod. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii.

6, 7, 8). (4) That when the ground is preoccupied in this way it may not lawfully be invaded as if it were unclaimed territory; in other words, that it is simply monstrous to treat the authorship of Genesis as if it were an open question.

And yet, notwithstanding all its wildness and inconsistency, the hypothesis before us has at least *this* convenience, that it furnishes us with common ground in any discussion with Professor Pritchard. The field of discussion is happily narrowed, inasmuch as we find ourselves agreed that the "Six Days" of Genesis i. *mean* six days, and no other thing.

I. But then it is certain that not a few eminent persons hold a widely different opinion. They choose to assume that in this place "Six Days" must mean six indefinitely long periods of Time. *Why* they take so extravagant a liberty with a statement which is quite intelligible as it stands, they have never condescended to explain. Their hypothesis certainly meets no admitted necessities of the problem which Genesis i. opens up. Thus, there is no reason for supposing that the first indefinitely long period of the history of our planet was one of aqueous vapour, irradiated by light;¹—the second, a corresponding long period throughout which our present atmosphere was superimposed on a world of waters;²—the third, a corresponding long period during which the present configurations of moist and dry were established, and the vegetable kingdom had its beginning;³—the fourth, a corresponding long period during which Sun, Moon and Stars came to view.⁴ And yet unless these are four *ascertained facts*, men are even without pretext for turning "days" into millions of years. If it is done out of consideration for the great Creator—to speak plainly, if men have invented the "long period" hypothesis in order to give ALMIGHTY GOD more time for the creation of plants, fishes, birds, etc.—they are respectfully assured that He requires no such indulgence at their hands. But, in fact, this assumption of theirs—for an assumption it is—is simply inadmissible, being inconsistent with the plain language of the record which it professes to explain or explode.

II. That the word "Day" is sometimes employed in Scripture (as in the familiar speech of mankind) with metaphorical license, is undeniable⁵—but wholly beside the present contention. The question before us is but this, *Has the word "Day" been so employed in Genesis i.?* It has not, I answer;

¹ Gen. i. 2-5.

² *Ibid.*, verses 6-8.

³ *Ibid.*, verses 9-13.

⁴ *Ibid.*, verses 14-19.

⁵ Consider Gen. ii. 4; St. John viii. 56; St. Luke xix. 42; 2 Cor. vi. 2, etc.

or rather, it cannot have been: and for the following considerations: (1) Immediately after what is told us concerning "the light" in verses 3 and 4, and in the same breath with the announcement that "the evening and the morning were the first Day," the memorable revelation is made that "God called the light—*Day*," and the darkness, "Night."¹ So that, in this chapter the continually recurring word "*Day*," cannot be intended to signify a vast tract of time, embracing an indefinite number of years; but must indicate the period comprised within a single revolution of the Earth on its axis. Note further (2), That in this same chapter, six successive days are introduced to our notice; and in order that there may be no mistake about the matter, each one of these "*Days*" comes before us furnished with its own "*evening*" and "*morning*." We do not ever, neither does the Bible ever, speak thus of long tracts of time; but we always *do* thus speak of ordinary days. We cannot, in fact, more clearly express our meaning. But above all (3), As if to make doubt *impossible*, the Fourth Commandment establishes the writer's intention in a manner which does not admit of evasion. To man, God says, "*Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work*," but on "*the seventh day . . . thou shalt not do any work*." "*FOR in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day*."² Here, the transactions in Genesis i. are not only declared to have been extended over an ordinary week of days, but the mysterious reason *why* they occupied a week of days emerges into prominence also. There is no ambiguity *here*. Neither is there room left for error or accident; in other words, "the human element" has been jealously excluded: for "the tables" whereon these words were written are declared to have been "the work of God; and *the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables*."³ Now, for GOD to impose on Man the duty, after labouring for six days, of resting on the seventh day, *because* that He Himself on one memorable occasion did the like, were plainly unreasonable, if GOD did *not* do the thing which He is so declared to have done. Have those who take it for granted that the "*Six Days*" of Creation must be explained to mean something different—have these men duly considered that Genesis i. purports to be a pure revelation? and will they venture to deny that the Almighty *may* have seen fit to distribute His creative work over six days? Everyone must see more than one excellent reason why He *should have done* so. But it happens to be a revealed fact that He *did*. With what

¹ Gen. i. 5.

