

## ARTICLE IV.

## JEHOVAH-JESUS-MESSIAH.

THE conversion of Saul of Tarsus was the most important event which occurred in the history of the early Christian church. It is described three times in Acts, and is given a prominence quite above that of any other incident mentioned in that book. Moreover, that conversion was a kind of event in the life of a human soul so extraordinary and striking, was such a violent and extreme soul-change, and produced such wide and deep results upon mankind, that it deserves to be studied with all care, to discover, if possible, the secret of the sudden and tremendous transformation which took place in the soul attitude of this wonderful genius. From all the narratives it is evident that the cause of the change was in the noonday vision which appeared to Saul on the way to Damascus. Hence, if we can only find out just what he did see then, and all that he saw, we can penetrate to the innermost secret of that great change which took place in him. The following is offered as an attempt toward that finding out.

I. Saul saw and heard Jesus of Nazareth in the Shechinah in heaven. All three accounts give the same words as spoken from the sky,—“I am Jesus whom thou persecutest”; Paul himself adding “of Nazareth” in his address from the stairs. And Ananias, plainly referring to Jesus, said to Saul at the healing in Damascus, “that thou shouldst . . . see the Righteous One, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth.” Moreover, “the glory of that light” was doubtless the same as the Shechinah of the Old

Testament, and as the "bright cloud" which rolled down upon the group on the mountain of transfiguration; and was also the same "glory of God," with Jesus standing in it, which Stephen saw at his martyrdom.

II. Saul also saw Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah whom the prophets of old foretold. This is evident from what he heralded right after in the synagogues of the Jews, as we are told in Acts ix. 20, 22, as follows: "And straightway in the synagogues he heralded Jesus, that he is the Son of God." "And Saul grew strong more and more, confounding the Jews who dwelt in Damascus, demonstrating that this one [Jesus] is the Messiah." The Greek has *ho Christos*, which the Authorized Version renders, "very Christ." But Saul and the Jews, speaking Hebrew, as they did, must have used the word "Messiah," of which *Christos* is the Greek equivalent; and only as we use the very word which they used can we get the full historic flavor of their speech. Therefore I say, "the Messiah."

III. But the chief matter is now to be stated. Along with seeing Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah of the Old Testament prophets, Saul also saw him as Jehovah incarnate. As he gazed upon Jesus standing in the midst of that "great light" "above the brightness of the sun," even the Shechinah of God, "the glory of that light" flashed into his deepest soul, as a revelation from God, the conviction that He upon whom he was gazing, and whose voice he heard declaring, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest," was also the human embodiment of the very Jehovah of the Old Testament; and that this was how he was "the Son of God." In that glorious, blinding vision it was disclosed to Saul, that to Him upon whom he was gazing there really belonged the threefold character rightly expressed by the threefold name, Jehovah-Jesus-Messiah; and at once he realized that he had been persecuting, and was now on his way still further to persecute,

the disciples of that very being whom he and all Israel had worshiped as Jehovah from the beginning of the nation; and whom the prophets had foretold should come as the Messiah. And it was the direct sight of this to him astounding, manifold reality, which completely overwhelmed his soul. Such was the revelation manifested to Saul of Tarsus in the vision which befell him on his way to Damascus. The proof for this view will be urgently and justly demanded; and to present that proof is my further task.

1. This task I begin by remarking that the above is the fundamental view, which is woven into the whole warp and woof of the New Testament. Take one cornerstone fact for evidence. Isaiah xi. 3-5 is quoted or referred to by all four of the Gospels, and applied to Jesus. But the prophet himself explicitly refers to Jehovah. His words are, "A voice crieth, In the wilderness prepare ye the way of Jehovah; make straight in the Arabah a highway for our God." Now what the prophet utters directly concerning "Jehovah, our God," the four Gospels apply with equal directness to Jesus. But, unless Jehovah and Jesus are the same being, such application is, to use a very mild term, a wild delusion. But the application is right, because the two are one and the same, as the use of the passage in the New Testament teaches, this oneness of the two being of the very marrow and substance of the Gospels. A quotation will make this appear with emphasis. Matthew iii. 1-3 reads: "Now in those days cometh John the Baptist, heralding in the wilderness of Judæa, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is near. For this is he that was spoken of through Isaiah the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make his paths level." Now all the four Gospels, and John himself, declare that John the Baptist was the Voice; and equally that Jesus was the being before whom the Voice was crying; all thus teaching that

Jesus and Jehovah are the same being, just as they teach that John is the Voice. Herein, at the very opening of the Gospel narrative, the view that Jesus was Jehovah incarnate appears fundamental.

2. Another evidence of what I am presenting is to be found in the saying of "the Angel of the Lord" to the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem, which is given in the Authorized Version as, "For unto you is born this day . . . a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." But what the angel really did say was, "a Saviour who is Messiah-Jehovah." The proof of this I present in brief.

We have already noted that *Christos* is the Greek for Messiah. Now as, naturally, the angel spoke to the Jews in their own tongue, doubtless the word he actually used was the Hebrew "Messiah"; and his very word we also have a right to use, and do so. But what right have we to put Jehovah for Lord? Of the ground for that right I give an outline.

