The following Tables (copied from "The Land of the Midnight Sun") give the dates of the appearance and disappearance of the Midnight Sun within the Arctic Circle.

### THE CONTINUOUS NIGHT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHERE THE SUN IS LAST SEEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>WHERE THE SUN IS FIRST SEEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodø</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>December 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karasjok</td>
<td>November 26</td>
<td>January 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromso</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardo</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerfest</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cape</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE CONTINUOUS DAY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodø</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>June 4</td>
<td>Bodø</td>
<td>July 8</td>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>July 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karasjok</td>
<td>19 May 21</td>
<td>19 May 20</td>
<td>20 May 22</td>
<td>Karasjok</td>
<td>21 July 21</td>
<td>22 July 23</td>
<td>23 July 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromso</td>
<td>18 May 19</td>
<td>19 May 19</td>
<td>20 May 20</td>
<td>Tromso</td>
<td>22 July 22</td>
<td>24 July 25</td>
<td>25 July 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardo</td>
<td>15 May 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17 May 17</td>
<td>Vardo</td>
<td>26 July 26</td>
<td>27 July 27</td>
<td>28 July 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerfest</td>
<td>13 May 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16 May 16</td>
<td>Hammerfest</td>
<td>27 July 27</td>
<td>28 July 28</td>
<td>29 July 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cape</td>
<td>11 May 12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13 May 13</td>
<td>North Cape</td>
<td>30 July 30</td>
<td>31 Aug.  1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE

Sun Standing Still.

If any proof were needed that the Bible teaches the doctrine of a stationary earth and a moving sun and moon, it is given in the tenth chapter of the book of Joshua. Here it is recounted how Joshua, the leader of the Israelites after the death of Moses, and the armies of Israel fought against the five kings of the Amorites and their armies, the Lord also casting great hailstones down from heaven upon the enemies of His chosen people. "Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and said in the sight of Israel:—

Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies." Rev. Ver.

Now although this account is evidently quite as historical as the account of the rest of the Israel's doings and battles, yet because the teaching conflicts with the views of men and the theories of modern astronomers it is tortured and twisted by laboured "explanations" to mean anything and everything but what the words naturally mean on the face of them. And, as though to prove that all these fanciful "explanations" are off the track, no two expositors are perfectly agreed, or give exactly the same explanation of the passage. They are only alike in one laudable but misguided intent, and this is, to save the Scriptures from reproach and to "harmonize" the account with the theories of modern astronomy and the views of so-called "scientists." It never seems to enter the minds of these well-meaning expositors to question the truth of this modern "science," but only how most plausibly to "reconcile" it with ancient and Biblical Cosmogony. This is not as it ought to be. We shall make no such futile attempt, neither shall we pause to vindicate the character of Israel's God, who will, we believe, do this Himself perfectly when the day of final judgment arrives; but we shall proceed to shew the unsatisfactory nature of all attempts at reconciling the Bible with modern astronomical theories, and boldly challenge any man, either scientist or sceptic, to give us one reasonable and practical proof that the earth has any of the awful motions attributed to it by them. If they cannot do this, and we have hitherto asked for the proof in vain, then we have both right and reason to believe that Joshua was correct in believing, with other Bible worthies, that the motion of the sun, and not of the earth, was and is, the cause of day and night.

The latest effort we have seen at impossible reconciliation calls forth these remarks. We give the writer credit for sincerity and devotion. As he has sent us a copy of his pamphlet we thank him for it, but he must excuse us pointing out clearly and conscientiously where his effort, like that of others has failed. His pamphlet is entitled "Joshua commanding the Sun to stand still. The miracle explained and defended. A lecture by the Rev. W. W. Howard, price 3d., to be obtained from the author, 47, Heman's street, Liverpool,"

We cordially agree with the opening paragraph:—

"The subject we have to discuss to-night has engaged great attention for ages. Believers in revelation have explained and defended the wonderful occurrence with great learning, zeal, and ingenuity, and infidels have made it the favourite object of their scorn and raillery. Many theories have been advanced with a view to give satisfaction to faith and remove doubt; and the way in which the event is still regarded to-day, both among believers and unbelievers shows that not any of them have met with much success."

This is quite true, especially the closing sentence; and we think the present effort is doomed to like failure with former efforts. And for the same reason, viz: lack of faith, on the part of "believers in revelation" in not receiving the account as it stands, and ignorance of true science on the part of infidels, and others, who unreasonably revile what they do not understand, and who credulously believe any absurd theory if propounded in learned jargon and uttered in the name of "Science." Thus the "Christian" has generally much too little faith in the All-wise God and His Revelation to believe it, so he explains it away; and the infidel has a great deal too much faith in ever erring mortals and their philosophy, so he proudly scorns and rejects it. But, of the two, the infidel is the more consistent; for the Christian expositor, like himself, unquestionably accepts those astronomical theories which makes the Word of God of none effect, while the sceptic does not believe in a Divine Revelation. But Zetetics can boldly challenge the truth of those theories, yea, more, they can shew that even as theories they are false to Nature, as well as to the Scriptures; and so the infidel's raillery is checked—and in all reason it ought to be—until he becomes sufficiently instructed to offer some decent proof in support of his position.
Let him try, for instance, to give proof of the earth’s supposed motion; as we have allowed some to try in public meetings, and the laugh soon turned to the other side. See our So-called “Mistakes of Moses,” under heading, The Book Wrong, which gives an instance which really occurred, in Blackburn, once when the writer was lecturing there. But we do not wish to satirize honest doubt, but rather to suggest reasons for thorough enquiry and Christian belief.

