
A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

enrolled in heaven . . . and to Jesus the Mediator of a new covenant. . . .

For him the wilderness, desolate to the bodily eye, is thronged with joyous ministers of God's will. For him no differences of earth can destroy the sense of kindred which springs from a common spiritual destiny.

What then, we are constrained to ask, is this revelation, what are these facts to us? Do they not meet the loneliness which has depressed us, the weakness which has often marred our efforts?

It must be so if God, in His love, open our eyes to behold the armies of light by which we are encircled; if He open our hearts to feel the strength of fellowship with every citizen of His kingdom.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

RECENT DISCUSSIONS OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

IT would be a strange phenomenon in the intellectual life of our time that some of our ablest men should be found contending earnestly as to the meaning and validity of a document so old as the proem to Genesis, were it not that, as Mr. Gladstone has so well put the matter,[1] this constitutes the opening section of a book in which is conveyed special knowledge to meet "the special need everywhere so palpable in the state and history of our race." In face of this special need it is true that questions of cosmogony, or of the origin of the lower animals, become small and unimportant. Yet these bulk more largely in our estimation when we find them to be subsidiary in even a small measure to the greater questions that relate to the early

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1886.

history and destiny of man. The present writer is not a theologian, or a divine, but simply a naturalist, whose specialities have lain in some departments of palæontology, and who has studied the Hebrew sacred writings partly as a means of knowing something of Semitic language and literature, and partly because of their practical connexion with Christianity. He has consequently been led to regard these ancient writings and the modern historical criticisms applied to them, as well as their relations to natural science, somewhat differently from the aspect in which they are ordinarily presented, and to compare them more closely than is usual with scientific and philosophical ideas at present prevalent.

At the outset it would seem that reasonable men should attach very little importance, except under considerable limitations, to the conclusions of those schools of criticism which regard the Pentateuch as of late date, and as made up of several documents. The earlier parts of Genesis, with which we are at present concerned, are undoubtedly intensely archaic in their style and manner, even in comparison with most of the other Hebrew books. They are not specially Palestinian and local, but have features in common with the earliest fragments of Chaldean and Egyptian literature. They have no special reference to the institutions of the Hebrew commonwealth, and have a simplicity in their subjects, and the mode of treating them, which speaks of the dawn of civilization. There is nothing in their texture to prevent them from being even more ancient than the time of Moses, and belonging to a period before the Hebrew race had separated from the main Turanian and Semitic stocks. The probability of this is strengthened by their connexion as to the matter of their statements with the primitive Chaldean documents recently discovered, and even with the remnants of the creation myths of American races.

These statements apply to the so-called Jahvist as well as to the Elohist portions of Genesis. Indeed, as Schrader has shown, in some instances, as in the history of the Flood, the Jahvist portion is nearer to the ancient Chaldean legend than the Elohist passages, and therefore if there is any difference, is apparently older.[1] The attempt to separate these old records into distinct documents, even if it were not greatly discredited by the extreme differences of its upholders among themselves, does not commend itself to a scientific student. We are familiar in palæontology with animals and plants of very generalized structure, but instead of regarding this as evidence that they are composite creatures artificially put together, we rather consider it as proving their primitive and unspecialized character. The oldest air-breathing vertebrates known to us are certain reptilian or semi-reptilian creatures of the Carboniferous age, to which the almost Homeric name of *Stegocephala* has been given. Now if I find that one of these animals has a head resembling that of a frog, vertebræ like those of a fish, and scales and limbs resembling those of a lizard, I do not separate these into distinct portions and place them in separate cases of my collection, and invent an hypothesis that they are of different ages. I recognise in the apparently composite and undifferentiated character of the remains, evidence that they belong to a very primitive animal. I believe this is the really scientific view to take of the Pentateuch, except in so far as it is probable that the earlier portions of it consist of old records of the Abramidæ existing anterior to the Exodus. In any case we must regard the first chapter of Genesis as one homogeneous document, and the evidence as to its age will develop itself as we proceed.

