

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. 58 (1881)

July 19, 1881

"Upper Columbia Conference" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 58, 4, pp. 59, 60.

THE second annual session of the Upper Columbia Conference of Seventh-day Adventists convened on the camp-ground at Dayton, W. T., June 1-7, 1881.

FIRST MEETING, June 2, 9 A. M. The President in the chair. Prayer by Eld. L. D. Van Horn.

Credentials of delegates being called for, the following were presented: Walla Walla, Geo. Savage, T. Chabot L. M. Johns; Milton, Wm. Russell, Win. McCoy; Dayton, C. F. Phar; Patha, Wm. A. Gibson. It was voted that Brn. H. Barkley, T. L. Ragsdale, E. E. Vinson, and Arthur Wilder act as representatives from Fairview, Pendleton, Peola, and Basket Mountain, respectively; also that Elds. J. H. Waggoner and I. D. Van Horn, and all members in good standing, be invited to take part in the deliberations of the Conference.

Minutes of last session read and accepted.

Voted, That the appointment of committees be left with the President. The following were named: On Resolutions J. H. Waggoner, L. D. Van Horn, A. T. Jones; Nominations, I. M. Johns, W. M. McCoy, Ambrose Johnson; Credentials, I. M. Johns, Ambrose Johnson, Aaron Miller; Auditing, Wm. Russell, Wm. Goodwin, C. F. Phar, Wm. A. Gibson, T. L. Ragsdale, E. E. Vinson.

Eld. Waggoner made interesting and profitable remarks on the necessity of members individually keeping up the interest in all branches of the work also upon the growth of our country, and the necessity of energy on the part of all, that the growth of our work may keep pace with that of the country.

Adjourned to call of Chair.

SECOND MEETING, June 3, 2:30 P. M.—The President in the chair. Prayer by Bro. Wm. Russell. Minutes of the meeting read and accepted.

The Committee on Nominations reported as follows For President G. W. Colcord; Secretary, A. T. Jones; Treasurer, Wm. Nichols; Executive Committee, G. W. Colcord, Wm. Goodwin, Ambrose Johnson. The nominees were unanimously elected.

The Committee on Resolutions reported as follows:—

Having examined the resolutions presented at your Conference,¹¹ your Committee recommend that the brethren and sisters re-read them, and continue to act upon their suggestions. As they cover the whole ground of

60

duty, if you strive to live up to them, it will be all that can be asked or expected of you as a Conference.

J. H. WAGGONER,
I. D. VAN HORN, *Com.*
A. T. JONES.

The Committee on Credentials and Licenses recommended that the credentials of Elds. G. W. Colcord and A. T. Jones be renewed, and license granted to Bro. Win. Russell. Adopted unanimously.

Adjourned to call of Chair.

THIRD MEETING, JUNE 7, 5:30 A. M.—The President in the chair. Prayer by Eld. Waggoner. Minutes of last meeting read and accepted.

Further action, of the Committee on Credentials and Licenses was called for; and it was voted that the Committee be discharged, and the matter left with the Conference Committee.

Moved, That a vote of thanks be tendered to the General Conference, for the efficient labors of Eld. J. H. Waggoner.

Adjourned *sine die*. G. W. COLCORD, *Pres.*

ALONZO T. JONES, *Sec.*

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. 59 (1882)

May 2, 1882

"The Authenticity of the Scriptures" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 59, 18 , pp. 273, 274.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

As long as the Bible is believed to be the word of God, so long will it be denied. As long as the Scriptures shall be held as of authority, so long will they be opposed as such. So long as we may present the Scriptures as the word of God, just so long shall we have to defend them as such. But believing, as we most assuredly do, that they are authentic, that they were written when they purport to have been written, and that therefore they are what they purport to be, it is only a pleasure to uphold and defend them, and the excellent part of the matter is that there is no lack of effectual means of defense, from whatever direction the attack may be made.

One of the favorite objections is, We cannot tell when the Bible was written, whether the books of the Bible were written when they are said to have been, or hundreds of years later.

But in reply we can say, We have abundant and indubitable proofs that the books of the Bible were written at the times that are claimed for them—New testament as well as Old, Old Testament as well as New.

In this article we do not intend to present any proofs to confirm the supernatural character of miracles or prophecies, but only proofs showing that the books which contain the supernatural were written at the time they claim to

have been written. And in doing this we shall present facts which cannot possibly be disproved.

It is a fact that the Bible exists to-day. It is also a fact that books are written in opposition to it. These things none can deny. It is equally undeniable that nearly *one hundred years* ago Thomas Paine wrote a book against the Bible, which proves that the identical Bible which is in existence to-day was in existence then. About *three hundred and sixty-five years ago*, Luther in Germany, Zwingli in Switzerland, and Faber in France, each and all opposed the corruption of the Church of Rome, and this opposition was based wholly upon the Bible. The Bible was preached, it was translated, it was printed and distributed in great numbers. It cannot be denied that the Bible was in existence then. We can go back nearly *two hundred years* further, and Wycliffe in England had a Bible, expounded it to the people, exhorted them to study it for themselves, and even translated it into the English language.

But, not to be tedious, we will at once go back *fifteen hundred and twenty years*, to A.D. 331-361. Julian was emperor of the Roman empire, and wrote in opposition to Christianity, and of course *opposed* the *doctrine* of the New Testament. But he never pretended to "*deny the truth* of the gospel history, as a history, though he denied the deity of Jesus Christ asserted in the writings of the evangelists; he acknowledged the principal facts in the gospel as well as the miracles of our Saviour and his apostles." He mentioned Matthew and Luke by name, and presented the objection to the genealogy of Christ as given by them, that is urged to this day. "He recited the sayings of Christ in the very words of the evangelists; he also bore testimony that the Gospel of John was composed later than the other evangelists, and at a time when great numbers were converted to the Christian faith both in Italy and Greece; and alluded oftener than once to the facts recorded in the Acts of the Apostles." "He expressly states the early dates of these records, he calls them by the names which they now bear. He all along supposes, he *nowhere questions*, their *genuineness* or *authenticity*; now does he give even the slightest intimation that he suspected the whole or *any part* of them *to be forgeries*."—*Horne's Introduction*, vol. 1, chap. 2, sec. 2.

This, being "testimony from an enemy, is the strongest kind of evidence" in favor of the New Testament, and proves that it was in existence in A.D. 331. But we have more of the same kind. One hundred years before Julian, A.D. 233, lived Porphyry, "the most sensible as well as the most severe adversary of the Christian religion that antiquity can produce." "He had conversed with the Christians in Tyre, in Sicily, and in Rome." "He was of all the adversaries of the Christian religion the best qualified for inquiring into the authenticity of the sacred writings. He possessed every advantage which natural abilities, or political situation could afford, to discover whether the New Testament was a genuine work of the apostles and evangelists, or whether it was imposed upon the world after the decease of its pretended authors. But *not trace of this suspicion* is anywhere to be found, nor did it ever occur to Porphyry to suppose that it was spurious. *He did not deny the truth* of the gospel history, but *actually considered the miracles* of Jesus Christ *actual facts*. He also notices the difference between Paul and Peter in Gal. 2:11. But the objections of Porphyry were not confined to

the New Testament, he attacked the Old Testament also, especially the prophecy of Daniel, declaring that it was written after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes."—*Horne's Introduction*, vol. 1, chap. 2, sec. 2, and *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century*, by Principal Cairns, Lecture 1, sec. 3.

This proves that the Bible was extensively known as far back as A.D. 233; for how could a man write in opposition to a thing that did not exist?