FOUR LEADING THEORIES.

Referring to the printed lecture before us we find that Mr. Howard selects four as the leading theories by which this miracle has been explained, and which even he himself cannot accept. The first is called

“THE POETICAL THEORY.”

Those who accept this theory, he says, suppose that the hours of sunlight did really appear to them to be lengthened? Someone afterwards expressed his feelings in poetry, “with the usual poetical license,” whatever that is, and incorporated his poem in a book of military songs called “The Book of Jasher.” We reject this exposition for the same reasons as the writer; because, “firstly, there is possibly a more reasonable view; and, secondly, the genius of Hebrew poetry lends no confirmation to its position.” And we further cordially agree with him when he adds;

“I have sought all through the Bible and have not discovered one instance of a natural event being exalted into a miracle by any of its bards.”

This, we think, is well and truthfully spoken. The second theory, he says, is called

“THE SPIRITUAL THEORY.”

There are those who hold that God, at the command of Joshua, allowed the sun and moon to go on their journey as usual, but in their places “two other bodies of a spiritual kind were slipped in so stealthily that the Israelites were unaware of what was done.” This theory, commonly held by Swedenborgians, the writer very properly rejects as charging God with deception, and assuming an impossibility. He gives his reasons, which those who are interested to know can find by obtaining the pamphlet. Our space compels us to be brief. The next exegesis reviewed is, thirdly,

“THE OPTICAL THEORY.”

Under this heading Mr. Howard says;—

“It is true that light is refrangible, and also that we see, not as we think,
result to be obtained by it, that belief reeks under the reflection. The energy here involved (in the "scientific imagination") is equal to that of six millions of horses working for the whole of the time employed by Joshua in the destruction of his foes. The amount of power thus expended would be sufficient to supply every individual of an army a thousand times the strength of that of Joshua, with a thousand times the power of each of Joshua's soldiers, not for the few hours necessary to the extinction of a handful of Amorites, but for millions of years."

These calculations are all very pretty, but they are worse than useless as the Bible does not speak of "arresting the earth's motion," but of the sun standing still. Hence they are utterly beside the mark; but the above quotation serves to show how men of "science" are led away from the Scriptures by unfaithful expositors and a false philosophy until, as Tyndale confesses, "Belief reeks under the reflection." While Christian men and so-called "Reverend Divines," who are paid to defend the Holy Writings, play into their hands by ignorantly, or cowardly, yielding the claims of unfounded astronomical theories so utterly subversive of the Bible teaching and true Natural Science. However, it is only fair to the writer of the pamphlet under consideration to say that he rejects this "explanation" also; although, at the same time, he holds those astronomical theories by which it is supported. He also makes the same mistake of talking about the earth's motion being arrested instead of that of the sun, for he says:

"Why did not the ocean overflow the land? Run with a pail of water until you come in contact with a wall, and observe the effect upon the liquid, how it will dash over the side: and the sudden stoppage of the rotary motion of the earth (!) would naturally send the sea almost all over the dry land . . . You know the shaking you get with the violent stoppage of an express train going at sixty miles an hour, and we ask you, please, to fancy the result to us, and to all cattle, dwelling houses, monuments, and even trees, if the earth, which at the equator moves nearly 1,100 miles an hour, was brought quickly to a stand still."

Now that is altogether and utterly irrelevant. When will professed defenders of the Bible let it speak in its own terms? What infidel could wrest the Scriptures more from their plain literal and grammatical sense? The American infidel Ingersol writes just in the same strain respecting this miracle in his so-called "Mistakes of Moses." But is it not rather a mistake, and a grave mistake, of Ingersol, Tyndale, Howard & Co., to speak of the Bible arresting the earth's motion, when the account says nothing whatever of the kind; but distinctly tells us that it was the sun and moon which stood still? They may charge the Bible, if they like, with being contrary to modern science; but we should retort that it is both illogical and unscientific to condemn the Bible on such a charge until the "science" in question has first been shown and proved to be true. Let them first prove the earth has any motion, before talking about the "arresting" of it. And we want something better than Foucault's pendulum experiment for this—especially as different pendulums will sometimes oscillate in opposite directions!—and more especially as practical experiments have already proved that the earth has no such motions as those attributed to it. The account of these experiments may be found in Parallax's great work, "Earth not a Globe." We have no space now to quote these experiments, as we are at present only engaged in shewing up the inconsistency of those who wrest the plain statements of the Holy Scriptures to suit the fanciful and absurd theories of modern "Science," falsely so-called. They may yet appear in the Earth Review in due course, if our friends will only come forward and sustain our hands in this unequal conflict. Some of them have already appeared.

THE LATEST EXPOSITION.