[1] The Book of Genesis undoubtedly represents the name Jahveh as in use in antediluvian times (Gen. iv. 1 and iv. 26). And the statement of Réville, that Exodus vi. 2, 3, contradicts this, is altogether superficial and inaccurate, as might easily be shown were there time to state the arguments in the case.

A second point on which I would insist, as essential to the interpretation of Genesis i. is, that its writer intended, and his successors in Hebrew literature understood, that the creative days are days of God, or Divine ages—*Olamim* as they are elsewhere called—or, which amounts to the same thing, that they represent such periods of time. It may be worth while shortly to mention the evidence of this, as I find it is doubted or denied by Huxley and Réville.[1] The writer of Genesis i. obviously sees no incongruity in those early days which passed before there were any arrangements for natural days; "dies ineffabiles," as Augustine calls them; nor in the fact that the day in which the Creator rests goes on until now without any termination; nor in the statement that the whole work could be comprehended in one day, "the day when Jahveh-Elohim made the earth and the heavens;" and if this be called later and Jahvistic, it will have the additional value of being the comment of an editor who may be supposed to have understood the documents he had to do with.

If we are to attribute the decalogue to a later period than Genesis, which even M. Réville seems to admit, the argument is rendered conclusive by the position of the fourth commandment in the midst of the "ten words," and by the reason attached to it, the whole of which would otherwise be inexplicable and even trifling.[2] A later writer, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. iv.), explains this. When God entered into His rest He gave that rest also as an immortal rest to man in Eden. But man fell and lost the perpetual or olamic sabbatism. There remained to him in the weekly sabbath a memento of the lost rest and an anticipation of its recovery by a Redeemer in the future.

[1] *Nineteenth Century*, December, 1885, and January, 1886.

[2] Réville's commentary on this and on the "Firmament," in the *Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1886, is remarkable as coming from a man who should have at least a popular notion of the contents of the Bible.

Hence the Sabbath was not only the central point of the moral law, but of all religion, the pledge and the commemoration of the Divine promise, and the means of keeping it before men's minds from age to age till the promised Redeemer should come. It is this that causes the Sabbath to be insisted on as the most essential point of religion by the Hebrew prophets, and this is the reason of its connexion with the days of creation. This also caused the necessity of its change by Christians to the Lord's Day without any new enactment, for on this day Christ arose to enter on His sabbatism "as God did into His." The Lord's Day now has the same significance to Christians as the type of the rest into which the Saviour has entered, and which has continued for 1800 years, and of that eternal Sabbath which remains to the people of God. In truth, independently of all considerations of cosmogony, the long seventh day of Creation and the long heavenly rest of the Saviour constitute the only valid reasons either for the Jewish or Christian Sabbath. That Jesus Himself held this view we learn from His answer to the Pharisees who accused Him of breaking the Sabbath. "My Father worketh until now and I work."[1] That the apostolic Church had the same view of the creative days and the Creator's rest we learn from the Pauline use of the words *aiōn* and *aiōnios* with reference to God's ages of working, and from the passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews already referred to.[2]

The creative days are the "antiquities of the earth" spoken of in Proverbs viii. They are the *Olamim* or ages noticed as equal to God's creative days in Psalm xc., for which even the Revised Version retains the unmeaning "from everlasting to everlasting." This Psalm too is a

[1] John v. 17 (Revised Version).

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 17; John i. 2, etc.; Heb. i. 2; iv. 4 to 12. In some of these passages the sense is obscured in our version by the use of the term "world," which is an incorrect translation unless understood in the sense of *time-worlds*.

very archaic one, resembling in its diction the songs attributed to Moses in Deuteronomy. Psalm civ. is a poetical version of Genesis i., and in it the work marches on in slow and solemn grandeur without any reference to days. Again there is not anywhere in the Bible a hint that the work of creation was remarkable as being done in a short time. Some of us have no doubt been taught in childhood that God's power was wonderfully shown by His creating the world in the short space of six days, but there is nothing of this in the Old or New Testament.

