

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTES.

I.

DARWIN ON HERBERT SPENCER.

THE remarkable urbanity characteristic of Mr. Darwin's writings made it rather difficult to tell just what he thought of the capacity of the writers whom he quoted or to whom he referred. Thus his passing reference to Herbert Spencer as a "profound philosopher" was long ago set down by many either to the credit of Mr. Darwin's good manners or to the discredit of his judgment of philosophers. This doubt has not been altogether dissipated by the publication of the great naturalist's "Life and Letters;" for though he confesses repeatedly that he himself is no philosopher, his writings show that he greatly underestimated his abilities in that direction; while his distinct references in correspondence to Mr. Spencer's work and methods of argument show how far apart the two men were in their whole plane of movement, Mr. Darwin being, in the main, in the strictest sense of the term, an inductive philosopher, bent on keeping within sight of his facts, while Mr. Spencer was a deductive philosopher, who treated facts as some preachers do texts, as though their chief value consisted in furnishing a point of departure. A voyage with Mr. Darwin is like a trip in a coasting vessel through the interminable channels of the Alaskan archipelago; while a voyage with Mr. Spencer leads you straight out into the boundless waves of the Pacific.

Mr. Darwin's hesitancy in accepting Mr. Spencer's conclusions is incidentally expressed in a letter to Mr. Wallace upon the subject of spontaneous generation, which he himself could never believe. Speaking of Mr. Bastian's effort to prove the theory, he says: "I am not convinced, partly, I think, owing to the deductive cast of much of his reasoning; and I know not why, but I never feel convinced by deduction, even in the case of H. Spencer's writings." In writing at a later date to Mr. J. Fiske, who early became in this country the most prominent expounder of Mr. Spencer, Mr. Darwin gives his views of the importance of the true deductive method quite fully, remarking, to begin with: "I have long wished to know something about the views of the many great men whose doctrines you give. With the exceptions of special points I did not even understand H. Spencer's general doctrine; for his style is too hard work for me. I never in my life read so lucid an expositor (and therefore thinker) as you are; and I think

that I understand nearly the whole—perhaps less clearly about Cosmic Theism and Causation than other parts.” Here we may remark by the way, that it is a genuine comfort to many to find that even Mr. Darwin had difficulty with Fiske’s Cosmic Theism.

But it is in the next quotation, a few sentences after this, that the real difference between Mr. Darwin and Mr. Spencer is explicitly stated. “I find,” writes Darwin, “that my mind is so fixed by the inductive method, that I cannot appreciate deductive reasoning: I must begin with a good body of facts and from a principle (in which I always suspect some fallacy) and then as much deduction as you please. This may be very narrow-minded; but the result is that such parts of Spencer as I have read with care, impress my mind with the idea of his inexhaustible wealth of suggestion, but never convince; and so I find it with some others. I believe the cause to lie in the frequency with which I have found first-formed theories to be erroneous.”

Those familiar with the patient efforts of Mr. Darwin to explain the difficulties attending his theory of Natural Selection cannot fail to be convinced that in his reasoning he has gone to the very end of his tether as an inductive philosopher, and this in nearly every direction in which he has dared to venture. It is interesting therefore to see the impression made upon him by Herbert Spencer’s “Biology.” This we find frankly stated in a letter to J. D. Hooker in 1866. “I have now read the last number of H. Spencer. I do not know whether to think it better than the previous number, but it is wonderfully clever, and I dare say mostly true. I feel rather mean when I read him: I could bear, and rather enjoy feeling that he was twice as ingenious and clever as myself, but when I feel that he is about a dozen times my superior, even in the master art of wriggling, I feel aggrieved. If he had trained himself to observe more, even if at the expense (by the law of balancement) of some loss of thinking power, he would have been a wonderful man.”