² Exod. xx. 9-11.

³ Exod. xxii. 16. Compare xxxiv. 1.

show of reason, of decency rather, can it be pretended now-days that the thing is incredible? A sufficient reason, we insist, is easily assignable *why* the present order of things should have been introduced to the notice of mankind in this particular way; namely, by the solemn enactment of the *Week* (with a view to the institution of *the Sabbath*), as a division of time.

Believe only (and we are constrained to believe) that the Sabbatical rest of every seventh day is, in the CREATOR'S account, a supreme necessity for Man; and there has been discovered a fully sufficient reason *why* the present order of things should be solemnly ushered in with such a narrative as that found in Genesis i. Years, months, days may be safely left to take care of themselves. The *weekly* account, not so! Whereas a single revolution of the Earth on its axis—a single revolution of the Moon round the Earth—a single revolution of the Earth round the Sun; whereas *these* establish the daily, the monthly, the yearly division of Time, far otherwise does it fare with the *Week*. The religious observance of one day in seven is a positive ordinance, and must be established by a grand decree of the CREATOR, which Man shall be evermore powerless to gainsay or to set aside. Behold, it is *proclaimed* by the Fourth Commandment (Exod. xx. 8-11); and behold, it is *authenticated* by the primæval record of Creation! Now, Genesis i. is very severe, very unadorned prose. It purports to be, and it undoubtedly is, history in the strictest sense: *revealed* history, and therefore *true* history. It claims to be, and it certainly is, the history of six ordinary *Days*.

III. But if we are right in our contention that the great Six Days spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis denote an actual Week of Days which happened nearly 6,000 years ago—then it follows inevitably that all those curious objections with which the Professors of Geological Science habitually assail the Mosaic record of Creation, fall to the ground. We are saying that all speculations as to whether the “nebular hypothesis,” and an “incandescent Earth,” and a certain “order of succession” in the præ-Adamic creatures, are reconcilable with this and that verse of Genesis i., become purely nugatory. An accomplished gentleman of celebrity, writing on this subject, “supposes it to be admitted on all hands that no perfectly comprehensive and complete correspondence can be established between the terms of the Mosaic text and modern discovery. No one, for instance,” he adds, “could conclude from it *that* which appears to be generally recognised, that a great reptile-age would be revealed by the Mesozoic rocks.”¹ No one

¹ The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone in the *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1886, pp. 9, 10.

indeed. But then, is not the very expectation that anyone *could* so conclude, essentially unreasonable? *Who*, in his senses, looks for Cyclopean masonry in a cottage built by his grandfather? or speculates on the possibility of finding a crocodile of the Pharaohs in the ditch at the back of his garden?

IV. Let us be allowed briefly to explain what we conceive to be the attitude of the majority of well-informed Divines towards the department of knowledge indicated in the foregoing paragraph. So far from receiving with incredulity, much less treating with levity, the speculations of those naturalists who make Geology and Palæontology their profession, we listen to their teaching with the profoundest interest, and receive their lawful decrees with the most submissive deference. We regard the Professor of this department of knowledge as Nature's High Priest. It is his special function to enlighten mankind in a department of human knowledge concerning which, but for such help, men neither know, nor can expect to know, anything at all. Scripture reveals nothing concerning the Universe during the præ-historic period, except the fact that GOD was its Creator. The rest, the same GOD hath left, in His infinite wisdom, for the exercise of human intelligence, and in order to furnish His rational creatures with materials for observation and study.—Let us be further allowed, in briefest outline, to indicate the relation which the cosmogony of Genesis i. bears to the mysterious Past of his little globe which GOD hath given us to inhabit. It is a matter which seems to be marvellously little understood by the generality of readers, whether of the Book of Nature or of the Book of Life.

