

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LXI.



LONDON:

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

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1929

723RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 22ND, 1929,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN began the proceedings by announcing the tidings just received, that the author of the paper about to be read, Dr. A. T. Schofield, so long an Associate Member and a Vice-President of the Society, had passed away. Those present stood in their places as a sign of respect to the departed. Later, a Motion already passed at the previous Council Meeting, expressing condolence with the family of the late Dr. Schofield, was read to the Meeting by the Chairman, and adopted unanimously by those present.

Resolution :—

“That this Meeting of the Council of the Victoria Institute learns with profound sorrow of the death, which took place on Saturday, April 20th, of Dr. Alfred Taylor Schofield, Vice-President of the Institute, and for the period of thirty-eight years an Associate Member. In the course of the years, Dr. Schofield served the interests of the Institute in many ways, reading papers which were accorded hearty appreciation by the Membership as a body. In these circumstances the Council expresses heartfelt sympathy with the family and friends of the lamented Vice-President.”

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were then read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the following :—As a Member: Dudley B. Toye, Esq., O.B.E., LL.D.; and as Associates: Howard Wilkins Wright, Esq., and Eliot Cecil Curwen, Esq., M.A., M.B., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

Lieut.-Col. HOPE BIDDULPH, D.S.O., read the paper on “Humanity.”

HUMANITY.

By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

AS a humble member of the largest hospital in the country—the London Hospital—I cannot but begin this paper with our venerable motto, so well known over the whole world—

“HOMO SUM : HUMANI NIHIL A ME ALIENUM PUTO.”

I am fully alive to the immensity and importance of my subject, and its enormous scope daunts me. To write comprehensively of Humanity would require a book, very large, fat, and in small print, to do it even scant justice. I have therefore determined to confine myself in the pages at my disposal, very rigorously to considering my subject under the three heads

enumerated by the great Apostle in 1 Thess. v, 23, as *τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ τὸ σῶμα*.

To keep within the scope of the pages allotted me, I may only consider each of these under one single head. (1) With regard to the *spirit*, I will consider it as relative and not absolute; (2) with regard to the *soul* (or mind), I will view it as homologous, and not heterologous; (3) as to the *body*, I will show it as created, and not evolved in the sense used by Darwin, and revived to-day. These three selections are by no means arbitrary; but to me, at any rate, they are vital, essential, and fundamental. I trust that, as I proceed, I shall succeed in proving this to some at least of my audience. I will therefore commence with—

(1) THE SPIRIT: RELATIVE AND NOT ABSOLUTE.

I may remark that in using the word "relative" I do not forget the delightful paper on "Relativity and Reality" we had nearly a year ago from our President, Professor Fleming.* My present remarks in no way touch upon that paper. As a fact, the subject of Relativity is sufficiently large to form the topic of many papers.

I must remember whom I am addressing at the present time. I presume that an overwhelming number of my audience belong to the Institute as Members or Associates, and therefore I am not speaking to an ordinary audience. In the objects of the Institute, to which the majority of my hearers have subscribed, I read that we combine "in humble faith in one Eternal God, to combat the unbelief now prevalent." I think I am right in saying that such an object is not generally found in literary societies: it defines at once the relative position of this Institute to the Eternal God; in other words, that of Humanity to Divinity, or the Relative to the Absolute.

I think we should be unwise to dismiss these views as unimportant or irrelevant, and especially in this year of 1929. During the last fifty years or less Relativity has risen to an extraordinary importance, owing to the wonderful discoveries of Albert Einstein. These, as we know, are in the physical sphere, but we cannot deny that they increase in every sphere

* Now "Sir Ambrose," in recognition of his remarkable discoveries. We are all glad that public acknowledgment should have been made of his distinguished work in wireless electricity; although it may be a question to some of us if the old title of Professor is not the better one to use. At any rate, with the President's permission, it is the one which I shall continue to employ in this paper.

the importance of insisting on the Relative. It is true that the Victoria Institute is concerned with its spiritual relations only ; but, nevertheless, I consider it is a remarkable feature that it insists on every Member and Associate being up to date as to the relation of the Relative to the Absolute.