While in the main Mr. Darwin’s processes of reasoning are kept within the proper limits of legitimate induction, still the most of his admirers are compelled in several instances to part company with him, and allow him to go off on a lone voyage into the broad and barren sea of *a priori* speculation. In one such voyage he discovered the fantastic doctrine of Pangenesis, which he presented as a philosophical explanation of the marvellous system of evolution which he has made so popular, and it is not surprising that when his mind was absorbed in contemplation of this favorite hypothesis his heart should feel more than an ordinary glow of admiration for his fellow-voyager Herbert Spencer, who has spent the most of his life cruising over the misty waters of that boundless sea. Pangenesis never made many converts. Still it was always cherished by Mr. Darwin with peculiar tenderness and is often referred to in his correspondence; sometimes as his “pet child” whom he is bound never to forsake; sometimes as his “god Pan” whom he can never cease to adore. Thus in writing to Lankester in 1870, we have a suggestive illustration of the mood of Darwin’s mind when

he bestowed his highest eulogiums upon Herbert Spencer. "I was pleased," he says, "to see you refer to my much despised child, Pangenesis, who I think will some day, under some better nurse, turn out a fine stripling. It has also pleased me to see how thoroughly you appreciate (and I do not think that this is general with the men of science) H. Spencer; I suspect that hereafter he will be looked at as by far the greatest living philosopher in England; perhaps equal to any that have lived." Previously he had written to J. D. Hooker: "I fear Pangenesis is still-born; Bates says he has read it twice, and is not sure that he understands it. H. Spencer says the view is quite different from his (and this is a great relief to me, as I feared to be accused of plagiarism, but utterly failed to be sure what he meant, so thought it safest to give my view as almost the same as his) and he says he is not sure he understands it. Am I not a poor devil? yet I took such pains, I must think that I expressed myself clearly. Old Sir H. Holland says he has read it twice, and thinks it very tough; but that sooner or later 'some view akin to it' will be accepted. You will think me very self-sufficient, when I declare that I feel sure if Pangenesis is now still-born it will, thank God, at some future time reappear, begotten by some other father, and christened by some other name. . . . You see I die hard, and stick up for my poor child."

Much might be said, and should be said, concerning the service rendered by Mr. Darwin in illustrating the fundamental laws of evidence in all practical affairs, and especially to the student of Christian evidences it is gratifying to find naturalists coming out of the field of profitless classification to recognize the hidden forces of nature, and to pay honor to the laws of probable evidence. How far the conclusions of natural science are from certainty none know so well as the scientific men themselves. As Professor Asa Gray has somewhere said (I quote from memory), "As a botanist I could not have a strong conviction of the stability of species since I had both made and unmade so many species myself. The names supposed to designate species in the animal and vegetable world express merely the judgment of the individual botanist or zoologist."

It is evident that in establishing the doctrine of the variability of species and their derivative origin the argument can proceed no farther than probability, and the theory may be established for all practical purposes while much is yet to be explained, and many difficulties are only provisionally obviated. This explanation of difficulties is what Mr. Darwin playfully refers to above as the process which taxed his capacity to wriggle. How successful he was in considering objections no one can realize without reading his works. His crowning merit is that, in the main, he did not attempt to build up a theory which was open to an overwhelming array of objections, that is, he kept within sight of his facts. As far back as 1856 he wrote to Professor Gray: "I think it can be shown to be probable that man gets his most distinct varieties by preserving such as arise best worth keeping, and destroying the others, but I should fill a quire if I were to go on. To be brief, I assume that species arise like our domestic varieties with much ex-

inction; and then test this hypothesis by comparison with as many general and pretty well-established propositions as I can find made out,—in geographical distribution, geological history, affinities, etc., etc. And it seems to me that, supposing that such hypothesis were to explain such general propositions, we ought, in accordance with the common way of following all sciences, to admit it till some better hypothesis be found out" (vol. i. p. 437).