Any reader of the Old Testament will note how constantly the word "Lord" appears there in small caps. The word which "Lord" is put to represent we call "Jehovah"; but every scholar knows that is not the true Hebrew, but is a mongrel which gives no idea of the real word. The explanation is this.

The four capital letters, YHVH, which are the foundation of what is now called "Jehovah," stand for a word which the later Jews came to think so sacred that it **must** never be spoken except by the High Priest on the great Atonement Day, in the Most Holy Place in the temple. So when, in reading the Scriptures, they came to that word, they used a euphemism, putting another word instead of that;—they read the word *adhonoi*, which meant "lord" or "sovereign"; thus putting the name of a function of God for the special name by which he was known to them. Now when the Septuagint translation was made,

the translators put into it the Greek equivalent for the euphemism *adhonoi*, namely, *kurios*, which means "lord" or "sir"; and made no attempt to represent the real Hebrew. Hence, throughout the Septuagint, *kurios* always appears wherever the sacred name is in Hebrew. Moreover, the translators took a special way to show this. They seem to have made it their rule, to which the exceptions are rare, to put *kurios* without the article, wherever it stands for the sacred name. It is so in the chapter above quoted, and generally.

It has been said that the Septuagint made the Greek of the New Testament. This is certainly true in this use of *kurios*, especially in the Gospels. After some examination I venture to say, that in every instance where a quotation is made in them from the Old Testament, and Jehovah appears in the Hebrew, there is some form of *kurios* without the article in the Greek. For example, in the account of the temptations, Matt. iv. 7 is quoted from Deut. vi. 16; and the words in the Gospel are identical with those in the Septuagint, having *kurios* without the article; so that it should read, "Thou shalt not tempt Jehovah thy God." Again, the quotation in the tenth verse is from the thirteenth verse of the same chapter in Deuteronomy, and is evidently from the Septuagint, though one word is different; but again we have *kurios* without the article, and the translation should be, "Jehovah thy God shalt thou worship, and him only shalt thou serve." One more example must suffice; and I quote from our Lord's discourse at Nazareth what he quotes (Luke iv. 18, 19) from Isa. lxi. 1, 2. The quotation seems to be from the Septuagint; and in both verses we have *kurios* without the article, so that they should read, "The Spirit of Jehovah is upon me," and "to proclaim the acceptable year of Jehovah."

This view is further confirmed by the use of the phrase "angel of the Lord," which is found seven times in the

Gospels, and five times in Acts, always meaning "the Angel of Jehovah" of the Old Testament; and in each instance, just like the Septuagint, *kurios* is without the article.

Such is an outline of the argument which seems to me conclusively to show that, as a rule, *kurios* without the article stands for Jehovah. We may now apply this fact to the saying of the "Angel of Jehovah" to the shepherds.

The part of the saying material to our purpose is, "unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is *Christos kurios*." Concerning *Christos* we have already learned that the angel really said, "Messiah." Now we note that *kurios* is without the article, and so comes under the rule already established. We note, also, that in the sentence before, *kurios* without the article appears twice, and both times unquestionably means "Jehovah." What, then, can reasonably hinder us from saying, that of course it means the same here? Nothing known to me; and I assume the case as proved. Then using the real word which good modern scholarship puts instead of the mongrel "Jehovah," we may give the passage thus: "And the Angel of Yahweh stood over them, and the Shechinah of Yahweh shone round about them, . . . And the Angel said to them, . . . to you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour who is Messiah-Yahweh." Thus are given the very words of the name which the Angel of Jehovah (to return to our customary word) gave to the Babe of Bethlehem, so far as those words can be lettered and sounded in our English tongue. That Angel named him Messiah-Yahweh, though the name has been now for so many ages lost. But in the day of Saul's conversion it was not lost; and when he saw Jesus up there in the sky, in that very seeing itself Jesus was disclosed to him as Yahweh or Jehovah incarnate. There is much evidence of the first order corroborative of this.

3. For a part of that evidence I turn to the very begin-

ning of the church, to the discourse of Peter on the day of Pentecost. The peroration of that discourse, according to our version (Acts. ii. 36), is as follows: "Therefore, let all the House of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ." But the Greek words *kurios* and *Christos*, translated "lord" and "Christ," are both without the article, just as they are in the saying of the Angel to the shepherds. And the same writer, Luke, made both records. So, in the light of the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the Hebrew words which Peter used (for he undoubtedly spoke in Hebrew), and which are represented by the Greek words in question, were Jehovah (Yahweh) and Messiah. The true rendering, then, would be, "God hath made that same Jesus whom ye crucified both Jehovah (Yahweh) and Messiah." No wonder that they who heard him were pierced to the heart when the fact was brought home to them irresistibly by the sermon of Peter, that their rulers "by wicked hands had crucified and slain" the human embodiment of the very being whom they and all their fathers had worshiped as God from the beginning of their nation; and whom all the prophets had foretold should come as their Messiah. Thus does it appear that the central thought in that first, great, Pentecostal sermon, under which the Christian church began to grow was, that Jesus the crucified was both Jehovah and Messiah. And what Saul saw in his vision was the same fact revealed in the manifestation of Jesus as both, standing in the Shechinah.