May I point out also that my subject, "Humanity," is undergoing a most searching and critical examination, on the physical and mental sides by Professor Sir Arthur Keith and his colleagues, and on the spiritual side by our theological teachers at Oxford and Cambridge, and other Modernist centres of learning. Is it not true, and rather remarkable, that while mentally and physically Sir Arthur Keith and his friends are seeking to lower, and even extinguish, *Homo sapiens* as of a "human" stock, in distinction to one merely "animal"; on the other hand, Modernist teaching, which incidentally dates from Nicodemus, tends to destroy the Relative, and in effect seeks to raise Humanity in the direction of the Absolute ?

A well-known clergyman lately begged me to study a book he lent me, of which the opening sentence was "The first man was not Adam, but God." But does not this, while lowering Divinity to Humanity, at the same time elevate Humanity to Divinity, and raise the Relative to the Absolute ? We cannot but note, in passing, this two-fold movement in Modernism : the denial of, or at least professed uncertainty as to, the Deity of Christ, and even as to a Deity at all, and the asserted certainty that man is not merely captain of his own soul, but that he needs no other captain.

Having emphasized enough, if not more than enough, the remarkably up-to-date position that the Victoria Institute holds with regard to the true relativity of Humanity to Divinity, I would remark that from another point of view the question is one that cannot be avoided. Freethinkers as a body were much to the fore fifty years ago, with their demand of an "open mind" on everything. Now, in their fullest meaning, neither one nor the other is possible to a relative Humanity ; only in asylums can such a belief be found. Where reason understands its seat, Humanity is aware that the Relative implies a certain loss of freedom, and that it is clear that the mind cannot be "open" on that which is already settled.

My own feeling is that the cause of the trend toward ignoring all spiritual relativity is this very desire to place Humanity in a more Absolute position, and thus to free it from the fetters

that have so long curtailed its full liberty. From such fetters the Victoria Institute shows no desire to be free.

Turning from the spiritual to the mental, from the spirit to the soul, we reach the second division of our subject.

(2) THE SOUL : HOMOLOGOUS AND NOT HETEROLOGOUS.

I must pause here to apologize for these awkward words of four and five syllables. I have no desire to be pedantic, but I really think it impossible to find simpler and more comprehensive words with which to express my meaning. These words represent a soul-truth so fundamental and important that it will be well worth endeavouring to secure a clear idea of their force and meaning. Quite possibly in the Discussion someone may be able to suggest more acceptable words for the truth I am about to expound. For the present, *homo* brings the meaning of likeness, and *hetero*, on the contrary, signifies unlikeness, or difference—Greek words, both of them.

Before dwelling on this, I must turn aside to the question of mind itself. I have been much surprised to find that, in spite of stout scientific opposition, Sir Arthur Keith is once again reviving the old idea of the 'sixties so persistently enforced by Haeckel—of Monism. In early days at Harley Street I had to fight the idea of Monists, that thought was neither more nor less than a secretion of the brain, just as bile is of the liver. Haeckel was the authority at that time. My warmest supporter was Sir James Crichton Browne, and I think we both thought that the mind was as the player to the piano, and in no sense was it the instrument itself, or any derivation of it.

I would insist on this, not merely on behalf of Humanity, but of the whole of the animal creation ; for I think none would deny that all animals have the elements of a soul or mind, as well as of a body ; and I think that, until Sir Arthur Keith's recent attempts, it was pretty generally agreed that this mind was in no sense physical, nor any derivation therefrom.

For our present purposes we may regard the soul as non-physical ; though the question is not directly before us. The question of the homologous and the heterologous is another one altogether, and is at once, as regards soul, the true distinction between the merely animal and the human. My audience will not object to my referring as proof of this to Gen. ii, 7 : " And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living

soul." Surely we have here absolute proof of the Divine origin of the human soul, thus distinguishing it by an impassable gulf from that of all other animals. This "inbreathing" into the soul of Humanity suffices to make it homologous, or capable of understanding (in part) the Divine, of which no heterologous soul can have any perception. Here indeed we see the fundamental importance of these two words. We must observe that this is no question of Christianity or New-Testament teaching, but is as old as the Bible itself, and constitutes the essential validity of the doctrine that Humanity is a new order, entirely distinct from a merely animal life.