V. GOD hath revealed Himself to His rational creatures partly by His WORKS and partly by His WORD. These two are supplementary the one to the other. In order to acquaint reasoning Man with the nature of His doings on this Earth of ours throughout the unnumbered ages of remote præ-historic Time, He hath with prodigal liberality furnished him with the testimony of the rocks: in which, laid up as orderly as in the shelves of a cabinet, are to be surveyed countless specimens of His own creative skill. Those rocks, by their superposition and structure, witness to a degree of antiquity for our planet which entirely defies arithmetic, as well as to a history which almost baffles conjecture. But, from a diligent study of the extinct forms of vegetable and animal life thus deposited and preserved in the earth's crust, something has been confidently predicated—(*but only within the last hundred years*)—concerning the order and sequence of those remote cycles of Creation, as well as concerning the probable conditions of

our globe during the periods when those plants grew and those creatures lived upon its surface. "Hundreds of thousands of animal species, as distinct as those which now compose our water, land, and air populations, have come into existence and died out again, through the æons of Geological time which separate us from the lower Palæozoic epoch."¹ . . . And thus much for the revelation which GOD hath made to us concerning Himself in His WORKS. These, be it observed, are the special province of the Natural Philosopher. He is the historian of præ-historic Time—the interpreter of its obscure records.

VI. GOD'S WORD claims to be the articulate expression of His mind and will, as well as the inspired record of His providential dealings with His rational creatures from the day in which He "made Man on the earth" until now. THE BIBLE, (for that is the name by which we designate the other great instrument whereby GOD hath revealed Himself to mankind), commencing with the briefest possible recognition of the antecedent history of the Universe—(it is effected in the single oracular announcement, "IN THE BEGINNING GOD CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH")—enters abruptly on the history of a Week of Days, on the sixth of which Man was created, and on the seventh of which GOD desisted from the work of Creation. As much as need be said has been offered already² concerning those days, and the recorded work of each. A pure Revelation—the narrative contained in Genesis i. lies altogether outside the province of the Palæontologist, for it purports to be the history of events which took place less than 6,000 years ago. To what extent the Author of Genesis—in describing the succession of the creatures in this, the latest cycle of Creation—shall be found to have described an order corresponding with that which Philosophers conjecture was also the order observed by the great Creator during the ages of the remote Past,³ is a matter of little importance to the Natural Philosopher, and of none to the Divine. Such a coincidence, though it might reasonably have been expected, cannot by any means be claimed as necessary. But in one other far more important particular, the Geologist is invited to note that the accuracy of his own observations is strikingly confirmed by the record of Revelation: namely, with respect to the comparatively recent appearance of Man upon the earth. Man is never found in a fossil state in any of the

¹ Professor Huxley in the *N. C.*, December, 1885, p. 857.

² See above, p. 245 to p. 247.

³ This irrelevant discussion fills many pages in recent numbers of the *N. C.* As, in the December number for 1885, and the January number for 1886.

Earth's earlier strata. In this way, be it remarked in passing, GOD'S WORD and GOD'S WORKS not only illustrate, but sometimes even mutually supplement, one another. That either should ever contradict the other, we hold to be a thing incredible, seeing that they both alike proceed from Him Who is the very Truth itself.¹ It remains to point out that as the interpretation of GOD'S WORKS is held to be the special province of the Philosopher, so is GOD'S WORD, and the interpretation thereof, held to be the special province of the Divine.

VII. Speaking therefore as a Divine, let the present writer be permitted to declare that never, since he seriously gave himself up to these studies, has he been able to see any special difficulty in this, the first chapter of the Bible. As he reads the record, it bears the impress of God's finger in every part: overflows with divinest teaching; is big to bursting with mysterious significance and beauty. It is greatly *in advance* of the old world's knowledge, instead of lagging behind it. Nay, as *he* reads the record, it is as much in advance of the wisdom of the new world as of the old: for, what else but one perpetual rebuke to "Darwinism" is *that* constantly recurring declaration of the SPIRIT, that GOD made every creature "*after his kind*"? . . . Those two great "lights" of which Moses speaks are here called "light-holders" rather, "luminaries" in short: a word plainly teaching that Sun and Moon are "receptacles" only, not original *sources* of Light. St. Paul actually designates saintly persons by the same name (*φωστῆρες*, Philippians ii. 15), because they shine with lustre derived wholly from Him Who is the fountain of Light.—By causing the earth to bring forth grass, herb, fruit-trees on the third day, and reserving for the fourth the manifestation of "the greater light," a sublime and most concerning truth is inculcated in this first chapter of Genesis: viz., that the fecundity of "Nature" does not depend on any generative power in the Sun, but is altogether the result of the decree of the great Creator.—On the other hand, "Light" is declared to have been the work—or rather the wonder—of "the first day," for a reason which will be apparent to anyone who will recite to himself Genesis i. 3, 4, 5, and (in close succession with these verses) St. John i. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9; xii. 35, 36, 46. "*That was the true light*," says the beloved disciple (speaking of our SAVIOUR) "which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." "*Very*" or "*real*" (*ἀληθινός*) is the epithet he bestows upon Him.—And what else, do men suppose, is pro-