4. To the same effect is the argument of Stephen before the Sanhedrin. His whole line of thought was to show, historically, how from age to age Jehovah had appeared to the fathers of Israel through the prophets, and how those fathers had rejected him. Now when, as Stephen proceeded, his hearers came to see that the trend of his argument led right up to the conclusion that, as their

fathers had rejected Jehovah speaking through the prophets, so they had rejected the same Jehovah incarnated in Jesus of Nazareth, and speaking through him, that is, that they had crucified the very being whom they worshiped as God, their faces flamed up in rage against him. He seeing this, suddenly broke off and hurled against them the consummation of his argument in the fearfully denunciatory words, "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit; as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? And they killed those who told beforehand about the coming of the Righteous One, of whom ye just now became the betrayers and murderers;—ye who received the Law through the ordinances of angels, and did not keep them." Thus Stephen with all his might charged against assembled Israel, embodied in the Sanhedrin sitting right there before him in their official hall in Jerusalem, their capital city itself, that they had rejected Jehovah in Jesus, as their fathers had rejected him before, when speaking through the prophets; and that, in having crucified Jesus, they had murdered their Messiah: for the phrase "Righteous One" was a current equivalent of "Messiah." No wonder that after such a charge the crowd burst into ungovernable rage and stoned him to death.

This speech Saul of Tarsus heard. From him the account of it may have been derived. And he never forgot it. Of that we may feel assured. Instead, rather, that argument formed the basic outline of the life-teaching of Paul, the converted Saul. Stephen had said in substance, Jesus whom ye crucified was Jehovah in human flesh; and then, right there on the spot, "being full of the Holy Ghost, and gazing intently up into heaven," he "saw the Glory," that is, the Shechinah "of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God," and cried out, declaring what he saw. That same, at length, Saul of Tarsus him-

self also saw in his vision on the way to Damascus,—saw Jesus standing as the incarnate Jehovah in the midst of the Shechinah-Glory, and saw that as such he was the Messiah whom the prophets had foretold. And it was all this, set in one solid event before his mind, which revolutionized his whole mental and moral being in an instant.

From the above argument it seems warrantable to conclude that the saying, "Jesus is Messiah-Jehovah," is literally the teaching of the Angel who led the heavenly hosts to the shepherds of Bethlehem; and of Stephen declaring what he saw in vision, and for which he was stoned; and of Paul declaring what he also saw in vision. That this was the teaching of Paul becomes fully evident when we take up certain passages in his Epistles, and ascertain what he really does say in them.

5. We have now, therefore, to examine those passages in the Epistles of Paul in which he plainly teaches that Jesus is Jehovah.

As the first passage I adduce 1 Cor. xii. 3, which in the Authorized Version reads, "No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." Now in the original the word for "Lord" is *kurios* without the article, just as in the quotations from the Old Testament to which I have referred. Hence, following what we have learned, the translation would be, "And no one can say Jehovah is Jesus [following the order of the Greek, or Jesus is Jehovah, if that order be reversed], save by the Holy Spirit." On this passage Dean Alford in his commentary says: "All that is implied in *kurios* being also here implied: and we must not forget that it is the Septuagint's solemn word for the Hebrew Jehovah." This comment approves our whole claim. You cannot have one single peach without you first have a peach-tree. So you cannot have Paul once saying Jehovah is Jesus, or Jesus is Jehovah, without first you have the tree of that thought growing up through the

whole substance of his mind. This one passage, therefore, shows the Jehovah-Jesus thought as permeating the whole of Paul's career as a Christian.

We will next examine Rom. x. 9, 12, 13. Romans is Paul's greatest epistle, his especially theological one; and what it teaches has the greatest weight. Verse 9 reads, "Because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth *kurion Iesoun*," that is, "Jehovah-Jesus," *kurios* being without the article, "and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Verses 12 and 13 read, "For the same Lord of all is rich unto all who call upon him. For every one who shall call upon the name of *kurion* [Jehovah], shall be saved." The whole of verse 13 is taken from the Septuagint of Joel ii. 32, *kurios* is without the article, and the Hebrew has Jehovah. The verse was written about Jehovah; and yet Paul applies it to Jesus, thus showing that in his mind Jehovah and Jesus are the same being. And this was in his mind because, in the vision when he was converted, he had seen Jehovah in the Shechinah-Glory and heard him saying, "I am Jesus." Alford confirms our interpretation as follows: "The name of the Lord (Jehovah,—but used here of Christ beyond a doubt. . . . There is hardly a stronger proof, or one more irrefragable, . . . of the unhesitating application to him by the Apostle of the name and attributes of Jehovah)." Furthermore, Paul having applied to Jesus what Joel said concerning Jehovah, goes right on and applies to Jesus also what Isaiah says concerning Jehovah, "How beautiful upon the mountains," etc. (Isa. lii. 7), which would be high treason to God, unless Jehovah and Jesus are the same being.