But our readers will naturally be anxious to know what is the final "explanation" given by the writer in question, who acknowledges that he had previously been "utterly bewilded with every attempt either to explain the miracle, or to explain it away." We shall let him speak for himself. He says:—

"I have now a fifth view to lay before you, which appears to be both rational and simple." . . . "My belief is this: Joshua and his men having walked all night, as the 9th verse tells us, would be tired next morning, but God caused a great trembling to spread itself amongst the foe, and there was an easy victory. When the war had pursued the Amorites some distance, hailstones fell upon them and did much damage. At the approach to Bethhoron the hailstorm increased in fury; and Joshua, seeing the devastation produced, and being cognisant of the fatigue of his men, prayed Heaven to let the hurricane go on till total and irreparable disaster was inflicted."

We refrain from saying all we think about this so-called "explanation," as the writer is evidently both sincere and devout; and he says that "it flashed across my mind many years ago, when I was on my knees." But we think it doomed to the same failure as the rest, and for similar reasons; it is not true to the sacred narrative. It reminds us of what the editor of the Daily Chronicle said of Dr. Geikie's book, The Bible by Modern Light. "He makes assertions which have the charm of novelty, but also the vice of inaccuracy." (See fuller remarks from the D.C. in another page.) This is the case with the present attempt. We have no record that Joshua "prayed Heaven to let the hurricane go on." This is an assertion, not of the narrator, but of the "expositor." Joshua prayed for the sun to "stand still," not for the hailstorm to proceed, and we are told that "there was no day like that, before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man for the Lord fought for Israel." But to get rid of this fact our expositor says;
"The chapter (10th of Joshua) is made up of two accounts, the one historical the other poetical. The poetical extends from the 12th to the 18th verse. The rest is historical."

This is oracular and authoritative! Mr. Howard comes back after all to a "Poetical Theory," although such a theory was the first one he so conclusively rejected. This only proves the impossibility of explaining the account in harmony with modern science on any theory. In short the narrative needs no explanation in itself; IT ONLY NEEDS BELIEVING! And, as "all men have not faith," let anyone of those without try to prove, if he can, that the account is not in harmony with the facts of Nature. This would be straight forward and reasonable; but to wrest the Scriptures, to twist and torture their language until it is made to mean anything the writer wishes, is neither strictly honest nor truly scientific. The very attempt to do so only serves to shew the unconscious influence and injurious effect modern astronomy has had on the minds of otherwise good and honest searchers after truth. Only let the incubus of this superstition (and we use the word "superstition" advisedly as of something standing above, or outside, natural facts) only let this incubus be removed from their minds, and the skill such writers manifest might do credit to the expository science they affect; but while their minds are, consciously or unconsciously, enchained by the trammels of a false philosophy, imposed upon them while they were too young to question it, they will not only "wrest the Scriptures," as they do, but writhe as it were in the meshes of a critical snare evidently laid for us by the Arch Deceiver of mankind. We have need to pray that our minds, and that the minds of our "Ministers," may be delivered from this "snare of the fowler." The miracle under consideration shews that God hears prayer, and answers it; but when He does He never flashes ideas or interpretations across the mind which are out of harmony with the general statements of that Divine Cosmogony revealed in his Holy Word.

"To the Law and to the Testimony; if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8: 20.

**Joshua Corrected.**

Before concluding our paper let us briefly consider the validity of some of the reasons given for this novel interpretation. Firstly, the employment of a hailstorm was a "means already in operation, and in every way capable of securing the end in contemplation." This is so utterly beside the question that we dismiss it at once. We might deny the hailstorm itself on such flimsy grounds. Secondly, we are told that "the language of the inspired penman suits this theory, and no other!" We will content ourselves with putting a note of exclamation after that!

Then "It is poetical, and all poets are allowed some latitude in their descriptions." Our expositor ought to be a poet of no mean standing for he evidently claims a poet's privilege! He says the account is extracted from the Book of Jasher, which seems to have been made up of martial odes, intended to "develop patriotism and faith in God." If Mr. Howard had not prefixed the title "Rev." to his name, a title which his Master has practically forbidden (Matt. 23: 8 vs.) we might have thought this the suggestion of a sceptic, that "faith in God" could be developed by the poetical recounting of a false miracle! But supposing that Mr. H.'s bare assertion that "the poetical portion extends from the 12th to the 15th verse" were true, what has he already told us respecting the genius of Hebrew poetry?

"I have sought all through the Bible and have not discovered one instance of a natural event being exalted into a miracle by any of its bard's. Great occurrences which are wonderful in themselves are greatly adorned, but left free from all miraculous elements. . . . This enquiry into the versaticity of Hebrew poetry has amazed me—made me feel how, contrary to the general view, in all their highest inspirations, the Bible bards kept a clear eye on sober truth—a remark, I think, which applies to the poets of no other nation."

Thus his own words are sufficient to answer the supposition that the account in question is a "poetical" fragment. But we do not admit that three verses are poetical. They seem to us just as historical as the rest of the chapter, and ancient Israel believed them to be so. We believe that Mr. H. would never have objected to them as equally historical with the rest of the chapter were it not for the absurd idea that we are living on a vast globe, turning us all head over heels once every twenty-four hours, and so alternately bringing day and night. This appears from his further remarks. He says;

"The first remark I have to make upon these words, as here rendered, is that if the prayer had been answered the day would not have been lengthened. To lengthen the day the earth must either slow in her rotatory motion or stop it altogether; and Joshua, had he wanted more hours of light, should have said, 'Ehren pause in thy revolution upon thy axis, or go slower.' Thus you see our Versions take all the meaning out of Joshua's prayer. Our View shows its point and beauty."

