

tematic classification of facts. * * * Quirini, in 1676, * * * *was the first writer who ventured to maintain that the universality of the Mosaic cataclysm ought not to be insisted upon.*"*

A later writer than Quirini, Woodward (1695), conceived—Sir Charles quotes his own words—"the whole terrestrial globe to have been taken to pieces and dissolved at the flood, and the strata to have settled down from this promiscuous mass as any earthy sediment from a fluid;"† while Whiston, in 1696, published a work bearing the striking title of "A New Theory of the Earth; wherein the Creation of the World in six days, the Universal Deluge, and the General Conflagration, as laid down in the Holy Scriptures, are shown to be perfectly agreeable to Reason and Philosophy."‡ But down even to our own day those absurd theories have lingered, not of course in the high places of science, but in quarters where science is made very little of, in comparison with an unquestioning belief in the Bible, such, for example, as Mr. Moody appears to possess. When, therefore, I imputed to the latter gentleman the old-fashioned belief on the subject of the Deluge, I may or may not have done him an injustice; but I certainly committed myself to no theory of Scripture interpretation; so that, as far as this goes, the charge that I fail to understand the language of Scripture is absolutely baseless. Possibly, however, my treatment of the parable of the Unjust Steward would be cited in support of the same charge, so a word on that subject. What I stated in "Proofs and Disproofs" was, that "the story is of no ethical value whatever, or rather is of a hurtful tendency, since crime is represented as actually receiving praise." It was not the crime, observes the Rev. Mr. Grant, but "the shrewdness and self-regard" that accompanied it, upon which praise is bestowed. The moral of the tale, then, on this theory, would be: "If you steal, do it cleverly—let there be commendable shrewdness; and in all your arrangements look out for number one—let there be an admirable self-regard." I am quite prepared to accept this amendment, and to withdraw my blunt asser-

tion that "the crime" received praise; only I must still be allowed to wonder that intelligent and moral men should consent to accept this as inspired teaching. The Rev. Mr. Grant tells us that the master also was "a child of this generation." Where does he find that in the record? The record, I do not hesitate to say, implies the contrary; but to adopt the supposition only makes the case stronger on my side, for of what "ethical value" is the admiration with which one unprincipled man regards the clever roguery of another?

Considering the unshaken faith professed by the Rev. Mr. Grant in the Scriptural account of the fall of Jericho, I cannot but wonder to find him now saying with reference to it that "those parts of the Bible were written for the infancy of the world"—that "they are still the delight of children, and grown men delight in them when they have imagination to conceive the surroundings." Why should sober, authentic history be more suited to children than to men, or to imaginative men than to men of weak imagination? Of course, if these things were fables, such language would be very natural; but seeing they are not fables, but as much matters of history as the French Revolution or the passing of the last Reform Bill, it is very singular to find them handed over to children and to grown-up people of lively fancy. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews cited a long list of just such marvels (including the sack of Jericho and the saving of Rahab, whose house was on top of the wall that fell down, and who, by special understanding, was in her house at the time), not to amuse children, or to tickle the fancy of

* Strange to say, Dr. Mozley, in his Bampton Lectures on Miracles, points to imagination as one of the most potent causes in promoting *disbelief* in miracles. "A cause," he says, "which has had just as much to do with it as science is what I may call the historical imagination" (page 2). As regards the mass of men, he continues (page 3), "the past is an inanimate image in their minds, which does not beat with the pulse of life. And this want of reality attaching to the *time*, certain occurrences in it do not raise the questionings which those very occurrences realized would raise." On the other hand, *when* such things are imaginatively realized, they excite surprise, and "surprise when it once comes in takes two directions: it either makes belief more real or it destroys belief." Considering the general efficacy attributed by Dr. Mozley to the historical imagination in weakening the belief in miracles, there can be no doubt as to the direction the surprise excited *ordinarily* takes.

* "Principles of Geology"—American, from 9th London Edition, page 25.

† Do. page 31.

‡ Do. page 32.