As our third passage we will examine Phil. ii. 9-11, which may be rendered as follows: "Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and of his free grace bestowed upon him the Name which is above every name: in order that

in the name of Jesus every knee should bow (Isa. xlv. 23), of those in heaven, and those on earth, and those under the earth; and every tongue should confess, *Kurion Ieson Christon*, to the glory of God the Father." Here again both *kurios* and *Christos* are without the article, just as in the heralding by the angels to the shepherds; the former standing, as there, for Jehovah, and the latter for Messiah. Hence the translation should be either, "confess Jehovah-Jesus-Messiah," or "confess that Jehovah is Jesus-Messiah, to the glory," etc. Thus in this passage again is the view that Jesus is Jehovah shown to be the spinal cord of all Paul's conception of Christ and Christianity.

But what is "The Name which is above every name"? The Old Testament permits but one answer. It is the Memorial Name given to Moses as recorded in Ex. iii. 13-15, which is represented by the letters YHVH, and which we call Jehovah, of which God said, "This is my Name forever, yea, this is my Name unto all generations." And this is The Name, this sacred, "Memorial Name," which Paul in the above passage declares that God had bestowed upon Jesus. So he combines into one group, as well as is possible in Greek, the three,—the Memorial Name, the human name which the angel gave for the Babe before it was born, and the title by which the prophets had foretold him,—sets them all arow as one name, pressing all the ages and the infinities into it, and so calls the Being whom he is heralding, Jehovah-Jesus-Messiah; and, to crown all, applies to him the saying of Isaiah concerning Jehovah, "Every knee shall bow, and every tongue" shall confess. How can there be any doubt as to what Saul saw in his vision on the way to Damascus, or how it changed his life?

Our next passage is 2 Cor. iv. 5, which may be rendered thus: "For we herald not ourselves, but *Christon Iesoun kurion*." Here again *Christos* and *kurios* are both without the article, and, as before, the one stands for Messiah,

and the other for Jehovah; so that the saying should read, "For we herald not ourselves, but Messiah-Jesus-Jehovah." The name identifies Jesus with Jehovah, as before, only the first and last words are reversed in order.

Yet further may be quoted 1 Thess. iv. 1, 6, as follows: "Finally, brethren, we beseech and exhort you in *kurio Iesou*," *kurios* being without the article, and so the phrase signifying "in Jehovah-Jesus." Then in the sixth verse there is *kurios* without the article, the passage meaning, "because an avenger is Jehovah against all these"; apparently referring to Jesus. And yet again in chapter v. 2, Paul says, "day of *kurion*," the word being without the article, and Paul evidently meaning the day both of Jehovah and of Jesus as one being, even the day of judgment, when he shall come on the clouds.

But one more passage will claim our attention, viz., Col. iii. 17, which may be rendered as follows: "And everything which ye do, in word or in work, do all in the name of *kurion Iesou*." The article being absent, *kurios* stands for "The Name," and the clause should read, "do all in the name of Jehovah-Jesus."

IV. The facts and argument thus presented would seem to establish the view, that what Saul saw in his blinding vision on the way to Damascus was Jesus standing in the Shechinah "glory of that light" as Jehovah-Messiah; and to show that what he so experienced was the central fact and force in Saul's whole career. But there is immediately suggested by this result a question which I have never seen raised, much more answered, viz., How came the title "Lord" to be applied to Jesus? My answer is, The original church from the day of Pentecost, having full consciousness that Jesus was Jehovah, as Peter declared at the close of his sermon that day, and having received the teaching of this by the flooding power of the Holy Spirit, did, from that day on, consciously and deliberately apply

to Jesus all that in the Old Testament which pertains to Jehovah, as far as that looked forward to the Messiah as the incarnate Jehovah. Then, as the Greek-speaking Jews came to the front (as represented by Stephen, for example), the whole Septuagint use of the word *kurios* for "Jehovah" (the Septuagint being their Bible) was by them applied to Jesus, and he was called *Kurios Iesous*, meaning Jehovah-Jesus; and thus the use of *kurios* as designating Jesus became fixed as we now have it. But about the close of the first generation the Gentile church had broken off from that composed of Jewish Christians; and in two generations the latter had practically ceased to exist, at least as an effective force. Hereby the Gentiles lost all historic sense of the original use of *kurios* in the Septuagint as standing for Jehovah, and of the original use of that word by the first Jewish Christians as signifying that Jesus was that very Jehovah incarnate; and they simply thought of it in its natural, Greek meaning of "lord" or "master" or "sovereign." Thus the special and real sense of the word in the historic connection I have pointed out was completely lost. Once lost it stayed lost, the conditions of the times making any other result impossible. Hence all Christendom reads the word as a mere title signifying sovereignty, without any true sense of its real historic significance. But if only Christendom could come to see that wherever in Paul's writings there is "The Lord Jesus Christ," he thought Jehovah-Jesus-Messiah, and we ought to think the same, how differently in some aspects Jesus would appear to Christians from what he does now.