But we may go back sixty years further to A.D. 176, or thereabouts, and we find Celsus, another "infidel writer, and one of the greatest enemies with whom Christianity had to contend. He not only mentions by name, but quotes passages from the books of the New Testament, so that we know that we have the *identical books* to which he referred. "The miraculous conception is mentioned with a view of accusing the Virgin Mary of adultery; we also recognize Joseph's intention of putting her away, and the consequent appearance of the angel warning him in a dream to take her as his wife, we meet with a reference to the star that was seen at his birth, and the adoration paid to the new-born Saviour by the Magi at Bethlehem, the murder of the infants by Herod, the consequence of his being deceived by the wise men, is noticed, as also the reappearance of the angel to Joseph, and his consequent flight into Egypt. Here then, are references to all the facts of our Saviour's *birth*. Again, we are informed of the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove and the voice from Heaven at the baptism of our Saviour in Jordan; we hear also of the temptation in the wilderness, we are told that Christ was constantly attended by a certain number of disciples, though the number is not correct. There is an allusion to our Saviour's conversation with the woman of Samaria at the well, and a reference, less distinct, to the attempt of the people of Nazareth to throw him down the rock on which their city was built. Here, therefore, is ample testimony to his *baptism* and the facts immediately following it."

He "also pretends to believe in the miracles of christ, and those of healing the sick, feeding the five thousand men, and raising the dead are expressly mentioned, though they are attributed to magical influence. Several passages also in our Saviour's sermon on the mount, are quoted *verbatim*, and his predictions relating to his sufferings, death, and resurrection are recorded. Nor are the *closing* scenes of the life of the Saviour noticed with less exactness. We meet with the treachery of Judas and Peter's denial of his Master, we are informed that Christ was bound, insulted, beaten with rods and crucified, we read of the gall which was given him to eat, and vinegar to drink, and we are insulted with an unfeeling jest upon the blood and water that flowed from our dying Redeemer's side. He mentions some words which were uttered by Christ upon the cross, and alludes to the earthquake and darkness that immediately followed the crucifixion. There is also mention made of the appearance of the angels at the sepulcher, and of the manifestation of Christ to Mary Magdalene, and the disciples after his resurrection."

"The difficulty of one angel or two," at the tomb "is noticed." "Jesus is reproached for needing to have the stone rolled away by an angel." Now he says, "These things are from your own writings, as to which we need no other evidence, for

you fall by your own authority."—*Horne's Introduction*, vol. 1, chap. 2, sec. 2; and *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century*, by Principal Cairns, Lecture 1, sec. 3.

There can certainly be no controversy about the existence of the New Testament in the times of Julian, Porphyry, and Celsus, and, as has been remarked, not one of these able writers pretended to call in question the authenticity of the *records* of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. It would be just as reasonable for us to-day to deny the facts of the Reformation by Luther, as to expect that Julian should deny the existence of the records of the ministry of Jesus; just as reasonable for us to-day to deny the facts of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, as to suppose that Porphyry could deny the faithfulness of the New Testament history. Just as wisely could we reject all the evidences of the American Revolution, as to suppose that Celsus could reject the evidences of the life of Jesus in the world. It would certainly be the supremest folly for any man to deny the reality of any one of these three world-stirring events. Just as supremely foolish would it have been for any of these three men to deny the event that was then moving the world as it had never been moved. An event the results of which were threatening the very existence of the empire of Julian as it had existed for hundreds of years, could not well be denied. Each of these men, more especially Celsus, had ample means and ability, and the *will* also, to disprove the authenticity of these sacred records, had it been possible; and the very fact that not one of them even pretended to attempt any such thing, proves that that thing was impossible. I will close this paragraph with Principal Cairn's closing observation on Celsus, before quoted: "His testimony here is evidently of the greatest weight; and his position, as at once an immediately succeeding writer and an enemy, gives the Gospels a recognition which could have come from no other quarter, even from later unbelief in the earlier centuries. *It is impossible for modern unbelief to shake this foundation*, or to resolve those materials which Celsus has attested as so solid and documentary, into the mist and vapor of shifting tradition. What he assails is not a cloud, but a fortress well defined, and the mark of studied attack and siege. It is *too late* now to obliterate his lines and parallels, which have even been added to the intrenchments against which they were directed."

As the last, but not by any means as the least authority in confirmation of the early date of the New Testament, we introduce Gibbon, the prince of historians. He says, "*The Christian Revelation was consummated under the reign of Nerva*."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 21, sec. 7. This indisputable authority carries us back beyond Celsus *sixty* years, for the reign of Nerva began in A.D. 96 and ended in A.D. 98. Here is a chain of authorities not a single link of which can be broken. Therefore, when all are taken together they prove to an *absolute certainty* that the New Testament was written at the time when it claims to have been written.

So much for the New Testament. Now for the Old.

(*Concluded next week.*)

May 9, 1882

"The Authenticity of the Scriptures. (Concluded.)" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 59, 19 , pp. 289, 290.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

(Concluded.)

It is a historical fact that *two hundred and eighty-two* years before Christ, the Old Testament was translated from Hebrew into Greek, at Alexandria in Egypt, and it there consisted of the same books that compose the Old Testament of to-day. "Whence it is evident that we still have them identical books which the most ancient Jews attested to be genuine."

We shall not take up separately each book of the Old Testament, as that would extend this article further than would be proper, but only some of the leading ones, and as the writings of the whole Old Testament are so intimately connected, if we establish a portion of it, we confirm the validity of the whole.

First we will notice the book of Daniel, and, as an introduction, offer a few lines from an editorial in the New York *Independent*:—

"A few years ago the critics with one voice refused to see anything in it [the book of Daniel] more than an apocalyptic composition of the date of Antiochus Epiphanes. Eichorn, Bertholdt, Gesenius, De Wette, Lengerke, Ewald, and Hitzig, with the more moderate as well as the rationalistic critics, agreed in its late date, some being so precise as to fix it at 167 B.C. 'There never was any Belshazzar,' they exclaimed, and we could bring nothing to corroborate our written record. The replies made to them were feeble and unsatisfactory. But the monuments of the kings of Babylon began to be read a few years ago."

The critics could assert with a great deal of assurance, that "there never was any Belshazzar," because Berosus and Herodotus, the only authorities of any value on the subject, both gave a list of Babylonian kings, in neither of which was any Belshazzar named. Therefore, as the historians failed to mention him, "there never was any such" king. But the Babylonian inscriptions make all plain, and *exactly* confirm the Bible account. They declare that Nabu-Nahid (Nabonidius) with an army took the field against Cyrus, and *left Belshazzar, his eldest son*, in command of the city. Nabu-Nabid, being defeated by Cyrus, was compelled to take refuge in Borsippa, and Cyrus went on against Babylon and Belshazzar, and the city was taken, with Belshazzar, as recorded in Daniel 5.

And this condition of affairs in Babylon is the only one that will agree with the record in Daniel; for Daniel was certainly made prime minister of the kingdom, the chain of gold being the insignia of that office. Yet for all his being prime minister, he is spoken of as the *third* ruler in the kingdom. Dan. 5:7, 16, 20. How can this be? Thus: Nabu-Nabid, the *first* ruler, Belshazzar his son, the *second* ruler, and Daniel, prime minister, yet the *third* ruler. And in no other possible way

can the records of Daniel be met; for his office was really the *second* in the kingdom. But how fully this illustrates the perfect accuracy of the Scriptures. Here is an important point in the history of Babylon, wholly passed over by the historians; yet Daniel records it exactly as it is, and after more than two thousand years the inscriptions of that king of Babylon declare that he is correct. This also fixes the date of the book of Daniel to the time that has been claimed for it, because there is no other time in the world's history when these points in Daniel could have been written. For shortly after, Babylon fell into decay, and these inscriptions were buried out of sight, and the historians made no mention of any of them; consequently they never could have been learned afterward; therefore they were learned in Babylon at the time when they transpired, and thus the claims of the book of Daniel are correctly placed, and absolutely fixed at the date 538 B.C. (For proofs as to Belshazzar, see Encyclopedia Britannica, ninth edition, article "Babylonia.") The list of instruments mentioned in Daniel 3:5, 7, 15, is another proof, for this "very list is true to the time of Daniel, and would never have been thought of three centuries later." In short, "every historical or social allusion in Daniel is borne out by the facts discovered."