This distinction, be it noted, is not due to the formation of the body, but rather to the Divine inbreathing in the creation of man and of man alone. Two effects follow:—All, so inbreathed, have a soul that exists for ever, as is abundantly shown throughout Holy Scripture, although Scripture never refers eternal life to the soul distinctively, but solely to the spirit when born again (John iii, 36). The other effect is that every soul so inbreathed has a capacity possessed by no animal, however gifted, of understanding a good deal about God and His Word, sufficient, indeed, to accept or reject the message of salvation. This, I repeat, is entirely due to the soul of humanity being homologous with the Divine, that is, capable of understanding (in part) that which is above it.

(3) THE BODY: CREATED NOT EVOLVED.

We now reach our third and last division of Humanity—the body. Of this we have stated that it is created, and not evolved in the sense used by Darwin and revived to-day by Sir Arthur Keith and others. In corroboration of this I find, in a remarkably able paper by Dr. Rendle Short on "Some Recent Literature Concerning the Origin of Species," these words in the "Conclusion" (*supra*, p. 156):—

"Now, finally, how may the tentative conclusions of the biologists whose names we have mentioned lessen the difficulty of reconciling science and the Bible? First, and mostly, by showing that, instead of crying with Darwin 'All's Chance,' we must recognize that 'All's Law.' And Law demands a Law-giver. Since the marvellous adaptations found in Nature cannot be due to Chance, they must be due to Purpose. The theoretical systems will not work without a Creator."

In other words, the body is created by Purpose, not evolved by Chance. Before going further into the matter, let me point out that, whereas a true mind and a true spirit belong to Humanity alone, man shares his body with all creation : all animals have bodies, and the resemblances of the vast number of varieties is quite as well marked as are the differences. That man is descended directly from any animal, especially the ape, is entirely unproven, as Sir Arthur Keith himself shows. There can be no doubt that the body contains numberless resemblances to those of many animals, and at the same time it has unique points which are not shared by any. Perhaps I have said enough to make clear that, considering man's body as distinct from his mind and spirit, we are on totally different ground with regard to Humanity from any hitherto reached.

We must, however, keep to our point—that is, this body was created, not evolved. We shall find it necessary, however, to define what we mean by evolution. Darwin's Evolution is well defined, but the word "evolution" as generally used is exceedingly vague. My experience is that hardly any two people employ the word in exactly the same sense. The crucial point is : Do we consider evolution as a force, or merely as a method ? If the former, as Darwin believed and taught, we deny teleology, and hold that the world was, and is, being made by blind chance (without purpose) ; if the latter, we imply a Maker, a Creator ; and this latter view, in opposition to Sir Arthur Keith, Sir Oliver Lodge now holds.

That the world as it is should be automatically evolved by laws of pure chance seems so fundamentally unreasonable, that one cannot be surprised that the idea has been so widely rejected scientifically as a baseless and incredible theory. Its utter unreasonableness will be seen later on when we come to consider some special creations.

I will not now attempt to adduce theological evidence against it, for many who hold it most strongly do not believe in God at all. I will confine my remarks to scientific objections from scientists themselves. Haeckel, indeed, says : "Evolution is, and must ever remain, a fabric of hypotheses." A few years ago the President of the British Association said : "It is seventy-five years since Darwin wrote his *Origin of Species*, but with all our knowledge to-day we see as yet no origin of species, and for the first time we are in a position to discuss these things on a basis of fact, so that Evolution is more a faith than a knowledge."

Since then Professor Keith has made what is probably a last attempt to revive it here in the face of Professor Fleishmann, of Erlangen, who has devoted his life to the subject, and who declares: "Darwinism is certainly not the product of scientific investigation, but purely the product of imagination." The French Academy of Scientists officially announces: "The reason the doors of this Academy are shut to Darwin is this—that the man who indulged in so much supposition without proof is unworthy of the name of scientist." Can it be other than a hopeless task for Sir Arthur Keith to keep open the British door?

All the "lines of evidence" in support of Evolution have been in turn rejected by evolutionists themselves. The testimony of Rudiments was rejected by Huxley, in common with that of Embryology, rejected by Sedgwick, Morgan, Ballantyne, and Karl Vogt, who called it "absolutely and radically false." Depéret, himself a foremost authority, calls the famous ancestries of the horse "deceitful delusions."