The view thus presented enables us to understand Paul's career as otherwise we cannot do. When we know that he saw the Jesus whose disciples he was persecuting, as the Jehovah in whose name he was doing the persecuting, saw it right there in that midday vision, then do we realize how he must have been overwhelmed indeed, and have

experienced such a vast revolution as came. Abundant reason was there, then, why he should go away into Arabia and stay three years, that in the solitude and quietude he might think over and think out the solutions of the many problems which were necessarily involved in the Old Testament seen in the light of that revelation.

We understand, also, on what grounds Paul so stoutly affirmed that he did not receive his Gospel from men, not even from the most "pillar-apostles," as he himself says in Galatians: but that he received it only "by revelation from Jesus-Messiah." That assertion was the literal truth; and that revelation began with that noonday vision, when he saw Jesus standing in the Shechinah-Glory, as both Messiah and Jehovah. Therefore it is that his message is really a "Fifth Gospel" in a higher sense than they who coined that phrase may have imagined. "The Twelve" had the exterior Gospel of the historic, human side of Jesus, and of his Kingdom; and they told the story of his human life, of which, apparently, Paul knew very little. Paul had the interior side of the same matter to tell,—the relation of the crucified Jehovah-Jesus-Messiah to the Mosaic ceremonial, and to the moral government of God.

We further understand why the presence and teachings of Paul angered the Jews so everywhere. The foundation of all his teaching and work was that the Jews, in crucifying Jesus of Nazareth, had "by wicked hands crucified and slain" that very Jehovah whom they and their fathers had worshiped, and that very Messiah whom the prophets had foretold. To an irritable, excitable, highly religious race, such as the Jews were, nothing could be more maddening than to be charged with such a crime, especially by one of so highly electrical a nature as Paul was. Hence like hornets they flung themselves upon him whenever they could.

And now, at last, in the end of the Ages, has not the time fully come when this fivefold Gospel, interior and ex-

terior (interior in God's moral government over all moral beings, exterior in his human Kingdom on this earth), should be made known, understood, comprehended, and mastered, as the full, complete, all-around divine-human system of both doctrine and life? And all serious souls who love Jesus are called with earnest cry to possess themselves of this stupendous immensity of God's truth in the whole Gospel of Jehovah-Jesus-Messiah.

## ARTICLE V.

GEOLOGICAL CONFIRMATIONS OF THE  
NOACHIAN DELUGE.

BY G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

INTERNAL EVIDENCES OF THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER  
OF THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT.

THE account of the Flood in Genesis does not stand alone. Similar traditions are found among nearly all the nations and tribes of the world. So wide-spread and persistent are these traditions, that those who have given attention to the subject have found it difficult to resist the conviction that they relate to a common event with which the ancestors of all the present population of the world were acquainted in its painful reality.

But, as might be expected, the traditions in general have taken on such local coloring and extravagant proportions that the kernel of truth underlying them has been hopelessly obscured. Among them all, the account in Genesis stands out conspicuous for the grandeur and beauty of the divine attributes revealed in connection with the catastrophe, for the simplicity of the style in which the story is related, and for its undesigned conformity with the natural facts incidentally involved in it.

In the biblical account, nothing is introduced conflicting with the sublime conception of holiness and the peculiar combination of justice and mercy ascribed to God throughout the Bible, and illustrated in the general scheme of providential government manifest in the order of nature and in history; while in the cuneiform tablets, the Deluge

is occasioned by a quarrel among the gods, and the few survivors escape, not by reason of a merciful plan, but by a mistake which aroused the anger of Bel.

“As soon as Bel arrived  
And saw the ship, Bel was angry;  
He was filled with wrath at the gods, the Igigi:  
‘Hath there any soul escaped?  
Not a man should have survived destruction.’”

The story is conclusively shown not to be a legend connected with an ordinary river flood, by the fact that the ark is represented as floating up stream. Upon this point, the Scripture account, the cuneiform tablets, and Berossus are in substantial agreement. According to Genesis, it was not, as it is usually translated, on “Mount Ararat,” but in the “mountains of Ararat,” designating an indefinite region in Armenia; according to the inscriptions, it was in Nizir, a region, in close proximity to Ararat, which is watered by the Zab and the Tornadus; while, according to Berossus, it was on the Gordyaeon Mountains, included in the same indefinite area. In all three cases, its resting-place is in the direction of the headwaters of the Euphrates Valley, while the scene of the building is clearly laid in the lower part of the valley.

Again, in the biblical account, the spread of the water floating the ark is represented to have been occasioned, not so much by the rain which fell, as by the breaking up of “all the fountains of the great deep,” which very naturally describes phenomena connected with one of the extensive downward movements of the earth’s crust with which geology has made us familiar. The sinking of the land below the level of the ocean is equivalent, in its effects, to the rising of the water above it, and is accurately expressed by the phrases used in the sacred narrative. This appears, not only in the language concerning the breaking-up of the great deep which describes the coming-on of the flood, but also in the description of its termination, in which it

is said, that the "fountains of the deep were stopped, . . . and the waters returned from off the earth, . . . and decreased continually." Such clear, simple language pretty certainly belongs to history, rather than to legend.