The book of Ezekiel gives another instance of the exactness of the Bible writers, and of being true to the times in which it was written. In chap. 23:14, 15, we read: "For when she saw men portrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldeans *portrayed with vermilion, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea.*" Of this also we may say that it "is true to the time of Ezekiel in the captivity in Babylon; and would never have been thought of later, nor in any other country. In Egypt, in Assyria, in Persia, and in Greece, their art was displayed in sculpture. From the gems upon which the carving was so minute as to suggest the employment of a magnifying-glass, to the colossal bulls that guarded the palace of Nineveh from the entrance of evil spirits, all, all was sculpture. But in Babylonia it was far different. "While the Assyrians had stone in abundance, the Babylonians were obliged to import it from a distance. Brick-clay, on the contrary, lay ready at hand. Where the Assyrians employed sculptured alabaster to ornament their buildings, the Babylonians contented themselves with enameled bricks, and *painted plaster.* *Sculpture* was naturally developed by the one; just as *painting* was by the other; and ornamentation, which could be lavished on the *exterior* in Assyria, had to be confined to the *interior* in Babylon." (Compare Eze. 8:8-10 with the text quoted above.) "The few bas-reliefs of Babylon that exist are small and inferior in execution; but *brilliant coloring* and a lavish use of the metals, made up for this want. The walls were covered with the most costly materials, and '*images portrayed with vermilion*' excited the admiration of the stranger. The love of bright colors, in contrast with the sober hues of the Assyrian palaces, led also to the cultivation of gardens; and the hanging gardens of Babylon, raised upon tiers of arches, were one of the wonders of the world."

At no time in the world's history later than this, could such a thing as Ezekiel describes be said of the Babylonians. For only a little while afterward the kingdom of Babylon was overthrown by the Medes and Persians, who took possession of it, and these Babylonish peculiarities were lost to the world. But how plainly these words of Ezekiel bring before us the Babylon of his day, when

Nebuchadnezzar reigned, whose utmost endeavors were put forth in the building and decoration of his capital city, when all the skill of his splendid artists was employed in blending the brilliant colors that ornamented the walls of his pleasant palaces, and Babylon sat as mistress of the world in that pitch of pride and grandeur, "the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." And by all this we know of a surety that the book of Ezekiel is correctly placed at B.C. 604-561. (Enc. Brit., art. Babylonia.)

Now we turn to the books of Kings and Isaiah. In Isaiah 36:1 and 2 Kings 18:13, we read: "Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah did Sennacherib king of Assyria come up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them." This is placed in our Bibles at the date 713 B.C., which does not *exactly* correspond with the

290

Assyrian inscriptions, but is only twelve years out of the way, being that much too early. The native monuments state that Sennacherib ascended the throne the 12th of Ab (part of July and August), 705 B.C., and place his invasion of Judah in 701 B.C. Again, in Isaiah 57:37, 38 and 2 Kings 19:36, 37, it is said: "So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. And it came to pass, as he was worshiping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezar his sons smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia. And Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead." The inscriptions declare that Sennacherib was "building a palace for himself at Nineveh on a grander scale than had ever been attempted before. His works were interrupted by his murder, in 681, by his two sons, who, however, soon found themselves confronted by the veteran army of Esarhaddon, their father's youngest and favorite son, who, in January, 680, defeated them at Khanirabbat, and was proclaimed king."—*Enc. Brit., art. Babylonia.*

Here, then, is the confirmation of every point in these scriptures, and in this single instance the slight difference in the dates will bear nothing against the truthfulness of the narrative, nor against the general correctness of the time in which the books were written. Indeed, the Scripture narrative would seem to demand more time than is there given for these occurrences. The invasion, return, and murder of Sennacherib are all placed by the dates, within 710-9 B.C., which is hardly time enough, especially as it is said that he "returned and dwelt at Nineveh; and this short period would hardly justify the statement that he dwelt at Nineveh. But the native monuments remove all difficulty, by showing that he did actually dwell at Nineveh after his return, being employed in building a palace in honor of his god. In this, therefore, is proof that Isaiah and this part of Kings were written as far back as the former half of the seventh century B.C.

The next point in the book of Second Kings is on the invasion of Samaria by Shalmaneser (chap. 18:9, 10): "Shalmaneser king of Assyria came up against Samaria, and besieged it. and at the end of three years they took it; even in the sixth year of Hezekiah, that is the ninth year of Hoshea king of Israel, Samaria was taken." The Bible chronology places this event "*about* 723 B.C." And the tablet of Shalmaneser, from the ruins of Nineveh, assert that his reign was B.C. 727-722, and that the "chief event of his reign was the campaign against

Samaria. The capture of that city, however, was reserved for his successor, Sargon, in 720." This corresponds with the Scripture date exactly, as the attack was made about 723, and the siege continued three years, which gives the very date of the tablets of Shalmaneser.

Besides extending this article to an immoderate length, it would be a too tedious task to give in full all the accounts confirming the Scripture record; therefore we shall mention the names, and give references to the passages of Scripture with which they correspond. The inscriptions declare that, in 710 B.C., Sargon, king of Assyria, overran Judea, and razed Ashdod to the ground (Isa. 20:1); that a year after the Judean war by Sennacherib, Merodach-Baladan was in command at Babylon (Isa. 39:1); 2 Kings 20:12); that in 740 B.C., Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, overthrew the ancient kingdom of Damascus (2 Kings 16:9), and in his "inscriptions Ahaz of Judah appears among the names of those who acknowledged his sovereignty and paid tribute" (2 Kings 16:7-18; *Enc. Brit., art. Ahaz*); that in 730 B.C. he placed his vassal Hoshea on the throne of Samaria in the room of Pekah (2 Kings 15:30; 17:1); that Ben-hadad reigned in Damascus, while Ahab reigned in Israel, and that Hazael succeeded Ben-hadad (2 Kings 8:7-15).

No less accurate and circumstantial is the testimony of the "Moabite Stone," discovered in August, 1808, and now familiar to many, which reads as follows:—

"I am Mesha, king of Moab [2 Kings 3:4]; the Dibonite, my father, reigned over Moab thirty years, and I reigned after my father. Omri was king of Israel [1 Kings 16:16]; and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh [1 Kings 11:7; Jer. 48:7, 13, 46] was angry with his land, and his son succeeded him [1 Kings 16:28]; and he also said, I will afflict Moab. In my days he spake thus: And I looked on him and on his house. [2 Kings 1:1; 4:4, 5.] And Israel kept constantly perishing. And Omri held possession of the land of Medeba, and there dwelt in it Omri and his son and his grandson, forty years. [1 Kings 16:23, 29; 2 Kings 3:1.] But Chemosh restored it in my days. And the king of Israel built for him Kiriathaim, and I fought against the city and took it [Jer. 48:1, 23], and brought back from thence the altar of Jehovah, and put it before Chemosh in Kerioth. [Jer. 48:24.] And Chemosh said to me, 'Go and take Nebo from Israel.' [Jer. 48:1; Isa. 15:2.] And I went in the night, and fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon, and took it, and I utterly destroyed it, and I slew all of it, seven thousand, for to Ashtor-Chemosh had I devoted them. And I took from thence the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. And the king of Israel built Jahaz, and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me, and Chemosh drove him from before me; and I took from Moab two hundred men all told, and I attacked Jahaz and took it. [Isa. 15:4; Jer. 48:21], joining it to Dibon. [Isa. 15:2; Jer. 48:18.] Chemosh said to me, 'Go fight against Horonaim.'" (Isa. 15:5; Jer. 48:5, 34.)