This would really be amusing to Zetetics if the matter were not otherwise so serious, and the writer evidently so earnest. He calls poetry, Hebrew, and astronomy all to his aid. He says that the Hebrew word dom never means to "stand still." It may not be again so translated, not exactly, and yet it may have this meaning. We think it has. The root word is damam. The writer admits it is once translated "tarry" 1 Sam. 14: 9. Although the word sometimes may be rendered be silent, this passage clearly shews it also means to stand still. It reads, "If they say unto us, Tarry (damam) until we come to you, then we will
stand still (amad) in our place." This latter word amad is the very Hebrew term used in Hab. 3:11, which again speaks of the sun standing still! Is this wrong also? We have faith in the translators to believe that they understood Hebrew as well, if not better, than the writer; and they, while giving various shades of meaning in the margin, give unmistakably the right meaning in the text, "Sun stand thou still," for we read "the sun stood still (amad) in the midst of heaven." v. 13. Mr. H. says the latter term means to rise up. But it cannot mean this only, for Parkhurst gives the primary meanings, "To stand, stand still, stay, remain." This Hebrew Lexicographer also says that "The Seventy generally render the verb by istemi to stand, and its compounds." As it may interest the reader we will give the translation from the Septuagint, shewing, how ancient Greek translators, untrammelled by modern astronomical theories, understood this passage;

"Then Joshua spoke to the Lord, in the day in which the Lord delivered the Amorite into the power of Israel, when He destroyed them in Gabaon, and they were destroyed from before the children of Israel. And Joshua said, Let the sun stand over against Gabaon, and the moon over against the valley of Aelon. And the sun and the moon stood still, until God executed vengeance on their enemies.

Italics of course are ours. Those who wish to pursue this point further will find the same Hebrew word (amad) translated "stand still," or its equivalent, in the following passages;—Josh. 3:8, 17; 10:13; and 11:13; 1 Sam. 14:9; and 2 Sam. 2:23 and 28; &c.; as also in the remarkable passage referred to in Hab. 3:11. It plainly appears, therefore, unless the translators did not understand Hebrew, that "stood still" is a correct and frequent translation of amad; and doubtless it never would have been called into question as applied to the sun were it not for the baseless theories of modern astronomy. These are at the bottom of the whole contention. The passage had to be harmonized with a philosophical, or rather an «philosophical,» theory; so the translation must be altered to suit! As Mr. H. remarks;

"When once a theory takes hold it grows apace and wields a power over future ages that is seen in expositions, annotations, and translations . . . till the original modicum of truth is distorted or lost in the process."

And again, we quote with approval;—

"The Bible itself will have to be studied anew in its own light; and when this is done, and we get back to its grand and simple truths unmingled with false views from extraneous sources, we shall be delighted with what it is and what it has to tell us."

This is good advice, if followed. And amongst the grand and simple truths of the Bible will be found that the sun has motion (Ps. 19:4); that the earth (or land) rests on "foundations" (1 Sam. 2:8); and that it is so established "that it should not be removed for ever." Yet in spite of this good advice, and the fact that the Scriptures do teach the Plane system, the writer speaking about his new theory or explanation says;—

"Our theory dispose of an old infidel objection to revelation. Sceptics sneer at the Scriptures because as they say, they enunciate the Geo-centric system of astronomy. Instead of the true (!)—the Helio-centric; and this miracle has never been the prop of their charge. 'See,' they have said, 'when Joshua wanted the day lengthening, he commanded the sun and moon to stand still, thinking falsely (?) that they circled round the earth every 24 hours; whereas it is the earth (oh!) revolving round on her own axis, that makes day and night.' But our theory will put an end to this, and prove that Joshua knew what he was doing.'

Vain hope! No mere "theory" will put an end to the infidel's sneer. Our plan is not to oppose theories or quibbles to the sneer of the sceptic, but facts; and then let him sneer if he can for shame. If the infidel can prove that water is convex, or that the earth really tumbles at all, land and water, topsy-turvey once every twenty-four hours, then he has a right to sneer at Joshua's ignorance; but if he cannot, and the pages of the Earth Review are open for any respectable effort, then we shall sneer at his ignorance, his lack of reasoning power, and his consummate folly for allowing himself to be duped out of Eternal Life over the simple and plain facts of Nature! We have a word also for the Christian. Why should you allow infidel theories respecting the universe, its form and its origin, to blind your eyes to the facts you see, or may see, around you, and to the harmonious teachings of that Divine system of Cosmogony revealed in Holy Writ? You need not attempt to make your Bible seem unreasonable, to the unfettered and really free thinking mind. Neither need you attempt to "explain" a miracle; it is above you. While the attempt to "defend" a miracle is puerile and absurd, a miracle is its own defence. All you have to do is to believe it, when attested. Defending a miracle is like a child defending a giant, or a fox defending a lion! But if you cannot believe your Bible, and if you are too indifferent or too ignorant to go into the proofs offered around you, then honestly join the infidel party, and prove the Bible is wrong in its Creation and its Cosmology, that is if you can.