Lastly, the idea of long prehuman periods exists in nearly all the traditions of ancient nations, and is contained in the Chaldean record, though it wants the division into days. Yet the Chaldeans had a week of seven days, and regarded the seventh as unlucky with reference to work, and as a day of rest.

I have insisted on this point, because though essential to the understanding of the record, it has been so much overlooked in popular religious teaching that even men of education may be excused for ignorance of it.

I propose now, without waiting to examine the physical cosmogony of the earlier days of creation, to notice shortly the actual statements of the author of Genesis respecting the introduction of plants and animals, taking these statements in their most literal sense.

Here at the outset we are met by an apparent discrepancy between the record in Genesis and what we have learned of the history of creation from the study of the earth's crust. Our author informs us that vegetation was introduced on the day preceding the final arrangements of the solar system, and two days before the inswarming of animals on the fifth day. This vegetation also included the higher kinds of plants, for while it was first *Deshe*, or seedless plants (not grass as in the Authorized Version), it also contained herbs bearing seed, and trees bearing fruit. In

so far as geological discovery has yet reached into the older layers of the earth's crust, it has found abundant remains of animals as low as the Lower Cambrian; but below this there is a vast thickness of both crystalline and fragmental rock, in which Eozoon of the Laurentian stands out as the sole representative of animal life; and its claim to be an animal is still in question. But land plants are not known to reach so far back. None are known so old as the Lower Cambrian, so that marine animals, and probably marine plants, appear to have existed long before land plants. Yet the geologist cannot safely deny the existence of land vegetation even in the old Laurentian period. We know that there was land at that time; and in the middle of the Laurentian series, there exist in Canada immense bedded deposits of carbon, in the form of graphite and of ores of iron, which cannot be accounted for on any known principles of chemical geology, except by supposing the existence of abundant vegetation. It is true that Eozoon exists in these beds, but it is in any case a mere precursor or foreshadowing of animal life, while the quantity of Laurentian carbon which it would seem must owe its accumulation to the deoxidising agency of plants, is enormous. Whether we shall ever find Laurentian rocks in a condition to yield up the actual forms and structures of this old vegetation is uncertain; but we know, as certainly as we can know anything inferentially, that it existed. Of its character and quality we have no information except the record in Genesis. If it was given to the primitive prophet of creation to see in his vision the forms of Laurentian vegetation, he saw what no geologist has yet seen, but what some geologist of the future may possibly see. In any case, he has to thank the discoveries of Sir William Logan and his *confrères* in Canada, for establishing at least a probability on scientific grounds that he was right; and until these discoveries were made, the fact of pre-Cambrian vegetation rested on his sole

authority. It may be said that such vegetation would be useless; but the same remark may be made as to the lower animals which existed so long before man, or as to the exuberant vegetation of some oceanic islands untenanted by the higher animals.

In the geological record the lower animals swarm upon the stage in countless multitudes and vast variety of form and organization, in the Cambrian age; and it is on this, and the subsequent succession of life, that discussion has centred in the recent controversies. Here, fortunately, we have ample material for comparison of the two records, and if they do not agree, it is here that their divergence must appear. But to give fair play to the old historian, it will be necessary to examine his method and to weigh well his words.

The method of the writer of Genesis in describing the work of the fifth and sixth days is similar to that employed in reference to the previous periods, but in some respects more complex, as befits the higher theme. He states first the Divine purpose or decree under the formula "God said"; next the actual production of the objects intended—"God created"; next the contemplation of the work and its subsequent development—"God saw." Let us put down these stages in order, as given for the fifth day.

(1) "God said, 'Let the waters swarm swarmers having life (animal life), and let fowl[1] fly over the earth on the surface of the expanse of heaven.'"

