

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.

WHERE THE SUN IS LAST SEEN.		WHERE THE SUN IS FIRST SEEN.	
Bodö	December	Bodö	December
Karasjok	November	Karasjok	January
Tromsø	"	Tromsø	"
Vardo	"	Vardo	"
Hammerfest	"	Hammerfest	"
North Cape	"	North Cape	"
	15		28
	26		16
	25		17
	22		20
	21		21
	18		24

THE CONTINUOUS DAY.

WHERE THE MIDNIGHT SUN IS FIRST SEEN.		WHERE THE MIDNIGHT SUN IS LAST SEEN.		WHERE THE SUN IS FIRST SEEN.	
Bodö	May	Bodö	July	December	Upper Rim.
Karasjok	19	Karasjok	21	January	
Tromsø	18	Tromsø	19	"	
Vardo	15	Vardo	16	"	
Hammerfest	13	Hammerfest	15	"	
North Cape	11	North Cape	12	"	
	31		4		
	19		22		
	18		20		
	15		17		
	13		16		
	11		13		
	8		8		
	21		21		
	22		22		
	26		26		
	27		27		
	30		30		
	10		10		
	22		22		
	24		24		
	27		27		
	28		28		
	29		29		
	31		31		

The So-called "Mistakes of Moses," a Satire on "Science." 7d. post free.
 Carpenter's 100 Proofs the Earth is not a Globe. 1s. 1d. do.
 The "Earth Review," (to be had from address on previous page) 2d. do.

THE

SUN STANDING STILL

AT THE COMMAND OF JOSHUA,

OR

Ancient *versus* Modern Science.

BEING A REPLY TO A

"Lecture by the Rev. W. W. Howard, Liverpool."

BY

ALBERT SMITH, LEICESTER.

FROM THE EARTH (*Not-a-Globe*) REVIEW,

January, 1894.

"If ye believe not his Writings, how shall ye believe my Words?"—
The Christ.

PRICE 2D.

POST FREE.

A Reduction of 20 p.c. on 5s. worth and upwards.

To be had from "Zetetes," Plutus House, St. Saviour's Road, Leicester,
 England.

H. BANBURY & Co., PRINTERS, LEICESTER.

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" with it 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 shews 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 is 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 enquiry into the veracity 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 upon the sober truth."

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,

always straight and direct, but on lines of light. When light, in its flight, strikes a medium denser than that it has been travelling through, it is turned aside somewhat, and we are led to think that objects are not where they really are. If you thrust a stick into water it appears to bend at the surface of the water We may also say that the stars are never where we seem to see them in the heavens, but where they were when the light we see them by left them."

So far we have been happy to agree with Mr. H., but from this he begins to flounder unconsciously in the meshes of absurd and extravagant philosophical theories. He re-affirms the popular fallacy that the sun is seen in the morning "eight minutes before he is above the horizon," that the light from some stars "would require thousands of years to cover the distance between us," and that

A "star or nebulae might be completely annihilated, and yet it would not seem to disappear from its position in the universe till its last beam of light had reached us, and that might be 20,000 years or even longer"!

He further affirms that "the axis of the earth is inclined to her orbit," that the "pole" dips so that "anyone living at the north pole would see the sun 12 or 13 days time before *he* actually rose above the horizon" (!) and moreover that "this would follow from the atmosphere bending the light beams, and the *north pole* rising by gentle graduation into the zone of day"! *Italics ours*. The writer innocently calls this contradiction "a fact," and says; "From this fact some have argued that the light rays of the sun and moon were bent, at Joshua's petition, to give him an extra 12 hours light to exterminate the enemy." And he quotes James Austin Bastow who supports this view in his Bible Dictionary. However, this theory, though "plausible" is rejected as "delusive," there being a vast difference "between the refraction of a few degrees on the one hand and that of half a circle on the other." We are then informed that

"THE FOURTH THEORY IS THE ASTRONOMICAL ONE."

Here of course, the tangle becomes greater than ever. We are told that

"The rotary motion of the *earth* was arrested, the arrested motion was prevented becoming heat, the water in the oceans, seas, lakes, and rivers was kept from obeying its natural laws, and the solar system was guarded against injury."

The writer, while agreeing, of course, with the "science" of the above paragraph, sympathises with men like Huxley and Tyndale, in their refusal to accept such an explanation, adding that Professor Tyndale, in *Fragments of Science*, remarks;

"There is a scientific imagination as well as an historic imagination; and when, by the exercise of the former, the stoppage of the *earth's* rotation is clearly realised, the event assumes proportions so vast in comparison with the

result to be obtained by it, that belief reels under the reflection. The energy here involved (in the "scientific imagination"?) is equal to that of six trillions 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 shew how men of "science" are led away from the Scriptures by unfaithful expositors and a false philosophy until, as Tyndale confesses, "Belief reels 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 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 shewn and proved to be true. Let them first prove the earth has any motion, be-

fore 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 bewildered 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 Beth-horon 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 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 15th 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 bards. Great occurrences which are wonderful in themselves are greatly adorned, but left free from all miraculous elements. . . . This enquiry into the veracity 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" figment. 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, 'EARTH 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 can not 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 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 *unphilosophical*, 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 unmixed 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 (Psa. 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." Psa. 104 : 5., &c., &c. 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 disposes of an old infidel objection to revelation. Sceptics sneer at the Scriptures because as they say, they inculcate the Geo-centric system of astronomy. instead of the true (!)—the Heli-centric ; and this miracle has ever 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 truth "reasonable" ; it is reasonable, 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 seige ; and when he had discomfited them he followed them, and

pursued them down to the descent of the hills. The place is called Bethhoron; 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."