Similar evidence that we mainly have in Genesis a plain, unvarnished tale, appears in the dimensions that are given to the ark, namely, 300 cubits (500 feet) long, 50 cubits (80 feet) wide, 30 cubits (50 feet) deep, which are the natural proportions for a ship of that size; being, in fact, very close to those of the great steamers which are now constructed to cross the Atlantic. The Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse of the North German Lloyd line is 648 feet long, 65 feet wide, and 43 feet deep. The dimensions of the Great Eastern (680 feet long, 83 feet broad, and 58 feet deep) are still closer to those of the ark. The naturalness of these proportions is strikingly in contrast with those given by the cuneiform tablets and Berosus. The cuneiform tablets give the length as 600 cubits (1,000 feet), and the width and depth as 140 cubits (233 feet), the dimensions of an utterly unseaworthy structure. The figures of Berosus are still more unreasonable, since he made the ark to be 3,000 feet long and 1,200 feet broad. It is in the highest degree improbable that the correct proportions of the biblical narrative are due to the accident of legendary guesswork.

#### INTERPRETATION OF THE SCRIPTURAL LANGUAGE.

We are not, however, compelled to narrow the interpretation of the biblical account down to the level of a hard-and-fast prosaic statement of dry detail. This whole episode in the history of the human race was introduced for the accomplishment of a moral purpose, which is enforced in the story by literary forms calculated to make the required impression, without pausing to gratify curiosity respecting all incidental details. The narrative portions are

extremely condensed, apparently limiting themselves, as the logbook of a sea-captain would do, to the most clearly marked objective facts of observation, without effort to harmonize them either with themselves or with any comprehensive view of the universe. The expressed object of the Flood may therefore properly be permitted to limit the meaning of many of the general phrases introduced into the vivid account. This is so plain a principle of interpretation that it would seem to need for its substantiation little more than the bare statement. But, as many extremists on both sides fail to appreciate the principle, a few words may profitably be devoted to its illustration.

Long before the rise of geology and of the doubts which it has raised concerning the contemporaneous universality of the Flood, it was noted by various learned commentators that the biblical account of the Deluge bore evidence that it was written by an eye-witness, and hence should be interpreted according to the natural limitations of such writing. In documents thus prepared, metonymy has a preëminent place. The language describes what appears to the senses, and does not go beyond the phenomena which are visible. It does not try to settle minute extraneous questions. Nothing is more common than this figure of speech, where the part is put for the whole, and the horizon which limits our vision is spoken of as the horizon of the whole world. It falls to the lot of scientific methods of interpretation to determine the extent to which this figure of speech legitimately modifies the literal interpretation of the text.

All the universality required by the language describing the Noachian Deluge would seem to be that which is necessary for the accomplishment of its ostensible purpose, namely, such a destruction of the human race that history could begin over again under new conditions of heredity and environment. Some of the general phrases used,

therefore, may properly be defined by the expressed object of the Divine judgment, while others have a natural boundary in the horizon which limits the writer's knowledge or observation. The objects of the Flood are all satisfied if the destruction of the human race with the exception of Noah's family was fully accomplished.

Respecting this point, it will be shown later, that it would be difficult to prove that, at the time of the Flood, the surviving members of the human race were not limited to a narrow area somewhere in the valley of the Euphrates. For example, Hugh Miller and others have plausibly urged that the human race before the Deluge had not spread very far from its original center, and that, owing to its great wickedness, it had not multiplied so as to secure any great density of population even there. While this is possibly the case, I shall defend another view, which will be supported by many recently discovered facts, pointing to a wide-spread destruction of antediluvian man in connection with extensive, recent, great geological changes, which have taken place since his appearance in the world. These considerations will prepare the way for regarding the Noachian Deluge as a catastrophe in Central Asia closing a series which had then already restricted the human race to that region. In this attempt, however, we are not called upon to prove the Flood independent of history, but simply to remove objections to the credibility of the history raised from unwarranted scientific assumptions.

Viewing the story of Genesis as the account of a really extensive, but comparatively limited, catastrophe in Central Asia, to which the survivors of the human race were then confined, the interpretation of the general phrases used may allowably be determined by the general limitation of the field which was within the reach of the writer's mental vision. Illustrations of this principle are familiar enough. When, for example, Job describes the thunder

as being "sent forth under the whole heaven, and his lightning unto the ends of the earth" (Job xxxvii. 3), we have no difficulty in understanding it as having reference simply to the whole visible horizon, for everybody uses similar expressions with this implied limitation. When we say, "Everybody knows it," or "The whole country turned out to see him," we have no difficulty in explaining that these phrases, though absolutely general in their form, are yet much restricted in their meaning.