(2) "God created great reptiles,[2] and every living moving animal with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged animal after its kind."

(3) "God saw that it was good, and God blessed them, saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters of the sea, and let fowl multiply in the earth.'"

This is, I think, a sufficiently literal rendering of the

[1] Used in old sense of flying animal. [2] *Tanninim*, that is crocodiles.

record as it stands in the Hebrew text, so far as the English tongue suffices to represent its words; but some of these terms require consideration. The word *sheretz* used for the first group of creatures, literally "swarmers" or swarming animals, is precisely defined in the law respecting animal food in Leviticus xi. There it is used as a comprehensive term, to include all the lower animals of the waters with the fishes and batrachians, as well as certain animals of the land, viz. the land snails, insects, spiders and scorpions, along with small reptiles, and perhaps, though this last is not quite certain, some small quadrupeds usually regarded as vermin. The precise definition given in the law respecting unclean animals leaves no doubt as to the meaning of the word. We thus learn that the creation of the fifth day included all the marine invertebrates, and the fishes and batrachians, with the insects and their allies, or at least all such as could be held to be produced from the waters. The link of connexion which binds all these creatures under this comprehensive word is their teeming oviparous reproduction, which entitles them to be called swarming animals, in connexion with their habitat or origin in the waters. Thus this one word covers all the animals known in the Palæozoic and Mesozoic periods of geology, with three notable exceptions—the birds, the true reptiles, and the marsupial mammals. But singularly, and as if to complete his record, this old narrator adds two of these groups, as if they had specially attracted his attention. The word *Oph*, "fowl, bird, or winged animal," is the usual word for birds in general, though in Leviticus it includes the winged insects, and the bats, which are winged mammals. As it is a very primitive and widely diffused word, and probably onomatopoetic and derived from the sound of wings, it may in early times have served to denote all things that fly, though applied to birds chiefly. The second group specially singled out is designated by the word *Tannin*, which, like

oph, is a very old and generally diffused word,[1] denoting primitively any animal long and extended. In the Hebrew Bible it is, however, used in almost every place where it occurs, either for the crocodile[2] or for the larger serpents. In Exod. vii. 9, the next place where it appears, it represents the great serpent produced from the rod of Moses. There is no warrant for the rendering "great whales," borrowed from the Septuagint, and still less for the "great sea monsters" of the Revised Version.[3] If we ask what animals the writer can have meant by *tanninim*, the answer must be either crocodiles or large serpents or creatures resembling them. Thus our author does not, as both Mr. Gladstone and Prof. Huxley seem to suppose, overlook altogether the "age of reptiles." There are, however, known to us in the Mesozoic period a few small marsupial mammals, humble and insignificant precursors of the age of mammalia. These our author has apparently overlooked; but he has an excuse for this in the fact that such creatures do not occur in modern times, except in Australia or America, and even if known to him, he had no special word by which they could be designated.

Even with the above deduction, it must be confessed that this history of the fifth creative day presents a marvellous approximation to the two earlier periods of animal life as known to geologists, the ages of invertebrates and fishes and the age of reptiles. With the above explanation, which is in no respect forced, but quite literal, I think Prof. Huxley should be ready frankly to accept this, and all the

[1] Sansc., *Tan;* Greek, *Teino;* Latin, *Tendo*, etc.

[2] See, for example, Ezek. xxix. 3 and xxxii. 2. Jeremiah compares the king of Babylon to a *Tannin*, and may refer to a Euphratean crocodile, now apparently extinct (Jer. li. 34).