We shall conclude our paper with a quotation from Josephus, a Jewish writer and historian who lived in the first century of the Christian era, and who was doubtless well acquainted both with the language of the Jews and the remarkable and miraculous history of Israel. Respecting the miracle in question he writes;—

"Joshua made haste with his whole army to assist them (the Gibeonites), and marching day and night, in the morning he fell upon the enemies as they were going up to the siege; and when he had discomfited them he followed them, and
pursued them down to the descent of the hills. The place is called Betlihoron, where he also understood that God assisted them, which He declared by thunder and thunder-bolts, as also by the falling of hail larger than usual. Moreover it happened that the day was lengthened, that the night might not come on too soon, and be an obstruction to the zeal of the Hebrews in pursuing their enemies.

Now that the day was lengthened at this time, and was longer than ordinary, is expressed in the books laid up in the Temple.

ANIQ. B. V. C. I. S. 17.

In a note under this paragraph Mr. Whiston, the learned compiler of Josephus' works, while hesitating what explanation to give the miracle says;

"The fact itself was mentioned in the Book of Jasher, now lost, Josh. 10:13, and is confirmed by Isaiah (28:21), Habakkuk (3:11), and by the son of Sirach (Eccles. 46:4). In the 18th Psalm of Solomon, ver. 14, it is also said of the luminaries, with relation no doubt to this and the other miraculous standing still and going back, in the days of Joshua and Hezekiah. 'They have not wandered from the day He created them, they have not forsaken their way, from ancient generations, unless it were when God enjoined them (so to do) by the command of His servants.' See Authent. Eccles. part I, p. 154."

"Hear the just law, the judgment of the skies, He that hates truth shall be the dupe of lies; And he that will be cheated, to the last Delusions strong as Hell shall bind him fast."

N.B.—The following pamphlets may also be had from "Zetetes," Plutus House, St. Saviour's Road, Leicester, England.

BY "ZETETES." Post free.

The so-called "Mistakes of Moses;" A Satire, shewing how "Zetetes" was excommunicated from the S.D.A. "Church," London, for believing the writings of Moses! "Very interesting and suggestive." —An American D.D.

The Midnight Sun and its teachings
For reply to criticisms thereon, see No. 4

The Earth (not-a-Globe) Review Nos. 1 to 5 now ready.

"Modern Astronomy," Press Discussion from The Leicester Daily Post. (only few left).

"It is amusing to see the floundering and beardlessment of your correspondents,—An English D.D.

"Cranks," and how they move thought

"CRANKS;"

OR
THE FALSE THEORIES OF "SCIENCE"
VERSUS
THE TRUTH OF NATURE AND THE BIBLE.

By "Zetetes."

Anyone but moderately acquainted with Theoretical Science knows that much which passes current in these days as "Science" is opposed to the plain teachings of the Bible. But this fact gives neither the "Scientist nor his disciple, any concern whatever; because, while he has been taught to doubt, or to discredit the teachings of the Bible, he has never been sufficiently sceptical, or perhaps sufficiently instructed, to doubt the teachings of what is presumptively called "Science." And in fact the ordinary mortal who dares to question anything advanced in the name of "Science" is considered to be either an ignoramus, or what is called a "crank;" and especially so if he dare to stand forth in defence of the Holy Scriptures against so called scientific teaching. But why should "Science" be exempt from criticism and enquiry any more than the Bible? The way some professed Christians treat the Scriptures, where they are opposed to the theories of Science, is discreditable in the extreme; not only to the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, but discreditable to their own profession and understanding. They profess to believe that the Bible is inspired of God, yet they apologize for its language, as though the writers were uninspired and ignorant of the fundamental facts of Creation. But may not this ignorance possibly be ours, not theirs? Such conduct is highly reprehensible on the part of those who are in positions where they are paid to defend and to advance Bible teachings and doctrines; and especially where they have never paused to inquire whether the discrepancy found between "Science" and the Bible is due to the ignorance of Bible writers or to the fallacies and unfounded theories of a "Science" which, as Paul says, is "falsely so called."
The word "Science" means knowledge, knowledge of the facts of Nature, &c.; but no doubt much that now passes for "Science" is not knowledge at all, but mere theory, or scientific guess-work. We have nothing whatever to say against the facts of science or Nature, but no fact in Science, and no real fact in Nature, can be found opposed to, or inconsistent with Bible teaching—but we have a right to question mere scientific theories, especially when those theories are opposed, as many of them undoubtedly are, to plain Bible doctrines. Take for instance the theories of Modern Astronomy, which is supposed to be one of the "exact sciences." Recognized Astronomers have differed as much as a hundred millions of miles respecting the distance of the sun alone; yet the sun's distance is the very elastic "measuring rod" of all other astronomical distances. Honesty must confess that the theories of modern Astronomy are directly opposed to Bible teachings; but it never enters the mind of the Scientist, and seldom even that of the professed Christian, to inquire which side is right. Not the claims of "Science" are cowardly yielded as being above question. While the Bible is either ignored altogether or its language is tortured to fit the latest modern scientific theory; or the pitiable excuse is made that the "Bible was not intended to teach Science," and that the writers wrote—not as they were moved by the Spirit of God—but according to the general belief of a past and ignorant age! Shame on such "Christian" defenders of God's Word!