Another insuperable difficulty is, to apply Evolution to the origin of man. Ontogeny used to be considered a sheet-anchor of proof in the history of the development of the embryo, but even Professor Keith now declares the arguments based on embryological resemblances to be invalid, while Bergson totally rejects the parallel, as also does Sedgwick in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Further, Professor Keith himself informs us that the missing-link theory is now generally given up! For man to have descended from the ape would require millions of years and a hundred links, and of such there is no reliable trace whatever.

That man cannot in any sense be the product of chance was shown with remarkable power by Professor Fleming in his paper on "Number in Nature," read before the Institute in December, 1927. From which I venture to make a brief quotation, premising that while all developing natal cells are at first alike in structure and nucleus:—

"The nucleus contains a material called chromatin . . . and this chromatin is arranged, at a certain stage of growth, in rod-like bodies called chromosomes. The remarkable thing is that the number of these chromosomes determines, or is determined by, the nature of the individual. There is one number, 48, characteristic of the cells of a human being; another number, 38, of an ox; another, 12, of a house-fly; and another, 24, of a lily. Thus an ox-cell can never produce a man or a fly-cell a lily." (*Transactions*, vol. lx, p. 21.)

That this can be a chance product, surpasses the bounds of reason to conceive. On the other hand, there is, I fear, little possibility to doubt that Darwin's Chance Laws were indirectly responsible for the horrors of the late War. Dr. Benjamin Kidd (*Science of Power*) most gravely charges that Darwin's bestial law of "survival of the fittest," developed into "might is right," was largely the cause of the War's atrocities. This law, indeed, had become the new gospel in Germany, while Christianity was declared to be the greatest enemy to progress Germany had ever had. Another great difficulty is the sudden appearance of fossils of myriads of new species, not preceded by the greatly desired intermediate types of which the strata are shamelessly deficient. All these new species seem perfect in every way, and show no traces of evolution; the species of insects alone number three-quarters of a million!

Consider for a moment Evolution as applied to insect-life, which seems, indeed, expressly designed to strike despair into a Darwinist's heart. It is certainly a terrible problem to discover how the "survival of the fittest" can cause a caterpillar, with numerous legs and complicated structure, suddenly to dissolve into a creamy mass of cells, all alike, and enclose itself into a horny chrysalis for weeks. Then, miracle of miracles! the grey slime has been transformed into the gauzy wings, gorgeous body, and long horny legs of a dragon-fly, or into the painted glories of a butterfly, or the polished scarabæus of a beetle. Reason absolutely refuses to grapple with such a problem. The instinct of these insects in the lines of evolution is just as insoluble as that of their formation.

Referring to this, *The Times* (June 9th, 1915) observed: "Battling for Evolution, scientists have torn it to pieces—nothing is left. Nothing on their own showing, save a few fragments strewn about the arena."

The word "Humanity" conjures up before us a magnificent vista, surpassed only by Divinity. In one way, I regret that I have confined myself to the three great points of which I have spoken; but, in another, as I realize that these are absolutely fundamental and are everywhere denied, I cannot but believe that it was my duty to bring before this select audience the best answers I could give to the scepticism of the day.

I trust that the noble subject of my paper may some day be taken up by a worthier pen. Meantime, my consolation is my sincere hope that I have succeeded in carrying my audience with me in the points of which I have spoken.

DISCUSSION.

Dr. THIRTLE, speaking from the Chair, said : In the progress of the lecture, as we have heard it read by Colonel Hope Biddulph, we cannot but have felt sincere regret for the absence of Dr. Schofield, through death, as notified at the opening of the meeting. From time to time our minds have gone back upon past years, and recalled occasions on which our absent friend has discoursed upon subjects of deep interest, once and again coming within close range of the very attractive theme that has engaged him to-day. Man in his origin and constitution, especially as regards his mental faculties and moral equipment, is a subject that for long years has occupied the mind of Dr. Schofield ; and when, in versatile fashion, he has dealt with the phenomena of mind, especially in relation to human well-being, he has uniformly commanded attention as the exponent of wholesome principles, expressive of forms of thought such as make for health of body and much beside.