For example, we are told in Deut. ii. 25, that the dread and fear of Israel should that day be put "upon the nations that are under the whole heaven." But the interpreter who should insist upon the absolute literality of such a phrase would prove not the point which he intended to prove, but rather the narrowness of his own range of familiarity with literature. So when, in Gen. xli. 54 and 57, it is said that there was a famine "in all lands," or "over all the face of the earth," and that "all countries" came to Egypt to buy corn, it would be only an interpreter of a very narrow acquaintance with literature who should insist that the language was literal, and that the irrigated plains of Babylonia were as dependent upon Egypt as were the hills of Judæa. So when the writer of the book of Kings says that Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth for riches, and that all the earth sought to hear his wisdom, and when the Saviour says that the Queen of Sheba came "from the uttermost parts of the earth," he would be a very narrow and ill-informed interpreter who should insist upon the strict literality of the words. In Acts ii. 25, we are told that there were present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost people "out of every nation under heaven," but when the enumeration is made it includes only the region extending from Italy to the Persian Gulf, over which the Jews are known to have spread. When Cæsar is said to have taxed "all the world,"

and we say that it means all the Roman Empire, we should not be construed to assert that the writer supposed there were no outlying provinces yet unsubdued by the Roman power. And so, when Paul (in 58 A.D.) asserts that the faith of the church at Rome was already "spoken of throughout the whole cosmos," it would be supremely puerile to insist upon the bare literal interpretation of the words.

In accordance with this principle of interpretation, we are permitted to regard the universal statements concerning the Flood as being the language of appearance such as would present themselves to eye-witnesses of the catastrophe, and limited in its general results to the main purpose for which it came. So that "all the mountains and hills under the whole heavens" may naturally mean all those within the horizon of the writer's vision, or within reach of his knowledge, or within the circle which was then inhabited by man.

#### THE DATE OF THE FLOOD.

Before entering upon the direct presentation of the facts bearing upon the question in hand, it will be best to prepare the way for answering one other objection, which may arise on the score of chronology. The present discussion will proceed upon the assumption that the date of the Flood may be placed considerably earlier than that given by the ordinary chronology as worked out by Archbishop Usher, or, indeed, as it would be obtained by considering merely the *prima facie* evidence in the first chapters of Genesis. But a careful study of the subject will show that the genealogical tables in the fifth and eleventh chapters are not designed to give chronological data, but merely to indicate lines of descent. The character of these tables has been so fully discussed in our pages,<sup>1</sup> by the late Pro-

<sup>1</sup> April, 1890, pp. 285-303.

fessor William Henry Green, of Princeton, that we may content ourselves with a brief summary of his arguments, referring to the elaborate article itself for the fuller substantiation of the conclusions arrived at.

In the genealogies in the fifth chapter of Genesis, ten generations are mentioned between Adam and Noah, and the age of the parent at the time of the birth of the son who is next in the chain is in each case given; while in the eleventh chapter ten more generations between Noah and Abraham are mentioned in the same manner;—that is, the age of the parent at the birth of each successive son is given in definite figures; so that, by adding together these sums to the date of Abraham (which is 1918 B.C.), as Archbishop Usher did, we get the dates which are found in the margins of many of our English Bibles, namely, of the creation of man, 4004 years B.C.; and of the Flood, 2348 B.C. Upon the face of it, it looks as though there could be here no way of avoiding conflict between a clear Bible statement and the result of modern investigations in geology and archæology, which give a much higher antiquity to man and to the civilization in Egypt and Babylonia; for, these chronological data in the genealogical tables seem to be linked together in such a way that there is no lengthening the chain without altogether destroying its continuity.

Close study of the subject, however, will convince any one that even the linked genealogical tables of these chapters were not intended by the writer, nor understood by their readers, to teach a definite chronology, but are inserted simply to show lines of descent, in which any number of intermediate links may be omitted without interfering with the purpose of the tables. This conclusion is based, not upon mere speculative reasons, or the necessity of making out a case, but upon the manifest usage of the sacred writers in numerous other places, and upon a careful consideration of the tables themselves.

As one of the most instructive examples, we may turn our attention to the first chapter of Matthew, where, in the first verse, Christ is called in the same breath "the son of David" and "the son of Abraham," after which the complete list is seemingly given in close column, extending from Abraham down. But it is noticeable that the names are divided into three groups of fourteen each. To bring them within the limits of these exact numbers, however, we find that three names are omitted in verse 8. It is said that "Joram begat Ozias" (Uzziah), when we know from the book of Kings that three names have been omitted—Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah; while again, in verse 11, Jehoiakim is omitted after Josiah.

What now is it reasonable to conclude from these passages? Shall we say that the writer of this chapter did not know of the existence of those links which he dropped out? Certainly not, for this is the Gospel that was written by a Hebrew, and both he and his readers had ready access to, and were devoted believers in, the Old Testament, and they were surrounded by Jewish opponents who would readily find fault with any serious misuse of it. The only explanation, therefore, is that all were so familiar with the use of genealogies to indicate simply lines of descent, without any reference to chronology, that nobody thought of raising any question concerning such use. Interpreters, therefore, should learn from this passage to be on their guard against making chronological use of similar tables in other portions of Jewish literature.