MODERN ASTRONOMY.

But the Bible does deal with the question of Creation, and it gives an account of the universe in harmony with natural appearances; and if its various writers were wrong in their harmonious teachings respecting God's world and this earth, they could not well have been inspired by the good Spirit of Him who created it. In fact, a brother in the faith gave it as a proof that the Bible is not inspired because it describes the earth as an "outstretched" and motionless plane, having "ends," "corners," "foundations," &c. It had never entered his mind to question the modern globular theory. Let us, however, be honest with sacred things, and venture to meet the sceptic on his own ground. Truth has nothing to fear from facts! and only theories can be feebly opposed to it. Take for instance this popular theory, that the earth is a Globe. This is but a theory after all. It has never yet been proved by a single fact in nature. The Bible speaks of the earth as an "outstretched" plane, resting on the waters of the great deep; and all natural phenomena can be explained on this basis, without assuming as astronomers do assume, the sphericity of the earth. It can be round and flat too. "Scientific" theory says that the earth is not only a vast globe, but that it is whirling away and flying through "space" at the awful rate of over a thousand miles a minute in its orbital motion. This is not only contrary to Bible teaching, which represents the earth as being at rest on "foundations," and "established," so fast that it "cannot be moved" at any time; but it is contrary to the testimony of our senses, and the intelligence of the wisest men in the world for over five thousand years. This supposed motion, whether "axial" or "orbital," is neither felt nor visible; and if a thousand pounds were offered for proof of its orbital motion, not a single proof could be given in support of it. If otherwise, let the proof of the earths' motion be forthcoming; Mr. Carpenter offers one hundred dollars for it, and we only wait to see it fairly put in print. It would be a literary curiosity! Yet, forsooth, we are called "cranks" for not believing this monstrous idea; while the poor deluded infidel gives himself for not believing the Bible! However, we invite him honestly to try his hand at the proof asked for; or at least to give up sneering at "Joshua commanding the Sun to stand still, instead of the earth." Yet the infidel who is unable to prove whether it is the motion of the Sun or of the earth which causes day and night, is far less inconsistent in his unbelief than the professed Christian, who, while equally ignorant with the sceptic in this respect, yet professes to believe that the Prophets were inspired of God, to write and speak as they did. Brethren, let us be consistent with ourselves and with our profession. If modern Astronomy is right, Joshua and the Bible are wrong. But let the proof asked for be given before we yield the contention against the Bible. This is only reasonable and fair.

WATER LEVEL.

The Bible is more scientific than many people are aware; and it cannot be overthrown quite so easily as some of our opponents imagine. Let them try it here, and prove that the earth has any motion, sidereal or orbital, to say nothing of the awful diurnal head-over-heels motion attributed to it. If it has not this motion—and we defy any man in the world honestly to prove it has—then the earth is not a globe at all, and the natural idea of a motionless and extended plane, in harmony with Bible teaching and ancient astrological belief, is after all right! We know that scores of other questions might be propounded here, but let this be settled first; for if the earth has no motion, then it is modern astronomy that is wrong, and not the system of the Bible. We can answer all other questions when time, space, and means are allowed us; but we here and now challenge these fundamental theories, or hypotheses of modern theoretical astronomy. The cleverest astronomers, after Newton and Copernicus, admit that they are but theories, suppositions, not facts; mere hypotheses, not science, or knowledge.
On the other hand we can give proof, to those who desire to know, that the earth is a motionless and “outstretched” plane; this proof is found in connection with the grand fact that the surface of all still water is perfectly level, not convex as it ought to be if the earth were a globe with the sea all round it. The fact that water is level is at the basis of the Zetetic teaching; but many other facts besides, facts found in nature and outside Bible teaching, go to prove that the Bible view of the Creation is right, and that of the so-called “Scientist” is wrong. Our own senses too, tell us that people are never found in any part of the world living with their heads downwards and “their feet towards our feet,” at some fancied “antisepsis.” It is those who believe, or rather who promulgate such absurd notions that ought to be considered cranky; not we who believe in the deliberate and intelligent verdict of our God-given senses, and in the teachings of his own infallible Word. However, I for one am not going to be scared out of my senses, and out of my belief in the Bible too, because some superficial sceptics ignorantly cry out “Crank!” I have generally found such people utterly incompetent to attempt even to give a decent so-called proof in favour of their own position. If I speak unadvisedly, let them and not I, be the proof asked for of the earth’s supposed terrible motion.