Our lecture to-day has been unusually short ; but for all that, the subject is a large and important one. Moreover, it is a subject open to debate from various points of view, a fact which makes it all the more to be regretted that the lecturer himself is not present, possibly to answer questions on points of detail. Were Dr. Schofield here to-day, I should have indicated, assuredly with profound respect, what I have personally deemed to be a weakness in his deliverance, namely, the failure to commend to his audience a psychological theory at once true to human experience and consistent with the language of Holy Scripture, which he has sought throughout to employ in a popular sense.

I need not recall the scheme of the lecture, beyond saying that, in his pages of definition, Dr. Schofield quoted Gen. ii, 7, where we read that, by the Divine inbreathing, the man whom the Lord God had formed of the dust of the ground, " became a living soul." Here we have, in outline, a course of procedure at once simple and capable of rational vindication ; but in course of his argument Dr. Schofield seems to have felt himself compelled, without any sort of apology, to reverse the procedure ; he has spoken of *the soul* as being inbreathed—" every soul so inbreathed has a capacity possessed by no animal, however gifted " (p. 227). Now, Holy

Scripture affirms this inbreathing to have affected the body, and makes it clear that it was after receiving the "breath of life" that man, the creature of dust, "became a living soul." If I admit that the subject, as a whole, has its difficulties, I do not thereby shut my eyes to the fact that we can hardly reach a safe explanation of this and such-like passages of Scripture if we consent to a confusion of their terms. As we all know, there are in the Old Testament passages in which the word *nepshesh*, generally rendered "soul," is used of animals as well as men; and again, the word *ruach*, generally rendered "spirit," has likewise a wide application, and in one place, as we recall, there is a question in regard to "the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth." All the same, I conclude that, to occupy safe ground, we must seek a formula at once true to Scripture and sound in its psychological theory. Such a formula, as I judge, has not been supplied this afternoon.

When Dr. Schofield comes to the discussion of the body, he occupies ground which is more sure and strong. Here we may meet evolution theorists with safety, while in regard to definitions of soul and spirit there may seem to be little to choose in point of vagueness between their statements and those the lecturer has employed. I would suggest that the vital facts do not depend upon speculations in regard to "soul" or "spirit," words which, owing to variety of definition, yield uncertain ground for conclusive argument. If in Holy Scripture there is a doctrine of human probation, it is of man as man—a tripartite creature—spirit and soul and body; if there is a doctrine of sin, it is the same, affecting the entire man; if a doctrine of salvation, it is the same, affecting the whole man. We do not well to associate sin with the soul and not with the body; to find salvation in the spirit as distinguished from the body and the soul. The same holds good of Christian life, in standing and service, also of the redemptive work of Christ in its provision and efficacy: we contemplate man as a whole, all-inclusive in his powers and faculties: and the issue, full and triumphant, will, in turn, yield victory to man as a whole, in the immortal life to which faith clings as destined to supersede the present constitution of spirit, soul, and body. I suggest that we are not able to contemplate, in the present state of existence, a separate soul-entity, a separate spirit-entity, and a separate body-entity—

certainly not for purposes of philosophical discussion. The three parts of man make one whole, and our concern is with man as a whole.

Were Dr. Schofield present, he would doubtless justify in some degree the definitions given in his lecture, and might propose further definitions, but still, for my own part, I would declare that danger lies in the way of endeavours to particularize upon the various aspects and parts of the human constitution. Finally, and most sincerely, do I thank him for his suggestive paper, and in particular would I recognize the cogency of the section in which he makes reply to Darwinism in its most recent development.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said : The circumstances under which we meet to-day seem to preclude criticism of the paper, this last contribution from our well-known, honoured and beloved Member. I would only make a comment on the text quoted (Gen. ii, 7). The language of these "Creation Chapters" is at once simple and stately—indeed sublime. Remembering that the verse may be translated "God breathed into man the breath of *lives*," *your* lives and *my* life, I feel constrained to testify that this verse has been to me a source of great help. It has seemed to open up to me a wonderful "revelation-vista." May I give an instance in which I used this verse in India? I would premise by reminding you that in the East the basis of most of the religions is that masterpiece of Satanic ingenuity—transmigration. Discussing this subject with a Hindu lawyer, I found this verse just what I needed. Transmigration teaches the benighted heathens that men and creatures may rise or fall, *e.g.* a bad man may become in his next life an animal; and a bad animal become a lower-animal; and a bad lower-animal may become an insect or less. Again, vice versa, a good insect may also rise. I said to the Hindu lawyer: "If such be the case, then the sum total of all 'transmigratable creatures' must from the beginning have been constant." There can be no simultaneous increase of living vegetation with the increase of fishes, animals, insects, birds, and men; the maxima must have been created and started at one time. Strangely enough, there are people in Syria that have this idea about their tribe. They say that there are always 100,000 of them, no more and no less. They may be born in Lebanon, or London, or elsewhere,