¹ St. John xiv. 6. They are the words of the great Creator: for consider St. John i. 1-3. Hebr. i. 2, etc.

phetically referred to, and mysteriously anticipated, by Genesis i. 3, 4, 6, but the Resurrection "on the first day of the week"—(τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, note the idiom!)—of Him Who habitually discoursed of Himself as "*the Light of the World*"? Will it not be His awful prerogative, at the Last Day, "to divide the light from the darkness"—as on the First Day of Creation? And is it not because the Incarnate Word ("the *true* Light," as we have heard His Apostle call Him) was very Goodness, that "light" is singled out from all the other creatures for that solemn sentence of approval, "And God saw the light that it was *good*"? . . . It was on the sixth day that the First Man was created—a prophetic anticipation that on that same day of the week "the Second Man" would taste of death, and thereby become "the beginning of the Creation of God" (Rev. iii. 14).—Then further, What more significant than the threefold cadence of the announcement (in ver. 27) of Man's Creation? ("So GOD created Man in His own image. In the image of GOD created He him. Male and female created He them.") Was it not a Divine anticipation of the threefold chime of the angelic hymn (St. Luke ii. 14) on the night that CHRIST was born? . . . *What*, lastly, more clearly prophetic than the Sabbatical rest from the work of Creation on that very day in which our SAVIOUR rested in the grave from the work of Redemption?—And let it be carefully noted how significantly from the record of that seventh day is withheld the statement with which every other of the six days is dismissed (namely, that "the evening and the morning" made up the day), in token that it is a faint adumbration of the "rest" (the σαββατισμός, as St. Paul phrases it, in Heb. iv. 9) which "remaineth for the people of GOD;" seeing that (according to the strong asseveration of St. John the Divine) "there shall be *no night* there" (Rev. xxi. 25; xxii. 5).—Nay, refer back to the opening statement in verse 2, viz., that preliminary to the work of Creation, "the SPIRIT of GOD moved" (*brooded*, that is, *like a dove*) "on the face of the waters." How exquisite was the fulfilment of that typical "brooding," when, at the Baptism of Him Who was to "make all things new" (Rev. xxi. 5), to "create new Heavens and a new Earth" (Isa. lrv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1), "the HOLY GHOST descended in a bodily shape *like a dove* upon Him" (St. Luke iii. 22) as He stood in Jordan! And when "the old world" (2 Pet. ii. 5) had been submerged by a "flood of waters," and a fresh beginning had to be made, does not *the dove* again come to view? Such persistency of imagery is surely a striking note of fixedness in the Divine purpose; and surely it was *meant* to be significant also! . . . Shall the present writer be deemed wanting in intelligence if he solemnly

insists that the Mosaic record of Creation seems to him full of overflowing of the sublimest Gospel teaching? But (as was shown above) it is full of the best philosophy as well; aye, and of sound moral guidance also. By withholding the sentence of approval from the second day till the middle of the third, *what* is so plainly inculcated as the lesson that, in God's sight, no unfinished, no incomplete work, is "good"?

VIII. Now, it is absolutely *nihil ad rem* that, in reply to what goes before, we should be told by the Geologist, "I really do not see it. You talk unintelligibly to me. I deny every word of your exposition of Genesis i." "Very likely," is our rejoinder. "That is because you, who have never studied Divinity, know absolutely nothing at all about the matter." It ought not to require in fact to be formally stated, that it is in the highest degree desirable throughout the present discussion that the Divine and the Philosopher should keep within their own respective provinces; that either of them (to speak plainly) should be supremely careful to *mind his own business*. It is not for the Divine to dispute with the Palæontologist about the records of the præ-historic ages, or to deny any of the well-ascertained facts of Geological observation. He does but render himself ridiculous if he pretends to dogmatize in a province where he is *plane hospes*—a province which is wholly external to his own. And what is to be said of the Philosopher who invades the mysterious province of the Divine? We venture to warn him that he will inevitably talk nonsense, if he does. . . Let us proceed, however.