Here, then, are the facts, strictly in accordance with the Scripture account of Omri, his son Ahab, and his grandson Jehoram; and of Mesha, king of Moab, and his father's servitude, and his own rebellion. And the references to Isaiah and Jeremiah, which I have given, show that the very cities named by Mesha as taken by him and belonging to him, belonged to Moab in their days. Now it is

utterly inconceivable how these statements of the Scripture could have been gathered from any other source than the actual events themselves. For there is absolutely no history of the Moabites, from which they could have been taken in later times. Therefore the perfect agreement between the occurrences as recorded in the Bible, and as recorded by Mesha, king of Moab, upon the enduring stone, proves, to a demonstration, that the records are contemporaneous. This, then, carries us back 929 years B.C., as the date of this portion of the Sacred Word. However, we are not obliged to stop at this date for want of proofs of any earlier, for the decipherment of the inscriptions on the Egyptian monuments and tombs fully corroborates the record in the Pentateuch concerning Joseph and the exodus; so much so, in fact, that it is now considered as a most valuable auxiliary to the full understanding of the Egyptian history, and "Brugsch and Lepsius and Chabas and Mariette treat the Pentateuch as of prime historical importance."

We shall add no more. These evidences, wholly external, prove beyond any possibility of reasonable doubt, that the Scriptures are authentic records of the things of which they treat, and all the researches in archeology only serve to heap evidence upon evidence of their absolute truthfulness.

Then hail! Book of books,—the Bible! Thou dost contain the most ancient history, the most sublime poetry, the grandest truths, the noblest examples, the best comfort of our imperfect condition, the most blessed gift in the knowledge of human kind! Let me bind thee as a crown unto me. Be thou ever "the lamp unto my feet, and the light unto my path" along all the way through the darkness of this world of sin. Hail! all hail! the precious Saviour whom thou revealest, the subject of thy sublimest poetry, the fountain of thy grandest truths, the sum of thy noblest examples, the object of our hope, the Author and finisher of our faith, the glorious King of kings!

Hail, Son of God, Saviour of men; let thy name
Be the copious matter of my song
Henceforth, and never let my heart thy praise
Forget, nor from thy Father's praise disjoin.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. 60 (1883)

February 13, 1883

**"Another View of the Papacy" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 60,
7 , p. 102.**

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

IT seems that from any and every point of observation that we may choose, the papacy appears to the worst advantage of any power on the earth. In studying the list of popes, I was struck with the shortness of the reign of a large number of them, and was thus led to draw a comparison between the *average*

length of the reigns of the popes, and that of other rulers of the world. The following table shows the result:—

	Dates.	Duration of kingdom.	No. of rulers.	Average reign.		
				yr.	mo.	da.
B.C.	975-599 Judah	376 years	20	18	9	18
"	975-720 Israel	255 "	19	13	5	1
"	747-538 Babylon	209 "	18	11	7	10
"	538-330 Medo-Persia	209 "	14	14	10	8
"	795-168 Macedonia	627 "	35	17	11	2
"	304-30 Later-Egypt	274 "	15	18	31	5
"	312-65 Syria	247 "	20	12	4	6
"	48-A.D. 364 Rome	411 ^o "	49	8	4	21
A.D.	364-476 Western Empire	111 ^o "	15	7	6	
"	364-1453 Eastern "	1089 "	84	12	11	17
"	428-1793 France	1365 "	84	16	3	
"	411-1868 Spain	1457 "	106	13	8	28
"	404-1603 Scotland	1199 "	71	16	10	14
"	632-1258 Caliphs	626 "	55	11	4	17
"	800-1804 Germany	1000 ²¹ "	59	16	11	11
"	827-1881 England	1055 "	61	17	3	16
"	862-1881 Russia	1017 ³² "	65	15	7	22
"	842-1795 Poland	950 ⁴³ "	48	19	9	15
"	1299-1881 Turkey	583 "	36	16	2	9
"	1093-1881 Portugal	788 "	36	21	10	19
"	1015-1881 Sweden	867 "	53	16	4	9
"	803-1881 Denmark	1060 ⁵⁴ "	52	20	4	18
"	1134-1881 Prussia	744 ⁶⁵ "	37	20	1	9
"	1627-1881 China	254 "	9	28	2	20
"	66-1881 Papacy	1796 ^o "	272	6	7	16

Thus it may be readily seen that the average length of the reigns of the popes is within *forty-six days* of a *whole year* shorter than that of any other succession of rulers from Babylon to this day. And it is a significant fact, that the next shortest is in the *Western Empire*, and still the next shortest is in the Roman Empire before it was divided; which all goes to show that the state of affairs was *much worse* under the popes, than during the Empire either before or after its division.

But an objection might be raised against this count of the line of the popes, to the effect that it is not exactly fair, because it embraces the era of martyrdom, during which time many of the bishops of Rome were put to death in the persecutions suffered by the Christians. It is true that many of the early bishops suffered martyrdom. Therefore we will admit the justice of the claim, and will begin at the *close* of the era of martyrdom, when Constantine gave peace (?) to the church, and count to the Reformation. From Sylvester to the death of Leo X., or from A.D. 314- to 1522, a period of 1195⁷⁶ years, there were 202 popes, whose average reign was 5 yrs., 10 mo. 29 da. This reveals the fact that the

state of affairs was actually worse than appears in the preceding calculation; enough worse, indeed, to *reduce the average* a period of *eight months and seventeen days*.

Without going into particulars, which would extend this article to an undue length, we will simply add a few leading facts:—

Two of the popes reigned less than a day.

Six of them reigned less than a month.

Twenty-five of them reigned less than a year.

Eight of them were murdered.

Four of them died in prison.

Six of them were deposed. ⁸⁷

This by no means completes the list, but is enough to show somewhat of the character of these popes and their times. With a slight change, the words which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of King Richard II., would be literally true of these:—

"And tell sad stories of the death of *popes*:—

How some have been deposed,

Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed;

Some poisoned, some sleeping killed;

For within the hollow crown,

That rounds the mortal temples of a *pope*,

Keeps death his court; and there the antic sits,

Scoffing his state, and grinning at his pomp;

Allowing him a breath, a little scene

To monarchize, be feared, and kill with looks;

Infusing him with self and vain conceit,—

As if this flesh, which walls about our life,

Were brass impregnable, and, humored thus,

Comes at the last, and with a little pin

Bores through his castle wall, and—farewell *pope*."

As in Christ is embodied and manifested the "mystery of godliness" (1 Tim. 3:16), so on the other hand, in antichrist is embodied and manifested the "mystery of iniquity." 2 Thess. 2:7. As in Christ, from whatever point we view him, we behold only godliness; so in the papal system, from whatever point we view it, we behold only iniquity, more than in any other system the world has seen. Whether it be viewed in its representative popes, such as Innocent III., crushing out heresy with fire and sword, deposing kings, trampling upon nations, filling Europe with bloodshed and woe; or Gregory VII., infamous Hildebrand, asserting absolute control over emperors, princes, priests, and people; or whether it be viewed as a *system*, infusing mankind with its baleful influence till it is reduced to the condition revealed by its place in the foregoing table, it presents itself as the worst of all things earthly. Worse than the "unspeakable Turk," worse than the Eastern Empire of Rome when for five hundred years "the sepulcher was ever beside the throne," worse than old Rome itself when the purple was never clear of blood. It fully justifies every title bestowed upon it in the Scriptures; and by the view here given, is especially illustrated and justified the comparison given in

Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, between Pagan and Papal Rome, where Pagan Rome is designated as the "*daily desolation*," while the Papacy is the "ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION."