but the number is constant. One dies and another is at once incarnated somewhere.

Continuing my argument with the lawyer, I said: "Suppose that the world's population to-day numbers 1,800,000,000; I can speedily show that during the past 200 years populations have greatly increased. Not to be too long, let me take India as an example of all 'transmigratable' lives. Let us draw a line three inches long to represent Indian population to-day—say 300 million. I am sure that you will agree that in the time of Warren Hastings it was probably only 150 million—we draw another line, one and a-half inches long; and in 1500 possibly 100 million only—and we draw yet another line, one inch long; and before the invasions of immigrations from the west still less—and our line shortens almost to a point. One village in India, numbering about 400, recently produced a sheet of calico giving the genealogy of the village, and proving that they were all the descendants of two people who settled there about the year 1600. Now, if that is so, transmigration is obviously an impossible theory." The lawyer professed to be convinced by my argument. Then I said: "Let us now read the revelation of God's Holy Word"; and I read to him Gen. ii, 7. Josephus says of the Holy Scriptures that they "gave the earliest account of things as *they learned them of God Himself* by inspiration" (*Against Apion*, I, 7), and so I believe it to be. The blessed Creator tells us that He made all, that He made man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into man the breath of *lives*, i.e. the power for one man to beget many, who in turn have the same powers to pass on to their descendants, also powers of procreation. This blessed book tells of one man of whom (or from whom—not as with animals) from a part of his body God formed his helpmate—woman. I am glad that we have such a revelation on this important subject, that satisfies my intellect, that rests my inquiring mind, and bears the impress of truth that is ever the stamp of Divine Revelation.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF referred to Dr. Schofield's gracious personality and wholesome Bible expositions, and continued: It appears to be open to objection to designate honest, open-minded seeking souls with the title "Modernist." To give Nicodemus the unenviable distinction of founding the teaching is assuredly not justified. What combination of his utterances can fairly be

construed so as to class him as a Modernist? Here are his words: "Rabbi, we know that Thou art a Teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that Thou doest except God be with him." Here Nicodemus, the ruler of the Jews, recognizes a Teacher from God, miracles, and God's presence. Again, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" This question expresses a perfectly honest difficulty. Another question: "How can these things be?" Once more, "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" This was said by Nicodemus in answer to the unjust sneers of the Pharisees.

On p. 229 there appears a singular statement: "The French Academy of Scientists officially announces 'The reason the doors of this Academy are shut to Darwin is this, that the man who indulged in so much supposition without proof is unworthy of the name of scientist.'" It would be interesting to know the source of this statement, and the year in which it was announced. There are probably very few Englishmen, whatever view they take of Darwinism, who would deny to Darwin the name of a great scientist. On p. 227, referring to the effects following the Divine inbreathing in the Creation of man, the lecturer makes an important distinction, that "every soul so inbreathed has a capacity possessed by no animal, however gifted, of understanding a good deal about God and His Word, sufficient indeed to accept or reject the message of salvation." This is fundamental, and clearly establishes a gulf between man and all created animals.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: The verse from Thessalonians, quoted on p. 223, seems determinant as to the tripartite nature of man. Some teach that the spirit and body together make the soul, and that when their partnership is dissolved by death there is no survival of the latter. This idea is supported by a wealth of illustration: the barrel and the stock make the gun, they say (have then their guns no locks?); divide them and the gun ceases to exist. The case and the works make the watch: separate them, and where is the watch? One would think existing still in its separated parts. Who has not seen the works of a watch going merrily on a jeweller's bench under a glass? If I took a parcel to a gunsmith and urged him to keep the stock, the gun, and the

barrel safe, he would be surprised to find only two articles, and put me down as a queer customer if I explained that I only meant two.