IX. The use which Man has made of the liberal provision thus devised by the great Creator for his edification and delight is suggestive, certainly. Whether it be calculated to furnish "*Homo sapiens*" (for so, we observe, Dr. Huxley styles Man, to distinguish him, we presume, from some other "*Homo*" unknown to such ill-informed mortals as the present writer) with any grounds for self-congratulation, let "*Homo sapiens*" himself declare. Throughout upwards of *fifty-seven* centuries the Book of Nature, though always lying wide open before his eyes, had been by him surveyed to so little purpose that its contents, in more than one important department, had been overlooked completely. Within the last hundred years, as if awaking out of sleep, he has suddenly become aware of his own incredible blindness, and of his own consequent grievous loss. The Truth has at last dawned, rather has flashed upon him, that in respect of that part of the Book of Nature which relates to the Earth's crust, realms of surprising interest and wonder have been freely submitted to his ken, of which, until yesterday, he did not so much as suspect the existence. We are assured, on competent authority, that since the year 1832,

"not only a new world, but new worlds of ancient life have been discovered;"¹ discovered somewhat as poker and tongs are discovered before the fire. Man learns that he has but to use his eyes, multiply his observations, accumulate the evidence which universal Nature furnishes, and he may acquaint himself with many a bygone world; may become as familiar with their strange furniture and uncouth occupants as with the plants and reptiles in his garden, the fishes and birds on his table, the animals in his farmyard. Now, that until yesterday this page of the wide-open Book of Nature should have been to Man as a history written in an unknown tongue, is quite strange enough; yet is it *as nothing* compared with the strangeness of what has next to be related.

X. For surely it were obvious to go on to inquire concerning Man—Has he then been rendered humble by the discovery of his own blindness through so many centuries of years? Has any public acknowledgment been made of a dulness of apprehension which to himself may well be inexplicable? And his words concerning Human knowledge, have they ever since been "wary and few"? . . . On the contrary. The Natural Philosopher so plumes himself on his recently acquired lore, that he will scarce tolerate that Knowledge of some sort shall exist in any other quarter. He arrogates to himself "Science" as his own exclusive province; and informs the world that outside this province all is "imagination, hope, ignorance."² To read his remarks about "*Science and Religion*," "*Science and Faith*,"³ and the like, one would really suppose that, besides sublimely ignoring that Mathematics, Astronomy, Geometry, Chemistry, Music, Metaphysics, Language, are "Sciences" likewise, the Natural Philosopher had forgotten that there is such a thing as "*Sacred Science*" as well—a Science which, inasmuch as it concerns itself chiefly with the written Revelation which God hath made to us concerning Himself, must of necessity be accounted the "*Scientia scientiarum*;" must perforce be recognised as the very Empress of all the Sciences. As for "*Religion*," does he not know that it is but Divinity viewed on its practical side? The term may not be used to cover the several branches of Sacred Science, of which the loftiest is "Theology." This, however, by the way. We had a supremely strange thing to relate, and it follows.

XI. The last impertinence of which the youngest of the Sciences has been guilty is certainly the strangest of any. She has taken it into her head that it is her function to invade

¹ *N. C.*, December, 1885, p. 850.

² *N. C.*, December, 1885, p. 859.

³ As in the *N. C.*, December, 1885, pp. 850, 859.

the province of Divinity, and to assail—the Bible. Her plea is that certain of its statements have reference to physical phenomena, of which (she assumes) its Authors can have known nothing. Does she consider that the CREATOR of universal Nature, that GOD Himself, is held to be the true Author of Scripture,—that the Bible claims to be a Revelation made to Man by GOD? “The Bible” (she asserts) “was not meant to teach Physical Science.” Has then the Professor of that Science been at the pains to acquaint himself with the marvellous structure, history, contents, of the Book of which he speaks so confidently? How, I venture to ask, does he *know* what “the Bible was meant to teach”? Surely, whatever things the Bible *actually teaches*, it is reasonable to assume that the same Bible was *meant* to teach! . . . I proceed to offer a few words on this great subject which shall be explanatory, and (it is hoped) will be found useful by those who sincerely desire to learn.