Turning to the Old Testament, itself, we notice, among others, one of the clearest examples in 1 Chron. xxvi. 24, where we read that "Shebuel the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, was ruler of the treasures," and again in 1 Chron. xxiii. 15, 16, we read that "the sons of Moses were Gershom and Eleazer. Of the sons of Gershom Shebuel was the chief." But Shebuel was appointed over the treasury

by David four hundred years after the time of Moses; so that six or seven generations must have intervened between Gershom and Shebuel. Still, notwithstanding this, the identical term is used twice over in expressing the relation between Moses and Gershom, that is used in expressing that between Gershom and Shebuel. Again, in Ezra vii. 1-5, the writer of this book, doubtless with full knowledge of what was written in the Chronicles before him, gives Ezra's genealogy in the line of Aaron, but in the table skips from Meraioth to Azariah, omitting six names which appear in the parallel passage in 1 Chron. vi. 3-14. Here, again, it would be absurd to suppose that such omissions were made through ignorance, since they created no disturbance in the minds of the Jews in general who read them. They simply illustrate what were the familiar usages of speech among the Jews.

And so we might go on enumerating a dozen other instances in which similar free use is made of genealogical tables where it is clear that the chronological questions connected with them are not taken into account in the least. The condensation of genealogical tables was with the Jews the rule, and not the exception. Manifestly they were used as we may use the phrase "sons of the Pilgrims," where everything but the line of descent is left out of view. Until, with Professor Green, one takes pains to go through the long list of genealogies abbreviated in the same manner in the Old Testament, he cannot have any proper conception of how frequent this use is, and how clear the point we are making appears from the facts.

In Professor Green's discussion he goes on farther to show, that not only is there no difficulty in supposing that the genealogical tables in Gen. v. and xi. are abbreviated, but that there are many special reasons in the tables themselves and in the contexts in which they occur, to show that this is really the case. In the first place, a strict lit-

eral interpretation of the first genealogical table (v. 3) might naturally lead us to infer that Seth was Adam's first child. The only way in which we find out that he was not, is from the history of Cain and Abel and the mention of a wife to Cain in the preceding chapter.

Secondly, no chronology is ever deduced from these tables by the sacred writers. "There is no computation anywhere in the Scriptures of the time that elapsed from the creation or from the Deluge, as there is from the descent into Egypt to the Exodus (Ex. xii. 40), or from the Exodus to the building of the temple (1 Kings vi. 1)." At the same time, the prominence given to the length of the individual lives after the birth of the son mentioned shows that something else than chronology was what the writer wished to impress upon the reader.

Thirdly, in the convincing words of Professor Green,—

"The structure of the genealogies in Gen. v. and xi. also favors the belief that they do not register all the names in these respective lines of descent. Their regularity seems to indicate intentional arrangement. Each genealogy includes ten names, Noah being the tenth from Adam, and Terah the tenth from Noah. And each ends with a father having three sons, as is likewise the case with the Cainite genealogy (iv. 17-22). The Sethite genealogy (chap. v.) culminates in its seventh member, Enoch, who 'walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.' The Cainite genealogy also culminates in its seventh member, Lamech, with his polygamy, bloody revenge, and boastful arrogance. The genealogy descending from Shem divides evenly at its fifth member, Peleg; 'and in his days was the earth divided.' Now as the adjustment of the genealogy in Matthew i. into three periods of fourteen generations each, is brought about by dropping the requisite number of names, it seems in the highest degree probable that the symmetry of these primitive genealogies is artificial rather than natural. It is much more likely that this definite number of names fitting into a regular scheme has been selected as sufficiently representing the periods to which they belong, than that all these striking numerical coincidences should have happened to occur in these successive instances."

"The notion of basing a chronological computation upon these genealogies is, therefore, a fundamental mistake. It is putting them to a purpose that they were not designed to subserve, and to which from the method of their construction they were not adapted. But, when it is

said, for example, that 'Enosh lived ninety years and begat Kenan,' the well-established usage of the word 'begat' makes his statement equally true and equally accordant with analogy, whether Kenan was an immediate or a remote descendant of Enosh; whether Kenan was himself born, when Enosh was ninety years of age, or one was born from whom Kenan sprang."

In other words, Kenan may simply have been a remote descendant of the branch which put off from the line of Enosh in the ninetieth year.

"We conclude, therefore [says Professor Green], that the Scriptures furnish no data for a chronological computation prior to the life of Abraham; and that the Mosaic records do not fix and were not intended to fix the precise date either of the Flood or of the creation of the world."

"If, therefore [he goes on to say], any really trustworthy data can be gathered from any source whatever, which can be brought into comparison with these genealogies for the sake of determining the question, whether they have noted every link in the chain of descent, or whether, as in other manifest instances, links have been omitted, such data should be welcomed and the comparison fearlessly made. Science would simply perform the office, in this instance, which information gathered from other parts of Scripture is unhesitatingly allowed to do in regard to those genealogies previously examined."

Whereupon he goes on to give reasons, from archæology and from the narrative in Genesis itself, going to show that the Flood was much earlier than would appear from the chronology ordinarily obtained from the scriptural language.

After this much of attention to preliminary questions relating to the proper understanding of the biblical account, we will turn, in following numbers, to consider the vast amount of evidence which has recently come to light showing (1st) that there has been a period of instability of the earth's crust extending down to comparatively recent times, which, from a scientific point of view, renders the scriptural account of the Flood easily credible; (2d) that there is much positive geological evidence that some such wide-spread catastrophe has actually occurred since man came into the world.