This is the legitimate and regular mode of proceeding in the establishment of a scientific proposition, and it is important for the defenders of Christianity to keep the principle constantly in mind. The most inveterate scepticism, both in science and religion, is the result of setting up an impracticable standard of proof, and of demanding a kind of verification which is unreasonable, because beyond our reach. Thus it cannot be reasonably asked that the miracles of the first century should be confirmed by the repetition of similar miracles in the nineteenth century; since miracles may be unwise, and so out of place, in these later times. Similarly the proof of any particular theory as to the origin of species may be beyond the reach of direct experimental verification, and still be capable of proof from general considerations and cumulative argument. The reason why naturalists hold Mr. Darwin in so much higher respect than they do Mr. Spencer is, that in the main Mr. Darwin kept his theories within reasonable limits, and when he ventured far away from his facts did so with caution, and took pains to give due warning to the uninformed and unwary. Mr. Darwin rarely left the field of natural history, while with Mr. Spencer natural history was but a segment in an all-comprehensive evolutionary scheme.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

II.

DIVINE HUMAN NAMES.

Few studies are more fascinating than the searching out the meaning of names. The Blacks and Browns, the Smiths and the Taylors, are plain enough. But to find that Leonard is "the lion-hearted," Sheldon "the man who lives by the fountain on the hill," that Luther is "the celebrated one," Forsyth "the honest man," and Morgan "the one born at sea," and so on through an endless list, is a continuous joy. It is like looking into a kaleidoscope where each turn surprises you with a new delight.

Originally every name had its meaning, growing out of some peculiarity in character, or physical singularity of the owner. It might have been even the location of his home; thus the occupant of the west cottage was known as Westcott, and the man in the north hamlet was Northrop.

We see this most clearly in the Bible names, where the mode of its origin is often given along with the name. Thus Adam is the man formed from red earth, and Cain is the man obtained from the Lord; Saul is the man

who was asked for, and David is the beloved one, and it startles us that the name Dido has the same signification; Ruth is the lady friend, and Susannah is the lily. Even the Hebrew word for name is itself the name of one son of Noah. Ham, "the hot one," is the appropriate cognomen of his brother who dwelt in the hot regions of the south; and Japhet, *i. e.*, "the widely spreading," is the fitting title of him whose descendants spread along the shores of the seas.

In studying Bible names we are struck at once with the large number into which the name of God enters as a constituent part. To us this may seem like making too free with the most sacred things, but in the simplicity of the early ages, it was a genuine reverence for God that led men to give such names to their children.

In Hebrew there are several names for God. One of these is *El* (pronounced like Ail), the generic term for Deity. It means literally "The mighty one," and all other attributes were subordinated in the thought of that day to supreme power. In poetry this name of God often stands alone, though sometimes with the article, as Ps. xviii. 30, 32, 47 (31, 33 and 48 in the Hebrew Bible). This name of Deity takes the pronominal suffix of the first person as in Ps. xxii. 1 (2 in the Hebrew Bible). In prose it is used with an adjective; as, *El Shaddai*, the omnipotent God; *El Hhai*, the living God; or *El Elyon*, the Most High God: also with other nouns; as *El Elim*, the God of gods (Dan. xi. 36), and *El Bethel*, The God of Bethel (Gen. xxxi. 13).

When this name of God is used to form a human name, it is placed either at the beginning or the end: at the beginning in such names as Eliezer, "God is his help," written also Eleazar, Elizur, "God is his rock," Eliphalet, "God is his deliverance," Eliakim, "whom God appointed," Elnathan, "whom God gave," and Elisha, "God is his salvation;" and at the end, in such names as Samuel, "heard of God" (another form of the same name is Ishmael, "whom God heareth"), Raphael, "whom God healeth," Gabriel, "the strong man of God," Daniel, "judge of or for God," and Abdiel, "servant of God," in Arabic, Abdullah.