XII. That it is not the *primary object* or *special purpose* of the Bible to instruct mankind in Physical Science is, I suppose, universally admitted. That is precisely the reason why its language concerning natural objects is popular, general, phenomenal. Such expressions as “the heavens and the earth,” “the herb yielding seed,” “luminaries in the firmament of the heavens,” “every winged fowl after his kind,”—show plainly enough that He who employs them is *not aiming* at what (by Natural Philosophers in the nineteenth century) is styled “scientific” precision. In the meantime, this method of handling things natural affords no pretext for *disbelieving* what is delivered concerning them. It does not follow that a physical fact may be lawfully disputed *because* it is discoursed of in a book of which the special purpose and primary intention is not to teach “Physical Science.”

XIII. In all fairness let two admissions be loyally made with reference to this subject. The first (1), That the points at which the respective domains of Sacred and Physical Science interfere with one another are few. The second (2), That wherever extraordinary Scriptural statements are made concerning things natural, those statements are of the nature of *revelations*: by which I mean that the wonders discoursed of must have remained unknown to mankind for ever, but for what is found related in the Word of GOD. The “Six Days” of Creation furnish an apt illustration of what is intended. It is a marvel concerning which, of necessity, mankind must have been ignorant for ever, had not the mystery been categorically revealed.

XIV. One other colossal and most concerning *Physical* fact there is, about which, apart from Revelation, the world could

never have known anything at all; but concerning which, in His Word, GOD hath seen fit to be singularly communicative—to be minute and particular in a high degree. I allude to the Creation of MAN; and of Woman out of Man (Gen. ii. 21, 22). The deliberation with which Man was created, of which a solemn record is preserved in the first page of the inspired Word (i. 26):—the intention of the Creator therein, namely, to make Man in *His own image* after *His own likeness*:—the gift of dominion over all creatures at once solemnly conveyed to Man:—the fact that the Protoplast was “formed of the dust of the ground;” and that, in order to his “becoming a living soul,” GOD “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” (ii. 7):—nothing, I say, of all this was to have been so much as suspected, apart from the particular record contained in Scripture. Add, the prophetic oracle which Adam pronounced at sight of his spouse (ii. 23, 24),—words which were solemnly re-syllabled by the Author of Creation when He “was made flesh and dwelt among us” (St. John i. 3 and 14); and by Him were made the ground of the sanctity of the marriage tie (St. Matthew xix. 5; St. Mark x. 7, 8);—and we seem to have reached the very height of wonder. But it is not so. This is not nearly all. The LORD GOD having formed out of the ground “every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, brought them unto Adam *to see what he would call them.*” It follows—“And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, *that was the name thereof.*” The lecture, therefore, in Natural History which the Protoplast then and there delivered was such an one as the world hath never listened to since—no, nor will ever listen to again. That there may be no mistake about this matter, the record is repeated: “And Adam *gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field*” (Gen. ii. 19, 20). Adam, therefore, came into the world a Philosopher. Inspired was he at his creation with more than human wisdom. He recognised the natures of the creatures when he saw them, and described their natures in their names,—as when he “called his wife’s name *Chavvah*” (that is *life-giver*), “because she was the Mother of all living” (iii. 20). Completely furnished Philosopher as well as divinely inspired Prophet—created in the image, and after the likeness, of GOD (i. 26; v. 1).—our first father Adam is in himself the gravest rebuke imaginable to our modern Professor. In the words of a witty Doctor of our Church—“An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise.”¹

XV. Now, the Bible—beginning as it does by describing

¹ South’s *Sermon* ii. (“Man created in God’s Image”), i. 55.