The authorities I have consulted in compiling the foregoing table, are as follows:—

Rollin's Ancient History, Prideaux's Connection, Gibbon's Decline and Fall, Lyman's Historical Chart, Harper's Hayden's Dictionary of Dates, Encyclopedia Britannica, ninth edition, Lawrence's Historical Studies.

August 7, 1883

"The Uncertainty of Geological Science" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 60, 32 , pp. 497, 498.

BY ELD. D. [A. sic.] T. JONES

ARCHIBALD GEIKIE, LL. D., F.R.S., Professor of Geology, University of Edinburgh, spoken of by the New York *Independent* as "an author who is surpassed by none of his compeers in scientific attainment, and hardly equaled by any of them for his gifts in the imparting of knowledge," has lately issued a "Text Book of Geology;" and he is also the author of the treatise on geology in the latest edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica; therefore we shall doubtless be justified in accepting his work as the latest, the ablest, and the best contribution in favor of geological science as it is at the present day. And after reading and studying it through three times, the impression left upon my mind by it was that expressed by the title which I have placed at the head of this article.

Geology is defined as "the science which investigates the history of the earth." "Its object," as stated, "is to trace the progress of our planet from the earliest beginning of its separate existence, through its various stages of growth, down to the present condition of things." "It seeks to determine the manner in which the evolution of the earth's great surface features has been effected."

But it is only by a proper understanding of the *present* order of things, that the *past* can be made out. He says: "Only in proportion as we understand the present, where everything is open on all sides to the fullest investigation, can we expect to decipher the past, where so much is obscure, imperfectly preserved, or not preserved at all. A study of the existing economy of nature ought thus to be *the foundation* of the geologist's training."

So, then, here we have properly, at the very beginning, laid down the foundation of geological deduction. And we may, properly enough, inquire, is this foundation secure, is it a foundation upon which we can finally stand and safely build? Let Mr. Geikie answer. In the very next paragraph he says:—

"While, however, the present condition of things is thus employed, we must obviously be *on our guard* against *the danger* of unconsciously *assuming* that the phase of nature's operations which we now witness has been the same in all past time, that

geological changes have taken place in former ages in the manner and on the scale which we behold to-day, and that at the present time all the great geological processes, which have produced changes in the past eras of the earth's history, are still extant and active. Of course we may *assume* this uniformity of action, and use the *assumption* as a *working hypothesis*. But it ought not to be allowed any firmer footing, nor on *any account* be suffered to blind us to the *obvious truth* that the few centuries where in man has been observing nature, form much too brief an interval by which to measure the intensity of geological action in all past time. For aught we can tell, the present is an era of *quietude* and *slow change*, compared with some of the eras which have preceded it. *nor can we be sure* that, when we have explored *every* geological process now in progress, we have exhausted *all the causes* of change which even in comparatively recent times have been at work." And in another place (No. I, under the Age of the Earth) he says plainly that this assumption "may be *entirely erroneous*."

According to this, "the foundation of a geologist's training" is an "assumption;" and this assumption must not be allowed a "firm footing" because it may "blind us to an *obvious truth*," and because it also may be "*entirely erroneous*."

And here, after laying *a*-yes, *the*-foundation, he has certainly destroyed it, and we might exclaim, not exactly with the psalmist, "if the foundations be destroyed, what shall the "geologists "do"? If, therefore, the foundation be assumption, the superstructure can be nothing more, and this also is just as plainly stated as is the foregoing, as follows:-

"In dealing with the Geological Record, as the accessible solid part of the globe is called, we cannot too vividly realize that at the best it forms but an *imperfect chronicle*. Geological history cannot be compiled from a full and continuous series of documents. From the very nature of its origin, the record is necessarily fragmentary, and it has been further mutilated and obscured by the revolutions of successive ages." "Enormous gaps occur where *no record* has been preserved *at all*. It is as if *whole chapters and books were missing* from an historical work."-See Part V., *Gaps in the Geological Record*; also in the Introduction.

Geology reveals no beginning:-

"It is still true that in the data with which they are accustomed to deal, as comprising the *sum* of geological evidence, there can be found *no trace of a beginning*. The oldest rocks which have been discovered on any part of the globe have probably been derived from other rocks older than themselves. Geology, by itself, has not yet revealed, and is little likely ever to reveal, *a trace* of the first solid crust of our globe. If, then, geological history is to be compiled from direct evidence furnished by the rocks of the earth, it *cannot begin at the beginning* of things, but must be content to date its first chapter from the earliest period of which any record has been preserved among the rocks."-Part I., *Cosmical Aspects*. If, then, it begins at an uncertain place, and follows an uncertain course,

and sometimes no course at all, how can the ending be anything else but uncertain?

In Part II., Geognosy, he discusses the *Age of the Earth, and Measures of Geological Time*, from which we extract the following. He says that the age of the earth may be attacked from either the geological or the physical side. First the geological:—

"The geological argument rests chiefly upon the observed rates at which geological changes are being effected at the present time, and is open to the obvious preliminary objection that it *assumes* the existing rate of change as the measure of past revolutions,—an *assumption* which may be *entirely erroneous*, for the present may be a period when all geological events march forward more slowly than they used to do." "*If we assume* that the land has been worn away, and that stratified deposits have been laid down *nearly* at the *same rate* as at *present*, when we must admit that the stratified portion of the crust of the earth must represent a *very vast* period of time. Dr. Crall puts this period at not less, but much more, than sixty million years." "On any supposition, it must be admitted that these vicissitudes in the organic world can only have been effected with the lapse of vast periods of time, though no *reliable* standard seems to be available whereby these periods are to be measured. The argument from geological evidence is strongly in favor of an interval of probably not less than one hundred million years since the earliest form of life appeared upon the earth, and the oldest stratified rocks began to be laid down."

Yes, no doubt, "if we assume" that such an such is the case, "probably" the balance will follow. But why are we called upon to "assume" an "erroneous assumption" only for the purpose of reaching an indefinite conclusion? This "argument from geological evidence," is like the famous essay on "Snakes in Ireland;" viz., "There are no snakes in Ireland." So, likewise, there is no geological evidence, and he says so. Why may we not just as rightfully assume that these changes and revolutions have been wrought in short periods, or even *suddenly*, as many of them have certainly been made violently?

498

And the argument from physics is just about as inconclusive as that from "geological evidence." He says:—

1. "Sir William Thompson, applying Fourier's theory* of thermal conductivity, pointed out some years ago (1862) that in the known rate of increase of temperature downward and beneath the surface, and the rate of loss of heat from the earth, we have a limit to the antiquity of the planet. He showed, from the data available at the time, that the superficial consolidation of the globe could not have occurred less than twenty million years ago. . . . nor more than four hundred million years ago; . . . he inclines rather toward the lower than the higher antiquity, but concludes that the limit, from a

consideration of all the evidence, must be placed within some such period of past time as one hundred million of years.

