

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

further back, as is his wont, and thinks he finds the origin of the very first variations of the first organisms,—“they conformed to the same general law as do the changes of the inorganic mass.”

Now it is obvious, looking on the nature and scope of these suggested modifications of Darwinism, that no alteration is made in its relation to religion. The most conspicuous break from pure Darwinism is that of Mr. Wallace, who places the origin of man as a responsible moral being outside or above the line of organic continuity; but even this is no reversal of anything Dr. Darwin taught concerning Organic Evolution in general. The present scientific position is fairly expressed in Professor Huxley's words, when taking a review of the question before the Royal Society, “The origin of species lies in variation, while the origin of any particular species lies, firstly, in the occurrence, and, secondly, in the selection and preservation of particular variations.”

How far the believer in Divine Revelation can acquiesce in the conclusions thus arrived at, and, at the same time, be loyal to truth, is a question for each one to solve. That it is possible to hold to the certainty of a Divine Revelation for the guidance of man in spiritual matters, and, at the same time, fearlessly and cheerfully accept the *well-attested conclusions* of science, I most firmly believe. It is of no avail to simply affirm that the conclusions are not valid: they must be shown not to be so, or else reasons must be adduced to show that there is a considerable element of uncertainty with reference to them. How far does Evolution extend? Does it cover all that is in man? Then, this being settled, what is the true relation of Revelation to the scientific position? These are the problems to be solved; and that they can be solved with due regard to *real* scientific authority and the real claims of Revelation, I most firmly believe.

Biblical Archaeology and the Higher Criticism.

BY THE REV. HERBERT SYMONDS, D.D., PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

IN connexion with Professor Sayce's paper on “Biblical Archæology and the Higher Criticism,” which appeared in the December number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, it may be interesting to some readers to note the views of that great Old Testament scholar Ewald.

1. Ewald decides against the use of writing in the patriarchal age. “We must admit,” says he, “that that primitive time . . . did not possess the art of writing” (*History of Israel*, Eng. trans. i. p. 48).

Nevertheless, as a possession of the Semitic peoples, he regards writing as of the most extreme antiquity, its origin being lost “in a distant mist which all our present means are inadequate to explore,” whilst as regards the Israelites “we need not scruple to assume that Israel knew and used it (*i.e.* writing) in Egypt before Moses” (*ut sup.* p. 51). One can hardly help questioning whether, seeing that “Israel did not adopt the Egyptian character” (p. 52), Ewald is quite consistent in denying the possession of this art to patriarchal times, since it would seem to follow that the Israelites must have

taken the Semitic character down to Egypt with them.

2. In regard to Gen. xiv., Ewald says: “All indications tend to show that this whole piece was written prior to Moses” (p. 52, *n.* 2). But it is more important to note that he considers it a document written, not by Hebrew historians, but inserted in Genesis by a later author who derived it from the records of some cognate nation, those of the Canaanites, for example. “When we consider the ancient narrative contained in Gen. xiv., so strikingly different from all other accounts, in which Abraham is described as an almost alien ‘Hebrew,’ much as a Canaanite historian might have spoken of him; . . . then it cannot but appear very probable, or rather certain, that the earliest historians of Israel found many historical works (*cf.* Gen. xxxvi. and Num. xiii. 22) already existing in the cognate nations” (p. 52).

One would be glad to know what Professor Sayce's opinion may be on this account of Gen. xiv.