particularly the Creation, and immediately afterwards the Fall of Man—is only to be comprehended by one who will be at the pains to bear steadily in mind that the two sets of writings of which it is composed relate respectively to the ruin of our Nature in the person of Adam, and to its restoration in the person of CHRIST. St. Paul puts this briefly when he proclaims that “as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive” (1 Cor. xv. 22). Hence again that saying of his, “*The First Man* is of the earth, earthy; *the Second Man* is the LORD from Heaven” (ver. 47). In other words, “Adam and CHRIST are *the two roots of Mankind*: Adam as in a state of Nature, and CHRIST as in a state of Grace.”¹ The earlier set of writings presupposes the latter; the latter set exclusively recognises the earlier. They may not be severed. Their unity is complete. Let it further be noted that Genesis itself may not be dismembered or disintegrated. Every subsequent page of the Book pledges itself to the authentic character of its earliest chapters. A first and a second decade of Patriarchs establish the world’s Chronology from the creation of the Protoplast until the birth of Abraham (Gen. v. and xi.). After which, as curious a piece of network as is anywhere to be found in History, carries our exact knowledge of dates down to the death of Joseph (Gen. l. 26). The narrative so coheres, that to establish a breach in it anywhere is impossible. The primæval oracle (that One born of Woman should bruise the Tempter’s head) takes the span of all the succeeding ages. Prophecy—brightening as it advances, until at last it actually names the place² and fixes the year of the Redeemer’s birth,³ describes His person and narrates His sufferings, Death and Resurrection⁴—Prophecy, I say, proves to be nothing else but *a preparation for Christ*. And yet, the Author of Scripture, foreseeing that unbelief would cavil at particular predictions, and seek to resolve the Divine Foreknowledge into ordinary human “Forecast,” hath caused that the very texture of the Book shall be prophetic likewise: hath procured that prophetic outlines of the Redeemer’s person, work, and office shall everywhere be woven into the very warp and woof of the narrative: hath so wonderfully interfered, that as well in its Ordinances as in its Histories, the Old Testament shall adumbrate the coming SAVIOUR in every part. In consequence of which—“*beginning at Moses and all the prophets*” (*i.e.*, explaining Joshua and Judges as well as Genesis and Isaiah)

¹ Sanderson’s *Works*, vol. i., p. 69.

² Micah v. 2. Compare St. Matth. ii., 4-6. St. John vii. 42.

³ Dan. ix. 25-27.

⁴ Isaiah liii. Psalms xxii: xvi. (Cf. Acts ii. 24-31.).

—He was able, when He came into the world, “to expound” to His Disciples, “in all the Scriptures *the things concerning Himself*” (St. Luke xxiv. 27). Now, this constitutes a kind and a body of evidence which no hardihood of unbelief will ever be able to explain away or evacuate. Particular types may be denied or doubted; but the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the settlement in Canaan, make up together an emblematic picture of Redemption, which no one may presume to treat with unconcern. The Divine Harmony and correspondence which in this way subsists between the Old Testament and the New (two sets of writings written at different dates, by different men, and sundered the one from the other by half a thousand years) is a marvel unapproached by anything of which the world has elsewhere had experience. Those several books must stand, or they must fall, together. And *all* must stand of both Testaments, or none may stand of either . . . The Bible ends with a promise of “a new Heaven and a new Earth” (2 St. Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxi. 1); and CHRIST is spoken of as the beginning of a new Creation (Rev. iii. 15). “Behold,” (saith He) “I make all things new” (Rev. xxi. 5).

XVI. We have entered somewhat largely into this subject not without a purpose. Some “reason of the hope that is in us” (1 St. Pet. iii. 15) has been incidentally assigned; from which, on the one hand, it will be clearly seen that no grotesque uncertainty as to the “order of succession” of “flying vertebrates” in the abyss of præ-Adamic Time, occasions us any degree of perplexity or distress. Such matters lie altogether outside the province of Sacred Science.

On the other hand, when the Natural Philosopher claims that MAN shall be held to be the product of EVOLUTION, and to be descended from an ape,—we trust that it has been made plain why we are constrained to reject his hypothesis with derision. It is plainly irreconcilable with the fundamental revelations of Scripture. Whether the hypothesis be not in itself *unscientific*, nor to say essentially *absurd*, we forbear to inquire. It may not, at all events, be pretended that “*the interpreters of Genesis and the interpreters of Nature*” are here in conflict; as if this were at all a question of “Interpretation.” An appeal is made on the one side to a plain fact of Sacred Science; so fundamental in its character that, by its removal, the entire superstructure would crumble to its base, and become a shapeless ruin. On the other, an hypothesis is gratuitously put forth utterly destitute of scientific proof, contradicted by reason and experience, and flouted by such a first-rate Naturalist as Sir Richard Owen.