While on the subject of “Cranckes” I would commend those who call us such names, for believing in the evidence of our senses, to read what an American humorist is said to have written about them in the Alliance News. If “cranks,” or “paradoxists,” are such as are here described, we need not be ashamed of being compared with them. It runs as follows:—

A WORD FOR THE CROUCHETERS.—Cranks, my son? The world is full of them. What should we do were it not for cranks? How slowly the tired old world would move did not the cranks keep it rushing along. Columbus was a crank on the subject of steam navigation; Morse was a telegraph crank; all the old abolitionists of the blood; Galileo was an astronomical crank; Fulton was a crank on the subject of steam navigation; Morse was a telegraph crank; all the old abolitionists were cranks. The Pilgrim Fathers were cranks; John Bunyan was a crank; any man who does not think the same as you do, my son, is a crank. And by-and-bye the crank you despise will have his name in every man’s mouth, and a half-completed monument to his memory crambling down in a dozen cities, while nobody outside of your native village will know that you have ever lived. Deal gently with the crank, my boy. Of course, some cranks are crankier than others, but do you be very slow to sneer at a man because he knows only one thing, and you can’t understand him. A crank, Telemachus, is a thing that turns something, it makes the wheels go round, it insures progress. True it turns the same wheel all the time, and it can’t do anything else, but that is what keeps the thing going; and the thing that goes in for variety, versatility, that changes its position a hundred times a day, that is no crank, that is the weathervane, my son. What? You nevertheless
if you think you can prove Joshua was wrong— in attributing—
your benefit and ours. But let us have argument not assumption,
reason not ridicule, science not sneers. We are willing to
abide by the result. Are you? If honest you are.

An Inspired Warning.—“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit,
who still need it, that ‘Science’ has something to do with the
question of Salvation, inasmuch as it is leading men not only
to deny the truths of the Bible, but, as a consequence, to deny
the Christ and the God of the Bible. The first paragraph is
from a weekly paper with the very suggestive title, Lucifer,
published in America; and from a number dated “December 23,
E.M., 287.” This is instead of calling it the year A.D. 1887.
Why do they refuse to acknowledge the A.D.? The editor
himself shall tell us. He says—

“We date from the First of Jan. 1601. This era is called the Era of Man,
(E.M.) to distinguish it from the theological epoch that preceded it. In that epoch
the earth was supposed to be flat, the sun was its attendant light revolving about
it. Above was Heaven where God reigned supreme over all potentates and powers,
below was the kingdom of the devil, hell. So taught the Bible. Then came the
new astronomy. It demonstrated (?) that the earth is a globe revolving about the
sun; that the stars are worlds and suns; that there is no ‘up’ and ‘down’ in space.
Vanished the old heavens, vanished the old hell; the earth became the
home of man. And when the modern cosmogony came, the Bible and the church,
as infallible oracles, had to go, for they had taught that regarding the universe
which was now shown (supposed?) to be untrue in every particular.8

Gently, friend Lucifer, for you are somewhat in the dark here,
notwithstanding you assume to be a great light bringer! It never
has been ‘demonstrated’ or ‘shown’ that the earth is a
whirling globe, and that, therefore, the Bible cosmogony is wrong. It has been quietly assumed by
astronomy, and this assumption has been cowardly yielded by the ‘Christian’
who ought to have challenged it. But it never has been proved.
Never! If it has, kindly give us the name and the address of
the man who ‘demonstrated’ it. Newton and Copernicus, both,
were candid enough to confess that the theory called by their
names is but a theory, a mere assumption not based on known
facts. Their disciples forget this.

And now, what is the result? It is seen in the above infidelitv;
and in the further fact that a correspondent signs his name
under these words:—

Yours without Christ, and no hope or desire of ever reaching the New Jerusalem.” See “Folly,” March, 1890.

But, Christian friend, if the earth be a great globe, shooting
and spinning away through space immeasurably faster than the
deadliest cannon ball, how can the New Jerusalem, a city
twelve miles square on every side, and twelve miles in pyramidal
height; how, I ask, can such a city come down from Heaven,
as the apostle John shews it will, and rest, in a particular and a prepared locality, upon its grand and glorious foundations? Well might Thomas Paine say, as he did say, in his Age of Reason:—

The two beliefs,—Modern Astronomy and the Bible—‘cannot be held
in the same mind: be, who thinks he believes both, has thought very
little of either.”

Once more, in Reynolds’s Newspaper, (England,) Sunday,
Aug. 14, 1892, under heading “Democratic World,” we find
the following blasphemous paragraph, which is also ignorantly
based on the assumption of the truth of this much vaunted
‘New Astronomy.’ It is written by some one who very
suitably signs himself “Dodo,” and it runs as follows:—

“We are trembling on the eve of a discovery which may revolutionize the whole
thought of the world. The most universal opinion of scientific men is that the
planet Mars is inhabited by beings like, or superior to, ourselves. Already they
have discovered (?) great canals cut on its face in geometrical form, which can only
be the work of reasoning creatures. (?) They have seen its snowfields, and it only
requires a telescope a little stronger than those already in existence to reveal the
mystery as to whether sentient beings exist on that planet (?) If it be found that
this is the case the whole Christian religion will crumble to pieces. The story of the
Creation has already become an old wife’s tale. (?) Hell is never mentioned in
any well-informed society of clergymen; the devil has become a myth. If Mars
is inhabited, the irresistible deduction will be that all the other planets are
inhabited. This will put an end to the fable prompted by the vanity of humanity
that the Son of God came on earth and suffered for creatures who are the lineal
descendants of monkeys. (?) It is not to be supposed that the Hebrew carpenter
Jesus went about as a kind of theosophical missionary to all the planets in the solar
system, re-creating, and suffering for the sins of various pigmies or giants, as the
case may be, who may dwell there. The astronomers would do well to make haste
toreveal to us the magnificent secret which the world impatiently awaits.” Dodo,
Yes, yes, “Dodo”; you are evidently a very fine bird to be the
‘lineal descendant of a monkey!’ Quite a rare and in your way,
no doubt. Although the famous astronomer Signor Schiaparelli
has said, “The newspapers are wrong in attributing to me
the idea of finding in the duplication of the lines on Mars
proof that that planet is inhabited, based on the supposition
that the lines are the work of reasonable beings” ; yet, “Dodo”
as you confess the whole affair is still a great “secret,” do push
on the astronomers to make their glasses only a “little stronger,”
that real may know whether your progenitors were really
monkeys or not. Do do, ‘Dodo’ pray do do. If you can but
prove that the earth is a “planet” at all, you will not only
have the pleasure of overthrowing the Christian religion, which
you evidently hate, but a friend of mine offers one hundred dollars towards making your telescopes a "little stronger" still, so that you may yet see the water in those parallel "canals" of Mars! Do push on the astronomers "Dodo," pray do do; and thus crumble to "pieces," if you can, this