2. "The argument from tidal retardation proceeds on the admitted fact that, owing to the friction of the tide-wave, the rotation of the earth is retarded, and is therefore much slower now than it *must have been* at one time. Sir William Thompson contends that had the globe become solid ten thousand million years ago, or indeed any high antiquity above one hundred million years, the centrifugal force due to the more rapid rotation *must have* given the planet a very much greater polar flattening than it actually possesses. He *admits*, however, that, though one hundred million years ago that force *must have been* about three per cent greater than now, yet '*nothing we know* regarding the figure of the earth and the disposition of land and water would justify us in saying that a body consolidated when there was more centrifugal force by three per cent than now, might not now be *in all respects like the earth*, so far as we know it at present.'" Thus, first, he contends that if the earth had become solid one hundred million years ago, it would have been much flatter at the poles than it is, yet is willing to admit that had it become solid then, we do not know but that it would have been now just as it is. Then if the result is the same in either case, where is the use of going back one hundred million years, or ten thousand million years for the start? And so "Professor Tait concludes that this argument, taken in connection with the previous one, probably reduces the possible period which can be allowed to geologists to something *less than ten millions* of years." "What a falling off is there, my countrymen!!" From ten *thousand* million to simply *ten* million! May we hope from this that they will finally reach the reasonable limit? But, Mr. Geikie has not yet exhausted his "argument" on the age of the earth; he presents his *third* from physics, thus:—

3. "The third argument, based upon the *age of the sun's heat*, is confessedly *less reliable* than the *two previous* ones." But the "two previous ones" themselves are confessedly unreliable and if the third be admitted as "confessedly *less reliable*" than they, how much reliability has geological science for the age of the earth?

The secret, however, of the whole matter is exposed in his last remark on this subject; viz., "One hundred million years is probably amply sufficient for all the requirements of geology." Yes, the geological ship has been launched upon the sea of speculation, and nothing less than one hundred million years will give her searoom.

(*To be continued.*)

August 14, 1883

"The Uncertainty of Geological Science. (*Continued.*)" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 60, 33 , pp. 513, 514.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

(*Continued.*)

NEXT in order, we come to Part IV., Structural Geology—Order of Superposition—*The Foundation of Geological Chronology*: "As sedimentary strata are laid down upon one another in a more or less nearly horizontal position, the underlying beds must be older than those which cover them. This simple and obvious truth is termed *the law of superposition*." Again, Part V., under "*Use of Fossils*": "The true order of superposition is decisive of the relative ages of stratified rocks." "For geological purposes therefore, and indeed for all purposes of comparison between the different faunas and floras of different periods, it is absolutely essential, first of all, to have the order of superposition of strata rigorously determined. Unless this is done, the most fatal mistakes may be made in Paleontological chronology." And yet again, Part VI., No. 1: "In every stratigraphical research the fundamental requisite is to establish the order of superposition of the strata. Until this is accomplished, it is *impossible* to arrange the dates and make out the sequence of geological history."

This would be all plain and easy enough, if the rocks always and everywhere were lying in their true and original position. But in some places "the rocks composing huge mountain masses have been so completely overturned that the highest beds appear as if *regularly* covered by others which ought properly to underlie them." And in such instances he says the "apparent superposition may be deceptive." How, then, are we to guard against deception? If huge mountain masses are lying in a directly inverted position to that of the valleys or the plains, how can we tell which one is "upside down"? Just here the geologist's *summum bonum*, the *fossil*, comes in thus:—

"It is by their characteristic fossils that the *divisions* of the stratified rocks can be *most satisfactorily made*. Each formation being distinguished by its own assemblage of organic remains, it can be followed and recognized even amid the crumplings and dislocations of a disturbed region." And again: "But it is *mainly* by the remains of plants and animals imbedded in the rocks that the geologist is guided in unraveling the *chronological succession* of geological changes." And further, one of the uses of fossils is plainly stated to be, "to furnish a guide in geological chronology whereby *rocks* may be classified *according to relative date*, and the facts of geological history may be arranged and interpreted as a connected record of the earth's progress." From these statements it plainly appears that it is by the *evidence of fossils* that the "order of succession," or "superposition," or "relative age of strata" is made out. Yet under "*Relative Age of Fossils*," is this equally plain statement: "The *chronological sequence* of fossils, must be determined *first of all* by the order of superposition of their enclosing strata," because "*there is nothing in the fossils themselves*, apart from experience, *to fix their date*."

Now here are two statements that we wish to place side by side, that it may be seen what they really say. And what they do say, although it may appear surprising, can be sustained by a greater number of quotations than are here already given.

"It is mainly by the *remains* of plants and animals [fossils] *imbedded in the rocks* that the geologist is guided in unravelling the *chronological succession* of geological changes."

"The *chronological sequence* [succession] of fossils [remains] must be determined first of all by the *order of superposition* [chronological succession] of their enclosing strata."

One of these says that the *relative age of the rocks* is determined *by the fossils*. The other says that the *relative age of the fossils* is determined *by the rocks*.

What is this but reasoning in a circle? Thus, the geologists say to us, for instance, "Here is a strata of rock that was deposited fifty millions of years ago." But we ask, "How do you prove that?" They reply, "We prove it by the fact that in it are imbedded organic remains of the earliest forms of life that appeared on this planet." But again we ask, "How do you prove that to be 'the earliest form of life'?" the reply is, "We prove that by the simple fact of their being imbedded in that particular strata of rock." Yes, certainly, prove each by the other, and they will then both be true. All this may be *geological*, but it assuredly is not *logical*, nor is it according to established rules of evidence.

And now, to show that I have not pressed any of these statements into service to make a point, I would beg leave to continue this line a little further.

Under Part IV., "*Relative Lapse of Time Represented by Strata and by the Intervals Between Them*:" "As a rule, we should infer that the time represented by a given thickness of similar strata was less than that shown by the same thickness of dissimilar strata, because the changes needed to bring new varieties of sediment into the area of deposit would usually require the lapse of some time for their completion. But this conclusion might often be erroneous." "But in all speculations of this kind we must bear in mind that the length of time represented by a given depth of strata is not to be estimated merely from their thickness or lithological characters. The interval needed for the transition from one stratum, or kind of strata to another may often have been more than equal to the time required for the formation of the strata on either side. But the relative chronological importance of the bars or lines in the geological record can seldom be *satisfactorily* discussed merely on lithological grounds; this must mainly be decided on the evidence of organic remains [fossils]. By *this kind of evidence* it can be made nearly certain that the intervals represented by strata were in many cases much shorter than those not so represented; in other words, that the *time* during which *no deposit* of sediment *went on* was *longer* than that wherein *deposit did take place*."

Again, Part VI., No. 5: "The relative chronological value of the divisions of the geological record is not to be measured by mere depth of strata. Of "two sets of rocks, the total depth of both groups together may be, say one thousand feet. Elsewhere, we may find a single unbroken formation reaching a depth of ten thousand feet;

but it would be *utterly erroneous* to conclude that the latter represented ten times the length of time shown by the two former." "Fossil evidence furnishes the chief means of comparing the relative value of formations and groups of rock. A break in the succession of organic remains marks an interval of time often *unrepresented by strata* at the place where the break is found. The relative importance of these breaks, and therefore, probably, the comparative intervals of time which they mark, may be estimated by the difference of the *facies* of the *fossils on each side*."

Further, Part V., under "*Doctrine of Colonies*:" "While the mere fact that one series of rocks lies unconformably on another proves the lapse of a considerable interval between their respective dates, the relative length of this interval may sometimes be demonstrated by means of *fossil evidence*, and *by this alone*. *But fossil evidence may be made to prove the existence of gaps which are not otherwise apparent*." "A few species may pass from one into the other, or perhaps every species may be different. In cases of this kind, when proved to be not merely local but persistent over wide areas, we must admit, notwithstanding the apparently *undisturbed* and

514

continuous character of the original deposition of the strata, that the abrupt transition from one *facies* of fossils to the other *must represent* a long interval of time *which has not been recorded by the deposit of strata*."