Another name of God which enters into the formation of many names of men is Jehovah. Without stopping to discuss the vexed question of its pronunciation, though the weight of evidence seems to be in favor of Yahweh, we simply remark that this may be called the proper name of God, as *El* or *Elohim* is his generic name. Especially was it the name of a national god of the Hebrews in distinction from the names of the idols of surrounding idolaters; as Baal of the Phœnicians, Moloch of the Moabites, Asshur of Assyria, etc. Thus only can we feel the force of the appeal of Elijah on Mount Carmel: "How long halt ye between two opinions? If Jehovah be God follow him, but if Baal [be God] then follow him" (1 Kings xviii. 21). So also the universal confession of the prostrate multitude: "Jehovah, he is the God. Jehovah, he is the God." Of course it is not meant that either Baal or Moloch were real gods, but Jehovah was the God of the Jew, because he was the true God, and besides him there was none else. And so

the very first commandment was: "Thou shalt have none other Gods before me" (Ex. xx. 3).

Among the names that begin with this most sacred name of God are Jonadab, "whom Jehovah impels," Jonathan, "whom Jehovah gave," Jehoram, "whom Jehovah exalted," Joshua, "whose help is Jehovah," Jehoiakim, "whom Jehovah sets up," and Jehoshaphat. "whom Jehovah judgeth," *i. e.*, protects from wrong. Some of those that end with it are, Hezekiah, "whom Jehovah strengthens," Gedaliah, "whom Jehovah made great," Adonijah, "Jehovah is my Lord," Benaiah, "whom Jehovah created," and Malchiah, "made king by Jehovah."

A like desire to be associated with their idols and to honor them in their names appears also in the Assyrian kings. Thus they acknowledged the favors which they supposed they had received at their hands. In this way the name Asshur banipal is an acknowledgment that in the person of that king "Asshur created a son." Esar haddon (Asshur akh iddina) likewise confesses that in him the same Deity "had given a brother." Shalanezer bears witness that Shalmanu (the god of peace) had protected the royal bearer of that name, and this name was so great a favorite that it was borne by four kings. And here it should be said that in many, if not in most, of these cases, the monarch selected the name by which he preferred to be known. So Rammanu nariri, "Rummanu [the storm god, or god of the atmosphere] is my helper" was the name chosen by two kings, while Asshur dan, "Asshur vindicates," was the name of three occupants of the throne of Assyria, and Tugulti ninip, or "ninip is my trust," was the name of two others.

So among the Babylonian kings we have the familiar name Belshazzar, a popular pronunciation of Bil shar uzur, *i. e.*, "Bil [who in this case is Merodach] will preserve the king;" also the equally well-known Nebuchadnezzar, in the original Nabu kuduri utsur, "Nabu preserves the land," and Merodach baladan, *i. e.*, "Marduch is the giver of life,"—these may serve as a specimen of more.

The question arises, Did the Babylonians learn this style of name from the Hebrews, or *vice versa*?

The earliest Assyrian king yet known bearing such a name was Ismi Dagon, "Dagon has heard [me]," and he reigned B. C. 1850-1820.

The earliest occurrence of such names among the Babylonians, so far as is known, was Naram sin, "the favorite of the moon god." He was the son of the celebrated Sargon of Agane, who, Professor Sayce tells us on the authority of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, lived B. C. 3750. This, if we follow our received systems of chronology, would give the precedence in this style of name to the Babylonians, for according to our chronology, he must have lived 1402 years before the Flood, which occurred B. C. 2348, the creation having taken place B. C. 4004.

But there is a very serious difficulty in the way of that conclusion, for according to Babylonian authority, Naram sin instead of living so long before the Flood, lived long after it. How long after it is not yet clearly made

out. Berosus speaks of eighty-six kings reigning for thirty-three thousand years after the deluge down to the time when the Medes (Elamites?) conquered Babylon. The mythical hero Gisdubar, who was surprised to find Khasisadra, the Babylonian Noah, looking so young after he had been so long among the immortal gods, lived long before Sargon and his son Naram sin. Then whatever adjustments may be found necessary to make the Babylonian chronology harmonize with ours, one thing is fixed even on Babylonian authority, viz., that Naram sin reigned not 1400 years before, but long subsequent to, the Flood.