[3] The word is usually rendered in the Sept. *Drakōn*; but another word, *Tan*, a name apparently of the jackal, has been confounded with it in that version. When the later Hebrew writers had occasion to refer to the whales, they used the word Leviathan, though in earlier writers this also is applied to the crocodile. Compare Ps. civ. 26 and Job xli.

more that he has been specially distinguished for the advocacy of views of animal classification akin to those of Genesis. No one has more insisted on the affinity of the batrachians with the fishes and that of the birds with the true reptiles. In like manner this ancient writer, if he had the batrachians before his mind, includes them with the fishes, and singles out the birds and the higher reptiles as companion groups, at the summit of the animal kingdom in their day. It may be somewhat unfair to test so popular and general a statement by such details; but if an author who lived so long before the dawn of modern science is to be tested at all by our present systems, it is proper at least to give him the benefit of the consummate skill which he shows in avoiding all inaccuracy in the few bold touches with which he sketches the introduction of animal life.

The argument in favour of the writer of Genesis might perhaps be closed here, without fear as to the verdict of reasonable men. But there is a positive side as well as a negative to this vindication, and we must not rest content with a bare verdict of "Not guilty," lest we should fall into the condemnation of being mere "reconcilers." Our ancient author has something to say respecting that formidable word evolution so constantly ringing in our ears, and which Prof. Huxley affirms is opposed to Genesis, while Mr. Gladstone somewhat hesitatingly believes in its consistency at least with the argument of design. With reference to the origin and becoming of things, legitimate science is conversant with two ideas, that of causation and that of development. Causation may either be primary as proceeding from a creative will, or secondary as referring to natural laws and energies. Development may be direct, as in that of a chick from the egg, or indirect, as in the production of varieties of animals by human agency. Now it so happens that by the school of Spencer and Darwin

the word evolution is used as covering all these kinds of causation and development; and by what Mr. Gladstone calls a "fallacy of substitution," or what I have elsewhere termed a scientific sleight-of-hand or jugglery, we are carried from one to the other almost without perceiving it, until we can scarcely distinguish between a causal evolution, which is a mere figure of speech, and a modal evolution, which may be an actual process going on under ascertained laws and known forces. So difficult has the discrimination of these things become, that it is a serious question whether sober men of science should not discard altogether the term evolution, and insist on the use of causation and development each in its proper place.

These questions were living issues in the time when Genesis was written. It was then a grave question whether one God had made all things, or whether they had arisen spontaneously, or were the work of a conflicting pantheon of deities. How does our ancient authority stand in relation to this great question? He recognises causation in the one creative will—"God said," "God created;" and thereby affirms a first cause and the unity of nature. Secondary causes he also notices in the agency of the waters, the atmosphere and the land, and in the law of continuity implied in the words "after their species." Development he sees in one form in the progress of the creative plan, in another in the power of fruitfulness and multiplication. Yet these several ideas are distinctly and clearly defined in his mind, and each is kept in its proper place relatively to the end which he has in view. It is not too much to say, that any plain man reading and pondering these statements may obtain clearer and more correct views as to the origin and history of animal life, than it would be possible to reach by any amount of study of our modern popular evolutionary philosophy. How did this ancient

writer escape the mental confusion which clouds the minds of so many clever men in our time? It may be said it was because he knew less of scientific detail, but possibly he had a higher source of enlightenment.

It is also interesting to note the strangely unerring instinct with which he seizes the relative importance of different kinds of creative work. He had selected the word *Bara*, "create," [1] to express the most absolute and original kind of making in the production of the materials of the heavens and the earth. He is content with the less emphatic *Asa*, "made," when he speaks of the expanse, the great lights and even the later animals. But he signalises the first appearance of animal life by a repetition of "create," as if to affirm the great gulf which we know separates the animal from dead matter. In like manner he repeats this great word when he has to deal with the new fact of the rational and moral nature of man. Should man ever be able to produce a new living animal from dead matter, or should the spontaneous development of the higher nature of man from the instinct of the brute become a proved fact of science, we may doubt his wisdom in the selection of terms, but not till then.

Observe also how, without in the least derogating from this idea of creation, in the words, "God said, Let the waters swarm swarming animals, after their kinds" he combines the primary Almighty fiat with the prepared environment and its material and laws, the reproductive power and the unity and diversity of type. Here again he proves himself not only a terse writer but an accurate, and, may we not add, scientific thinker.