And so we are brought by this line of quotations again around the geological circle, thus:—

"The first and fundamental point is to determine *accurately the order of superposition* [sucessation] *of the strata*. Until this is done, detailed *paleontological* [fossil] *classification may prove to be worthless*."—Part V. under *Subdivisions by Modus of Fossils*.

"When *the order of succession of organic remains* [fossils] among the stratified rocks *has been determined*, they become an *invaluable guide* in the investigation of the *relative age of rocks* and the structure of the land. And the *true succession* [superposition] *of strata may thus be sufficiently established*."—Part VI., No. 4.

And also this last quotation may be placed over against these: "The true order of superposition is decisive of the relative ages of stratified rocks." "The chronological sequence of fossils must be determined first of all by the order of superposition of their enclosing strata."

And thus the second time, after laying the Foundation of Geological Chronology, he has destroyed it. but this is Geological Science. Yet we cannot help wondering whether it does not come within the scope of Paul's words in 1 Timothy 6:20.

(*Concluded next week.*)

August 21, 1883

"The Uncertainty of Geological Science. (Continued.)" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 60, 34 , pp. 529, 530.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

(Continued.)

AS the Science of Fossils "is looked upon as a branch of geology, seeing that its assistance is *absolutely indispensable* in many of the most familiar and fundamental problems of the latter science," we might spend a few minutes in an inquiry as to the real inherent value of fossils themselves.

One quotation, already made, may properly be repeated as the head of this division,—Part V., under *Age of Fossils*: "There is nothing in the fossils themselves, apart from experience, to fix their date." And again, No. 2, under *Use of Fossils*: "Consider, for a moment, what would happen were the present surface of any portion of Central or Southern Europe submerged beneath the sea, covered by marine deposits, and then re-elevated into land. The river-terraces and lacustrine marls formed before the time of Julius Cesar could not be distinguished by any fossil tests from those laid down in the days of Victoria. . . . So far as regards the shells, bones, and plants preserved in the various formations, it would be *absolutely impossible* to discriminate their relative dates; . . . yet there might be a difference of two thousand years *or more* between many of them. They would be classed as geologically contemporaneous, but the phrase is too vague to have any chronological value except in a relative sense. *Strict contemporaneity cannot be asserted* of any strata merely *on the ground of similarity, or identity of fossils*. . . . Similarity or identity of fossils among formations geographically far apart, instead of proving contemporaneity, ought rather to be looked upon as indicative of *great discrepancies in the relative epochs of deposit*. . . . When, however, the formations of distant countries are compared, all that we can safely affirm regarding them is that those containing the same or a representative assemblage of organic remains belong to the same epoch in the history of biological progress in each area; but we cannot assert that they are *contemporaneous unless* we are prepared to include within that term a *vague period* of perhaps *thousands* of years."

These extracts show a considerable degree of uncertainty about fossil sciences, but the uncertainty is made absolute by the following relation of the discoveries of M. Barrande, a distinguished author of a geological treatise. He "drew attention more than a quarter of century ago to certain remarkable intercalations of fossils in the series of Silurian strata of Bohemia. He showed that, while these strata presented a *normal succession* of organic remains, there were nevertheless *exceptional bands*, which, containing the fossils of a *higher zone*, were yet included on different horizons among inferior portions of the series. He termed these *precursory bands* 'Colonies,' and defined the

phenomena as consisting in the partial co-existence of two general faunas, which, considered as a whole, were nevertheless successive. . . . This original and ingenious doctrine has met with much opposition on the part of *geologists* and *paleontologists*. Of the *facts* cited by M. Barrande, there has been *no question*, but other explanations have been suggested for them. . . . Much of the opposition which his views have encountered has probably arisen from the feeling that *if they* are admitted, they must *weaken* the value of *paleontological evidence* in defining geological horizons. A paleontologist, who has been accustomed to deal with certain fossils as *unfailing* indications of particular portions of the geological series, is *naturally unwilling* to see his *generalizations upset* by an attempt to show that the fossils may occur on a *far earlier* horizon."

I think that I cannot close this sketch of fossil evidence any better than by giving a part of Professor Geikie's closing words on this subject:

"As fossil evidence furnishes a much more satisfactory and widely applicable means of subdividing the stratified rocks of the earth's crust than mere lithological characters, it is made the basis of the geological classification of these rocks. Thus we may find a particular stratum marked by the occurrence in it of various fossils, one or more of which may be distinctive, either from occurring in no other bed above or below, or from special abundance in that stratum. These species might therefore be used as a guide to the occurrence of the bed in question, which might be called by the name of the most abundant species. . . . But before such a generalization can be safely made, we *must be sure* that the species in question *really never does* appear on any other platform. [But by Barrande's facts they cannot be sure of this till they have explored the whole earth.] This evidently demands wide experience over an extended field of observation. The assertion that a particular species occurs *only on one* horizon manifestly rests on *negative* evidence as much as on positive. The paleontologist who makes it cannot mean more than that he knows the fossil to lie on that horizon, and that, so far as *his experience* and that of others goes, it has never been met with anywhere else. But a *single example* of the occurrence of the fossil on a different zone would *greatly damage* the value of his generalization, and a *few* such cases would *demolish it* altogether. [And that is just what Barrande's "doctrine of Colonies" does, and his facts show that there are even more than "a few such cases," and that explains the "opposition" referred to,—they did not want their theory "demolished."] Hence all such statements ought at first to be made tentatively. To establish a geological horizon on limited fossil evidence, and then to *assume* the *identity* of all strata containing the same fossils, is to *reason in a circle* and introduce utter confusion into our interpretation of the geological record."

If, now, it be true, as the Professor states in his introduction to the subject of fossil science, that without some knowledge of this, "progress in modern geology would be impossible;" according to the *real knowledge* of fossil evidence displayed in these quotations, how much of the progress of modern geology is reliable?

After showing so forcibly as he has, the utter unreliability of fossil evidence in the succession of strata, he proceeds to the discussion of the succession of

strata, and shows that it is by such evidence that that is fixed. Of the Upper Silurian group he says:—

"The formations which in the British Islands are classed as Upper Silurian, occur in two very distinct types. So great, indeed, is the contrast between these types that it is *only* by a comparison of *organic remains* that the whole can be grouped together as the deposits of one great geological period."

Again, under the "Cambrian," he says:—

"Murchison worked out the stratigraphical order of succession from above, and chiefly by the help of organic remains. He advanced from where the superposition of the rocks is clear and undoubted, and for the first time in the history of geology ascertained that the transition-rocks of the older geologists could be *arranged into zones* by means of *characteristic fossils* [the very thing which he has just shown is unreliable] as satisfactorily as the secondary formations had been classified in a *similar manner* by William Smith. *Year by year* as he found his Silurian *types of life* (fossils) *descend farther and farther* into lower deposits, *he pushed backward* the limits of his Silurian system."

Of the Old Red Sandstone, he says:—

"It is important to observe that in no district can these three subdivisions be found together, and that the so-called middle formation occurs *only in one* region—the north of Scotland. The classification, therefore, does not rest upon any *actually ascertained* stratigraphical sequence,

530

but on an *inference* from the *organic remains*" (fossils). And he says, "This view *has been accepted everywhere* by geologists." Until recently, Professor Geikie alone has called in question "the existence of any *middle* division."

The Old Red Sandstone, otherwise called Devonian, is an established group in geology, and has been accepted everywhere by geologists, and consequently forms an important, integral part of the whole system of geology, and yet it confessedly rests *only* upon an "*inference*" *from fossils*, while the Professor has previously abundantly shown that no reliable, "positive" inference can be drawn from fossils, and that the order in time of fossils themselves *must be established "first of all"* by the order in position of the stratified rocks.