**BIBLE VIEW OF THE WORLD.**

1. Heaven is *above* (not at all round), earth *beneath*, and "*water under the earth.**" Ex. 20, 1-4.

2. Heaven, the *firmament*: a semi-transparent structure, strong enough to divide the waters "*above*" it, from those "*below*" it. Gen. 1:7; Job 37:18; and Psalms 19:1; and

3. The sun, moon and stars, placed within the firmamental *vaults*, are powerful "*lights*" only, some greater some lesser, electrical and magnetic, intended for "*signs and for seasons*; and to give light to this the only world." Gen., 1:16-18; Ps. 136:7-9; and Rev. 6:13.

4. The earth is represented as being "*outstretched*" as a plane, with the "*outstretched*" heavens everywhere above it, like a circular "*tent*" to dwell in; to the great confusion of our so-called "*wise*" men. Isa. 40:22; Prov. 8:27; Ps. 81:24-25; Luke 4:5; and I Cor. 3:19.

*5. The earth (or *land* portion of the world) is firmly and immovably fixed on "*foundations*" or "*pillars*" having "*ends*" and "*corners*" jutting out into the sea, like Land's End, Cape Finisterre, &c. Gen. 1:10; Job 38:4-6; 1 Sam. 2:8; and Ps. 93:1; and 104:5. R.V.*

6. The sun, moon, and stars move around and "*above*" the earth (not more than a few thousand miles off) so that day and night are "*ruled*" by the motions of the heavenly bodies, or "*lights*" and not by the supposed axial motion of the earth, which contradicts the Holy Scriptures as well as our own God-given senses. Heaven is nearer to us than we have imagined. Josh. 10:12-14; Ps. 19:4-6; Luke 24:51; and Dan. 9:21-23.

7. All that exists was created in six days (of the same kind as the seventh), and not since evolved, as infidels suppose and recklessly affirm, during "*millions of millions of years.*" God said: "*In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.*" Ex. 20:11. SHALL WE BELIEVE THE CREATOR, OR THE CREATURE?

Christian, will you be guilty of so great a sin and enormity; and especially for a modern unproved and unprovable assumption? See previous notes. For, "*He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar.*" Dare you act thus, and deny the truth of His Word? which, in spite of what half-hearted Christians say to the contrary, does deal with the question of the Creation and the Universe, setting forth the wonderful works of God as the basis of our allegiance to Him as the Creator.

---

**The Vanishing Ship.**

**By "Search Truth."**

Proofs (so-called) of the World's Roundness, examined in the Light of Facts and Common Sense.

**Proof 1.—** If on a clear day we take our stand on a hill above a seaport while ships are leaving, we shall see that the ship does not *become dimmer and dimmer, and is so lost at last to our view, but* that we first lose sight of the hull, then of the lower half of the masts, and last of all of the top masts. In the same way, if we catch upon the horizon the first sign of a ship, we shall find it to be the top "*masts and top sails*; then we shall next see the masts, the whole "*masts, part of the hull, and, last of all, the entire hull.*" In both cases it is as if the one ship were going down, and the other were *coming up, a hill.* This is one proof that the earth is round," i.e., a globe. The above is copied from "A Senior Geography," by John Markwell, M.A., corrected down to 1882, and used by the London University.

**Proof Examined.—** If a good telescope be used when the hull of a vessel has disappeared very frequently the whole of the vessel will be restored to sight, specially in calm weather. How then can the hull of a vessel have gone down behind a "*hill of water*"? One must either believe that the telescope enabled the observer to see through a "*hill of water*," or else that there is no "*hill of water*" at all. The writer has seen the whole of a vessel through a telescope when, with the unaided eye, only the top of a mast could be seen. The vanishing hull trick is thus exposed as a fallacy, for it is certain that, if the ship had gone down behind a hill of water, no telescope could restore it to sight again. Often, when at the seaside, the hull of a vessel has disappeared to one person, but to another, of longer sight, it can be seen quite plainly. This proves it is partly a question of optics, for if once a vessel had gone behind a real hill of water, no difference of sight could possibly restore it to sight again. The Laws of Perspective alone are quite sufficient to account for the way ships disappear at sea, and it is strange that in almost all geography books these laws are ignored, as the following sentence clearly shows: "The ship does not become