ANTIQ. 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. *ult.* 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. Rec. 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.
		s. d.
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!		7
<i>" Very interesting and suggestive."—An American D.D.</i>		
The Midnight Sun and its teachings		2
For reply to criticisms thereon, see No. 4		
The Earth (not-a-Globe) Review		2½
Nos. 1 to 5 now ready.		
" Modern Astronomy," Press Discussion from <i>The Leicester Daily Post.</i> (only few left).		1½
<i>" It is amusing to see the floundering and bewilderment of your correspondents.,,—An English D.D.</i>		
" Cranks," and how they move thought		1½

"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. No! 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 the earth's rotation or revolution, not a single proof could be given in support of it. If otherwise, let the proof of the earth's 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 *prides* 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 ideas* 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, 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 "antipodes." 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 attempt to give the proof asked for of the earth's supposed terrible motion.

While on the subject of "Cranks" 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 CROTCHETEERS.—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 American discovery and circumnavigation, and at last met the fate of most cranks, was thrown into prison and died in poverty and disgrace. Greatly venerated now? Oh, yes, Telemachus, we usually esteem a crank most profoundly after we starve him to death. Harvey was a crank on the subject of the circulation 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 crumbling 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 ship going ahead. 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

thank Heaven that you are not a crank? Don't do that, my son. Maybe you could not be a crank if you would. Heaven is not very particular when it wants a weathervane; almost any man will do for that. But when it wants a crank, my boy, it looks about very carefully for the best man in the community. Before you thank Heaven that you are not a crank, examine yourself carefully, and see what is the great deficiency that debars you from such an election. (*From the "Banner of Israel."*)

Again, another writer in the *San Francisco Truth*, well says:—

"If a man is too much for you in argument, or so much better informed than you are, that you do not enjoy his conversation, call him a crank. If his conscientious devotion to principle makes you ashamed of your own loose morality, political or otherwise, just call him a crank, and get even with him. It is really quite an honor to be called a crank (under such circumstances) but the fools who use the term so freely have not yet found it out."

OUR BELIEF.

But we must, for want of space, briefly summarize our position as follows:—

We believe, for reasons which we are able to render, when the opportunity or the means are forthcoming, that,

1. The earth is a stationary and "outstretched" plane, resting, as the Bible teaches, on "foundations."

2. That the sun and moon are simply "two great lights," circling around and above the earth, not more than about three thousand miles off; and only large enough, by reason of our thick atmosphere and the laws of refraction, to illuminate about one half of the world at one and the same time.

3. That the stars are still smaller bodies of light, electrical or magnetic, but not "worlds like ours," nor *suns*, but "lights," intended to subserve this the only world known to the Bible or to *fact*; and as the Creator himself said, intended "for signs and for seasons," "to rule over the day and over the night," and "to give light upon *the earth*." Gen. 1: 16-18.

Now, all the phenomena of Nature, the seasons, tides, eclipses, &c., are explainable in harmony with the above propositions; while we challenge any scientist, infidel, or christian, to give us a single reasonable "proof," or a fact not otherwise explicable, to prove that we are living on a vast rotating globe, flying through "space" two or three times faster than a flash of lightning! Only *one* good proof of this is wanted. Who can give it? Christian friend, which will you choose to believe? The Bible or "Science"? The Holy Scriptures which are able to make you wise unto salvation, or "Science" which an inspired Apostle intimates may be "falsely so-called," and which is fast leading men into doubt and infidelity? "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," is the precept addressed to you. If you are not able to prove these scientific theories true, then stand by us and your Bible like Christian men, as you ought to do, at least until some one can do it for you. And, unbeliever,

if you think you can prove Joshua was wrong in attributing motion to the sun rather than to the earth, set to work and put your proof in print, that we may view it, and *review* it, for 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, *after the tradition of men*, after the rudiments of the world, and *not after Christ*.” Paul.

ANOTHER—“If ye believe not his (Moses’) writings, how shall ye believe my words.” *The Christ*.

SCIENTIFIC BLASPHEMY.

The following is proof, for those innocent minded Christians 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 ruled 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 heaven, 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.”

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 “shewn” that the earth *is* a whirling globe, and that, therefore, the Bible cosmogony is wrong. It has been quietly *assumed* by the “new astronomy” and the 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 infidelity; 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 together in the same mind: he, who thinks he believes both, has thought very little of either.”

Once more, in Reynold’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 almost 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 descendents 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, incarnate, 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* to reveal 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 *rara avis* in your way, no doubt. Although the famous astronomer Signor Schiapparelli has said, “The newspapers are wrong in attributing to me the idea of finding in the duplication of the lines on Mars a 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 we 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 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.

3. The sun, moon and stars, placed within the firmamental *vault*, 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; Psa. 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; Isa. 44: 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; I Sam. 2: 8; and Psa. 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; Psa. 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 slowly 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.

TO BE HAD FROM THE WRITER, AS BELOW. PRICE 1d.
OR POST FREE 1½d.

Further information, with a list of similar publications, to be obtained on receipt of a stamped and addressed envelope, sent to:—

ALBERT SMITH, PLUTUS HOUSE, ST. SAVIOUR'S ROAD,
LEICESTER, ENGLAND.

Printed by R. W. COLES & Co., 68, Highcross St., Leicester.

The Vanishing Ship.

By "SEARCH TRUTH."

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

PROOF I.—"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