This, as well as each of the other divisions of this subjects which I have sketched, might be easily extended to twice its present length, but as I did not intend in the beginning to write a treatise, but simply a sketch, I do not wish to extend it to an immoderate length. However, this is sufficient to demonstrate from the ablest geological treatise itself, that in no single instance does the science proceed upon any certain data. And even this is plainly stated by Professor Geikie: "From all these facts it is *clear* that the geological record, as it now exists, is *at the best* but an *imperfect* chronicle of geological history. *In no country* is it complete. The lacun of one region must be supplied from another. Yet *in proportion to the geographical distance* between the localities where the *gaps occur* and *those whence the missing intervals are supplied*, the *element* of

uncertainty in our reading of the record *is increased*."—See closing portion of *Gaps in the Geological Record*, in Part V.

The one essential element that is lacking in all these productions on geology is *demonstration*. Assumption upon assumption, and inference upon inference, are proposed upon confessedly uncertain data, and from that, then *speculation*, to an unlimited degree, is indulged in, and all this is offered to us in the name of science! But we would respectfully enter a demurrer, and ask, Geological gentlemen, give us *demonstration*, instead of speculation, and then every point so established we will gladly accept.

But again: *Geology is not susceptible of demonstration*. Astronomy is. Therefore there is no speculation upon the course of the planets and stars, and the times of their revolution. When in 1845 and 1846 Adams in England, and Leverier in France, virtually weighed the solar system, and found that another planet was required to give the true balance, and then each in his place made his calculations upon paper, as to when the then unknown planet should be, and each from his place wrote to an astronomer telling him to direct his telescope to a certain point in the heavens, and find the required planet, and he did so, and found it, *that was science*. When, from the fall of an apple, Newton reached the law that governs every particle of matter in the universe, *that was science*. Let geology give us some such instances as these, and we will believe all that is proved by them.

We have said that geology is not susceptible of *demonstration*, and for proof of this, quote Heb. 11:3: "Through *faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear;" also verse 1, "Faith is the evidence of things *not seen*." If the formation, the growth, and the structure of the earth, can be *shown* by geology, if it can be demonstrated, so that it may be a *matter of knowledge*, just then it will be removed from the field of faith. As faith is the evidence of things *not seen*, just so soon as geologists can cause us to see *how* the worlds were framed, just that soon there is no longer any faith about it. But the God of the universe has placed "the framing of the worlds by his word" at the very head of the list of faith, and we doubt, exceedingly, whether it shall ever be removed from that chief place, before the dawn of that glorious day when Faith itself shall be utterly lost in Sight. But—

"When that illustrious day shall rise," and we shall dwell amidst and above those worlds of light, and shall see the face of Him who sits upon the throne, and "know even as we are known," and "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," *then*, we hope to *fully know* the awful sublimity of the Almighty Fiat.

As for the present state of geological science, the only *certain* thing about it, is its *uncertainty*. And *therefore* it is the *fitting foundation* of *Evolution*. Darwin says: "The *high antiquity* of man, . . . is the *indispensable* basis for understanding his origin."—*Descent of Man, Vol. 1, page 3. Appleton's edition of 1871.* thus the two go hand in hand to destroy faith in the word of God, and well may Christ exclaim, "When the Son of man cometh, SHALL HE FIND FAITH ON THE EARTH?"

August 28, 1883

"Is Evolution Science?" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 60, 35 , p. 547.

BY ELD. ALONZO T. JONES

IN the *Independent* of May 27, 1880, appeared an article by President Gregory, of Lake Forest University, Ill., on the question, "Is Evolution Science?" in which occurred the following quotation, and comment:—

"Take, as illustration of the quality of the so-called science, the well-known passage from Mr. Darwin: 'The early progenitors of man were, *no doubt*, covered with hair, both sexes having beards. Their ears were pointed and capable of movement, and their bodies were provided with a tail. . . . The foot . . . was prehensile, and our progenitors, *no doubt*, were arboreal in their habits, frequenting some warm, forest-clad land. . . . At an earlier period the progenitors of man *must have been* aquatic in their habits.'

"When men laud this as 'advanced science,' we have to say that it is a double 'no doubt,' and a 'must have been' resting on a hypothesis which is conceivable, but has not a fact to support it. We protest, in the name of sound thinking, against the almighty *must-be-ity* with which the evolutionist constructs his system; and we do it for the same reason that we protest against the equally patent *must-be-ity* and *per se-ity* of the speculative philosophers and theologians. . . . Let us have real science, and not sham science."

Now we will append to this an extract from Geikie's *Geology*, in comparison with the above from "Darwin's *Descent of Man*," and see whether President Gregory's "protest" will not lie with equal weight against both.

The third paragraph under Part III., *Dynamical Geology*, reads as follows:—

"At an early time in the earth's history, *anterior to any* of the *periods* of which a record remains in the visible rocks, the chief sources of geological action *probably* [italics mine] lay within the earth itself. The planet still retained a great store of its initial heat, and *in all likelihood*, was the theatre of great chemical changes, giving rise, *perhaps*, to manifestations of volcanic energy somewhat like those which have so marvelously roughened the surface of the moon. As the outer layers of the globe cooled, and the disturbances due to internal heat and chemical action became less marked, the influence of the sun, which *must* always have operated, would then stand out more clearly, giving rise to that wide circle of superficial changes wherein variations of temperature and the circulation of air and water over the surface of the earth came into play."

So on this we too would say, "When men laud this as 'advanced science,' we have to say that it is simply" a "probability" linked with a "likelihood" and

sustained by a "perhaps," and all supported by a "must have operated," with not a fact to underlies any of it, because it is all concerning periods of which there is no "visible record." In the words of President Gregory, "we protest, in the name of sound thinking against the almighty 'probabilities,' and 'perhaps's,' and 'must have's, with which the geologist constructs his system." And with him we say, "Let us have real science, and not sham science."

But as evolution, with all its "no doubts" and "must have been's" has never been able to give, as Mr. Darwin says, an explanation of the "loss of the tail" by "man," so on the other hand, geology with all its probabilities," etc., cannot tell whether its changes have been wrought by the means conjectured, or by other, and totally different means and at the same time much rapidly than is allowed in any of the calculations of geologists. And therefore we, as evolutionists, are willing to admit as a "working hypothesis" that man, as man, was created, and created *without a tail*. And as geologists, we will admit as a "working hypothesis" that "once upon a time" "the windows from on high were opened, and the fountains of the great deep were *broken up*," and that "a flood of waters covered the whole face of the earth." And the "probabilities" are, "no doubt," that, "in all likelihood," we, as evolutionists and geologists, "must be" just as near right about these things as "perhaps" are the evolutionists and geologists of the "advanced science" school.

Farmington, W. T., Aug. 4.

¹ For convenience of reference, we subjoin the resolutions referred to by the Committee on Resolutions, as follows:ó

Resolved, That we all, as churches and individuals, hereby pledge ourselves to labor to the fullest extent of our ability to push the great work of the third angel's message to a successful issue in all its departments.

Resolved, That we deem the paying of tithes a duty enjoined in the Scriptures; and therefore we recommend that every member in this Conference adopt the tithing system, and carry it out faithfully in all things. A. T. JONES, Sec.

² 4 years interregnum

³ 3 yrs. inter.

⁴ 7 yrs. inter. and anarchy.

⁵ 15 yrs. inter.

⁶ 3 yrs inter.

⁷ 13 yrs. interregnum.

⁸ All of this list is between A.D. 315 and 1522.