So, when Paul said, "Your whole spirit, and soul, and body," he surely meant three parts, not only two. *The spirit* is the higher side of the spiritual nature of man, that knows, and is in touch with God (1 Cor. ii, 11; John iv, 24); *the soul* is in touch with the bodily senses, and loves, hates, fears, etc. The two are never separated, though the supreme proof of the penetrating character of the Word of God is its power to "divide asunder" soul and spirit, in the sense, I submit, of "discriminating" between their movements. The verb is *di-ikneomai*, to penetrate, pierce, "even to the division," which Grimm believes means "that most hidden spot of the dividing line between spirit and soul" (Heb. iv, 12). It seems important to insist, as the Chairman has done, on the unity of man; he is regarded as a whole. God did not say, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thy soul shall die," but "*thou shalt die.*" This affects the question of man's immortality.

That man was created with a capacity for endless existence, is, I believe, conveyed in the manner of his creation at the direct hand of God and by the word for "breath," *n'shah-mah*, which God breathed into him, and which can be shown to apply only to God and man in the Scriptures. But it is equally clear he was not born immortal—that is, with immunity from death, for otherwise God would not have warned him he would surely die in case of disobedience. When he fell, the man was not affected externally; physically he was unchanged; certainly he did not cease to exist. But a marked and mysterious change took place in him. He became afraid of God, and hid from Him. A great gulf had yawned between him and his Creator: this was moral death. Death is not cessation of existence, but separation of existence. Man's physical death had to be provided for by his exclusion from the tree of life, but he should continue to exist for ever in a sin-infected body. The gift of eternal life, though not to be compared with immortality and vastly transcends it, does nevertheless include it. The immortality of the body is conferred separately and later. Those who refuse to partake of the gift of eternal life will certainly never regain immortality, but will none the less exist for ever.

Mr. L. BIDDULPH, a visitor, said : It should be borne in mind that the ancient philosophers were not ignorant of the science of psychology, but, on the contrary, had a clear and accurate knowledge of the constitution of the man, regarded as distinct from the body. This is specially true of the ancient Egyptians, from whom the most learned of the Greek philosophers received instruction, viz., Pythagoras and Plato. St. Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and was a man of learning in all senses of the word. He had learned to distinguish between the spirit and the soul, and therefore mentions them with the body as being the three main divisions in man's constitution.

These divisions may be defined briefly as follows :—A.—*Spirit*, the real man, the immortal self, or ego. B.—*Soul*, the part which goes to make up the personality of men, the emotional and sentient part of man, without which he could have no feeling or interest in the world : not immortal in origin, but only conditionally immortal. C.—*The physical body*, which is the garment of matter (mistaken by children and some others for the real self), which forms the instrument through which the spirit has contact with the material world, and is enabled to experience conditions of matter, and learn in the school of life such lessons as can only be acquired in a physical embodiment. D.—St. Paul probably includes in "soul" *the mind* or intelligence, though this is really a separate part, and is the link between the spirit and its lower vehicles, like the lense between the magic-lantern slide and the reflection on the sheet. It is the focussing point between the spirit and its vehicles.

In the nature of things there was no reply on the discussion. In closing the Meeting, however, the CHAIRMAN made two remarks : (1) If Dr. Schofield were present, he would doubtless have declared that the proceedings went to show that psychological theory has never exhibited anything in the nature of unity of judgment. Here, as elsewhere, it is a case of "so many men, so many minds." (2) As to the statement that, in Gen. ii, 7, the inspired writer speaks of "the breath of *lives*" (in the plural), there is this to say : that in various forms of Semitic speech, "life" is classed among plural ideas. The word *chayyim* is of frequent use in the Old Testament ; and whether emphatic in its relation to physical life,

or appearing in expressive combinations—such as tree of life, way of life, book of life, years of life, or the fountain of life—it is given in plural form in regular Hebrew usage. In the circumstances, therefore, it would hardly seem to be justified to find a mystical meaning in the word as encountered in the Genesis records of the Creation.