I have left little space for the consideration of the Sixth day, but what has been already said will render less com-

[1] This statement is sufficient to vindicate the translation "create," for *Bara*, but it could be confirmed, if necessary, by citing every passage in which the word occurs in the Hebrew books, whether in literal or figurative applications.

ment necessary. Here the statement is longer, as befits the introduction of man, and the day is divided into two separate portions, in each of which occurs the threefold fiat, act and development. It is interesting in this connexion to note that while man is introduced in the same creative day with the higher animals nearest to him in structure, his greater importance is recognised by giving him a distinct half-day to himself.

The land is here commanded to bring forth its special animals, but these are no longer *sherātzim*, birds and reptiles, but the mammalian quadrupeds. The three terms used to denote these creatures are translated even in the Revised Version by the notably incorrect words—"cattle, creeping things and beasts of the earth." It requires no special scholarship, but only the industry to use a Hebrew concordance, to discover the simple and familiar use of these words in the Old Testament. *Behemah*, though including "cattle," is a general name for all the larger herbivorous quadrupeds, and in Job the hippopotamus is characterised as the chief of the group. These animals appropriately take the lead as culminating first in the age of mammals, which is also the geological fact. *Remes*, "creeping things," is applied in a very indiscriminate way to all small quadrupeds, whether mammalian or reptilian, and may here be taken to represent the smaller quadrupeds of the land. The compound word *Haytho-eretz*, "beast of the land," though very general in sense, is employed everywhere to designate what we would call "wild beasts," and especially the larger carnivora. This first half of the sixth day is therefore occupied in the introduction of the mammalia of the land. This completes the animal population of the world with the exception of the whales and their allies, which strangely are not included in the narrative. Perhaps it was this apparent omission that induced the Septuagint translators to insert these marine mammals instead of the

crocodile as a representative of the *tanninim*.[1] The omission has, however, a curious significance, in connexion with the probability that this creation document originated before the removal of men from their primitive abodes in interior Asia, and when the whales, as well as the marsupial mammals already referred to, must have been unknown to them. That the Septuagint translators, living on the borders of the Mediterranean, should regard the omission of whales as a defect in the record was most natural; but if the original narrator and his audience were inland people, dwelling perhaps in the plain of Shinar, they may have been ignorant of whales or of any name for such creatures, and it is in such a case as this that we may legitimately apply the doctrine, that the Bible was not intended to teach science.

It is remarkable that the animals of the sixth day are said to have been "made," not created, as if after the first peopling of the world with lower creatures, the introduction of the higher forms of life was an easier process. The modern evolutionist may take this much of comfort from our ancient authority.

The second half of the work of the sixth day, though the more important, has not entered into the controversies which have prompted this article. Its distinctive features may be shortly stated as follows. Man was "created," and this in the image and likeness of God, and with godlike power in subduing the earth and in ruling its animal inhabitants, among which, however, in accordance with an intimation in the special record of man in the second chapter, the "wild beasts" are not included. Thus the

[1] The use made of this mistranslation by Prof. Huxley in his argument is almost ludicrous in its perversity. There is a passage in the Authorised Version of the Bible which seems to give countenance to the mammalian idea of this word: "Even the sea-monsters draw out the breast" (Lam. iv. 3). But the correct reading here is understood to be not *tannin*, but *tanim*, "jackals," instead of "sea monsters," and the word is so rendered in the Revised Version.

rational and moral elevation of man on a plane higher than that of the animal kingdom is recognised, and he is made the vicegerent of God on the earth. A certain limitation as to food is also imposed upon him. He is not to be carnivorous, but to subsist on the better and more nutritious kinds of vegetable food—seeds and fruits. These intimations all point to a direct relation of man to his Maker and to a supremacy over the lower creatures, conditions which are more fully specified, in perfect harmony with the earlier statements, in the more detailed account of man and his relations to God and external nature in the sequel of the book (chaps. ii. etc.).