XVII. Yes, it cannot be too plainly stated that THE CREA-

TION,—THE TEMPTATION,—THE FALL of Man, are three fundamental verities ; points essential to the existence of Christianity as a system ; and therefore at all hazards to be guarded inviolate. The pretence that the earliest chapters of Genesis may with safety be regarded as allegory, fiction, fable, can only proceed from one who is either utterly unacquainted with the very rudiments of Divinity, or else is an enemy of God's Truth. It is not merely that, without those first three chapters, the whole Scheme of Salvation, as revealed in the New Testament, becomes irrational and meaningless. Rather is the system observed to collapse entirely without them ; reminding one of what would be the fate of yonder cathedral pile in the morning, if, "while men slept," its foundations were to be withdrawn.

And thus it becomes plain why we so earnestly deprecate any playing of tricks with the "Six days of Creation." Whether the citadel could be retained when the enemy had once been admitted within the walls of the city, we forbear to inquire. We decline to let him in. We take our stand before the gate ; and if we must be slain, we elect to be slain *there*.

XVIII. Professor Huxley, the most recent assailant of Genesis, does not improve his position as a controversialist when he remarks concerning the first chapter :

My belief, on the contrary, is, and long has been, that the Pentateuchal story of the Creation is simply a myth. I suppose it to be an hypothesis respecting the origin of the Universe which some ancient thinker found himself able to reconcile with his knowledge, or what he thought was knowledge, of the nature of things ; and therefore assumed to be true.—(*N. C.*, February, 1886, p. 198.)

The same distinguished Philosopher informs us that

"Creation"—signifies a gradual Evolution of one species from another, extending through immeasurable time.—(*Ibid.*, December, 1885, p. 857.)

Elsewhere, he virtually denies that the Universe can have had any Creator at all. He says :

Omnipotence itself can surely no more make something "out of" nothing than it can make a triangular circle.—(*Ibid.*, p. 201.)

More recently still, the same writer has used expressions with regard to ALMIGHTY GOD which are little short of blasphemous. We forbear to quote them. Christianity he seems to regard as "Hellenized Judaism ;" and the God of Christian men as (to say the least) a very imperfect character indeed (*Ibid.* p. 860). We read such things with sincere commiseration, but with even more surprise. We have ever supposed that the true Man of Science is supremely careful not to dogmatize in any department of Learning which he has never studied, and which he clearly does not understand. But the arrogance of Professor Huxley knows no bounds. "The

assured results of modern Biblical Criticism," he informs us (*Ibid.* p. 193), are fatal to the "Mosaic" authorship of the Pentateuch. We take leave to apprise him that he has been hoaxed. Is he aware that the Incarnate WORD meets him with a clear counterstatement—"Moses wrote of Me" John v. 46, 47)? His "thinkings" on Micah vi. 8 ("And what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"), are quite a curiosity:

If any so-called Religion takes away from this great saying of Micah, I think it wantonly mutilates, while, if it adds thereto, I think it obscures, the perfect ideal of religion.—(*Ibid.*, p. 860.)

XIX. There is a time for all things—a time for bandying compliments, and a time for speaking plainly. We must be allowed to designate all that precedes by its proper name—*impertinence*. We recommend the concluding clause of what Professor Huxley regards as the Cyclopædia of Divinity to his own special consideration. Let him learn to "walk humbly" with his Maker. And since the Philosopher is so fond of straying out of his own province into that of the Divine, he is respectfully assured that it is one of the fundamental truths of Sacred Science that "*the fear of the LORD* is the beginning of wisdom." He is also reminded that it was "*the Fool*" who "said in his heart," (because he was ashamed to say it with his lips), "there is no God."

XX. Why need I withhold the frank avowal that what is sometimes dignified with the name of "Scientific doubt" excites in me nothing so much as astonishment and ridicule? Astonishment, at its pitiful imbecility; ridicule, at its utterly unscientific character. The so-called philosophers who from time to time favour the world with their silly cogitations on Sacred Science—their weak objections, their impossible hypotheses, their crude difficulties—remind me of nothing so much as little children, crying because they find themselves left out in the dark.

JOHN W. BURGON.



ART. II.—NONCONFORMITY IN POOR PARISHES.

IT is not the design of this paper to expose or magnify the shortcomings of Nonconformity, but to aid in vindicating the right of the Church of England to be regarded as the Church of the poor, and to show the unrighteousness of those who, mainly for political ends, persistently assert that