Now that being settled, it is just as certain that Holy Scripture speaks of this custom of incorporating the name of God into the names of men as existing long before the Flood. Indeed it makes mention of three instances of such names,—two in the line of Cain, viz., Methusael (Man of God) and his father Mehujael (Smitten of God), and one in the line of Sheth, viz., Ma ha la leel (Praise of God), who according to our received chronology was born B. C. 3069, or 1260 years before the Flood. By far the earliest mention of this kind of name then is in the Bible; and so if one must have borrowed from the other, the Babylonian must be the borrower, and the Bible the lender. But what is there to prevent both being independent lines of action? The same reverence for a higher power manifesting itself in the same way in each, but on any supposition that we may form on the matter, the Bible is no borrower from Chaldea, though Chaldea may have done its share in the transmission of documents which were used more intelligently under the guidance of the Spirit of truth, than by those who held according to Berosus that ten kings reigned for 432,000 years between the creation and the Flood! an average of 43,200 years for each!¹

It only remains to notice a statement of Professor Sayce, that “the two varying forms of Methuselakh and Methusael should be Mutu sha ilati, the husband of the goddess, *i. e.*, the sun god Tammuz, husband of Ishtar.”²

If an apology is needed for differing from so ripe an Assyrian scholar, he furnishes one himself where he says: “The teacher and the pupil must both alike be learners. . . . There is no authoritative standard to refer to.”³

Then on this point it may be said that the most recent and reliable writers, while admitting a resemblance in names between some descendants of Cain and Sheth (Gen. iv. and v.), yet unhesitatingly deny the identity of the two lines of descent.⁴ Yet Professor Sayce makes one name from the line of Cain, and a different one from the line of Sheth, to refer to the same person and to be represented by the same Assyrian title. Methuselakh, as the Professor writes it, ends in *Hheth*, not *He*, a termination never used to denote the feminine, and Methusael ends with a name which is masculine only. The lexicons give no hint of any other gender.

¹Geo. Smith's Ancient History of Babylonia, p. 9. ²Hibbert Lectures, p. 185, note.

³Lectures on the Assyrian Language, p. 2.

⁴See Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant, Vol. i., pp. 88-95; E. Harold Browne, D.D., in Speakers' Commentary; also the commentaries of Professors C. F. Keil, F. Delitzsch, J. P. Lange, and J. G. Murphy.

Muta sha ilati may refer to Tammuz in the inscriptions of Assyria. But on what ground is that meaning transferred to the Hebrew name Methusael? Is it said that the inscriptions sometimes use the masculine *itu* when speaking of the goddess Ishtar? The Professor gives a sufficient reply to this on pages 253 and 254 of his "Hibbert Lectures," where he tells us that the Accadian name of Ishtar was without gender so that the Shemites who transferred it to their lists were in doubt whether to treat it as masculine or feminine. Indeed one tablet speaking of the planet now known as Venus, but then as Ishtar, calls it "a female at sunset, and a male at sunrise." But what has all that to do with the Hebrew name for God? How would the argument read? "The Assyrians doubtful about the gender of a certain idol spoke of it sometimes as feminine and sometimes as masculine, therefore there is the same uncertainty about one of the Old Testament names of God." The absurdity of such an argument no one needs to point out.

If this was only a question about words and names it would hardly deserve any notice, but it is much more than that; for if in the days of Mehujael, so soon after the creation, men believed in goddesses, why not from the creation itself? In that case polytheism came from Paradise, and man has been climbing up ever since toward the monotheism of the gospel, as some in these days do not scruple to affirm. But the Bible teaches that the one only living and true God revealed himself to Adam, and walked with Enoch and with Noah, and when men in the days of Abraham had gone over to idolatry, because, though God had revealed himself to them, they did not like to retain him in their knowledge, God chose him and his posterity to be the instrument through which he would bring back the race to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The importance of the truth involved must be our apology for calling attention to the mistake of Professor Sayce, and having done so we can safely leave it in the hands of scholars and in his own.

THOMAS LAURIE.