It may be well here to notice the essential differences between the Hebrew and the Chaldean Genesis, or the fragments of the latter which remain. Unfortunately we have only as yet a passage in which "the gods in their assembly created" living creatures, and these living creatures are specified as "animals of the field, great beasts of the field, and creeping things." So far as this goes, it would seem to indicate a classification of animals like that in Genesis, but a polytheistic belief as to their creation. This polytheistic element is indeed the distinctive feature of the Chaldean record, and raises questions as to the relative ages and religious tendencies of the documents. With respect to the former, it seems certain that the originals of the Nineveh tablets may have been very ancient. They are, however, so mixed up with the history of a Chaldean hero, known as Isdubar, as to give reason for the supposition that there may have been still older creation legends. Again, is it true, as many seem to suppose, that polytheism is older than monotheism? Is it not likely that the simpler belief is older than the more complex; that which required no priests' ritual or temple, older than that with which all these things were necessarily associated? Further, there is no example of any polytheistic people, spontaneously and without some

impulse from abroad, laying aside its many gods. On the contrary, the Jewish history shows us how easy it is to lapse into polytheism, and we have seen how, in comparatively modern times, the simplicity of primitive Christianity has grown into a complex pantheon of saints. These considerations would entitle the Hebrew record to the earliest place among all the religious traditions of our race, and render still more remarkable its clear, consistent and natural statements.

With respect to the tendencies of the two documents, it is certain that the Hebrew Genesis is in every way to be preferred. It avoids all the superstitions certain to result from breaking up the unity of nature and deifying its powers, and cuts away the roots of every form of debasing nature-worship. In its doctrine of creative unity and of developed plan, it lays a secure basis for science, while it leaves the way open for all legitimate study of nature. These are great merits which science should ever be ready to acknowledge. It is in this grand general tendency of the Biblical record that the real relations of revelation and science are to be found; and if it is necessary to enter more into detail, this is not for the sake of a so-called "reconciliation," which must necessarily be incomplete, though on the supposition of a real revelation and a true science, ever improving in exactness; but merely because imperfect views of revelation and of nature have been raising up apparent contradictions which do not exist, and which may tend alike to the injury of science and religion.

With reference to the religious aspect of the question, one cannot better illustrate this than by turning to the beautiful passage quoted by Prof. Huxley from the prophet Micah: "What does Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Micah's religion, it is to be observed, begins and ends with God, and his God is not the God of the

agnostic who cannot be known; nor the god of the mere pantheist, everywhere and yet nowhere; nor one of the many gods of the polytheist. His God is the Almighty Personal Will, the Creator of heaven and earth, a God who reveals Himself and "requires" something at our hands, and Micah himself is a prophet who affirms that the "word of Jehovah came" to him, giving this very precept. Further, He is a God who Himself loves both justice and mercy, and who invites His fallen children to "walk" with Him, but "humbly," as befits a redeemed people. Such a religion requires an intelligent knowledge of God, and to be intelligent it must be founded on just such teaching as that of the first chapter of Genesis. Such was the religion of Job, who though a good man, doing justly and loving mercy, yet fancied himself a very deserving person, until God showed him his littleness and infirmity, by referring him to His own great creative works in physical and animal nature; and then Job humbles himself, and "repents in dust and ashes." Such was the religion of Paul, when he mildly reproves the people of Athens for being "somewhat superstitious" in adding to their many gods an altar to the "Unknown God," and points them to "the God that made the world and all things therein." There may be a superstitious or sentimental or emotional religion, without such knowledge of God, but there cannot be a rational religion without that belief in a Creator, which is expressed in the words "God created the heavens and the earth," and there cannot be a saving religion without the belief in a Redeemer fulfilling God's old promise in Genesis, that "the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent."

J. Wm. Dawson.