

THE SCIENCE OF FACTS

OR

THE DELUSIONS OF FICTION—

WHICH ARE WE TO BELIEVE?

A CRITICAL INQUIRY

Having Special Reference to the Mathematical Theories
OF

SIR ISAAC NEWTON,

SHOWING

HOW THE GRANDEST INTELLECTS OF THE DAY
MAY BE MISTAKEN ON ONE OF THE MOST
ELEMENTARY AND PRACTICAL SUBJECTS
EVER ENTERTAINED BY MAN.

DEDICATED

TO ALL INDEPENDENT TRUTH SEEKERS.

By "INVESTIGATOR."

JEREMIAH viii. 9.

Published by the Zetetic Society,
3, PARK STREET, CROYDON;
AND W. REEVES, 185, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

The first chapter may be had separately, 2d.

1578 / 6057

The Newtonian

OR

Solar System

Is it Scientific?

AN INQUIRY INTO THE PREMISES OR DATA ON WHICH IT WAS BASED; SUGGESTING SOME IRRECONCILABLE CONTRADICTIONS CONNECTED WITH IT, AND INSISTING THAT SUCH A MIND AS NEWTON'S COULD NOT HAVE ENTERTAINED THE IDEA OF ANY ABSOLUTE APPLICATION OF ABSTRACT MATHEMATICAL ACCURACY TO THE SOLAR SYSTEM BEING EVIDENCED BY POSITIVE FACT.

Illustrated by Diagrams.

Dedicated to the Cambridge Professors and University Students generally.

By an INVESTIGATOR.

PUBLISHED BY THE ZETETIC SOCIETY,
With a Preface by the Editor.

Price, Sixpence complete, or single parts 2d. each.

LONDON: W. REEVES, 185, Fleet Street.

Brief Summary of the following Critical Inquiry as to the Scientific accuracy of the popular or generally accepted system of Modern Astronomy, as Mathematically formulated by Sir Isaac Newton.

- I.—The Introductory Statement of the Case.
- II.—Two of the Elementary Definitions of the Newtonian System, *Equinoctial and Ecliptic* will be taken and shown by two simple intersecting lines that it is an utter impossibility for the Earth's Axis to be in two different positions at the same time; hence the utterly irreconcilable contradiction; but as a *fact*, we observe the one in nature, and in effect we have the other: but as it is a simple impossibility that the effect can be due to the Newtonian cause, we have thus another contradiction—indeed about half-a-dozen items of contradiction following in a string which must be patent to the most superficial reasoner.
- III.—Copernicus' method of attempting to prove Earth's Orbital motion will be noticed; then his failure; then the excuse; then that the excuse has no foundation in fact, because the Stars are within a few thousand miles of the Earth.
- IV.—This naturally leads to the method of measuring distances by triangles, which is altogether unavailable until there is some side or portion of a side positively known; so that, although mathematical calculations may be correctly worked with regard to abstract numbers, they are null and void in application, till some positive base be found; and the radius must be known before any *magnitude* can be stated. So with the Triangle; so long as the 3 angles are relatively the same—the Triangle may be indefinitely increased in magnitude without affecting the ratios of its three sides, and therefore results as observed in phenomena prove nothing as to distance until *one* side of the Triangle is known.
- V.—Kepler's three laws are simply a play upon numbers, which it is quite easy to show. If Newton demonstrated their truth, he by the same means upsets the mathematical ratio of radius to circumference, which cannot be admitted for a moment. Newton was not deceived—hence he wrote that his work could be translated into geometrical language, which the professors say is done; then let them refer to the first demonstration and say how the same straight line can at one and the same time occupy two different positions, making an angle of $23\frac{1}{2}$ degrees? Kepler's laws could never have been deduced from his observations, apart from the introduction of a theory! All calculations of Eclipses, &c. are made upon observations and are independent of any Theory. They are dependent upon correct observation of regular motion. All phenomena are explicable upon either theory or motion, whether it be earth or sun which moves. Nearly 2,000 years ago the Arabs calculated the length of the year to within *two minutes* of the time accepted by our professors. And the man to whom alone all other Modern Astronomy is most greatly indebted by his observations, collections, and records—for the power to verify ancient dates, was a *Stationary Earth Theorist*! To conclude by a word of faithful warning addressed separately to the Secularist, the Professor, the Minister of the Gospel, and Society generally.



EDITOR'S PREFACE.

IN introducing the following papers to the mathematical reader as well as to the more general student of scientific literature, we would merely premise that the author's object is to endeavour to disabuse the public mind of the notion that physical science, as it is now taught, is provably based on sound philosophical principles, and also that Sir Isaac Newton, who is generally quoted as the highest authority on these subjects, never ventured to assert or argue that his so-called "solar system" was an accurate description of the divine cosmogony. But, on the contrary, that he took special pains to express the fundamental rule that nothing is to be assumed as a principle, which is not established and verified by universal observation and the testimony of all intelligent minds; and that "no hypothesis is to be admitted into physics, except as a question, the truth of which is to be examined by its agreement with acknowledged facts. Whatever," he said, "was not deduced from facts or visible phenomena was to be called an hypothesis, and hypotheses, whether physical or metaphysical, whether of occult qualities or mechanical, have no place in experimental philosophy."

Nothing can be more clearly or explicitly stated. We never find Newton losing sight of the fact that he was a mathematician, pure and simple. He further insisted that "the main business of the natural philosopher is to argue from facts, without feigning hypotheses, and to deduce causes from effects, if so be we may arrive at the first cause, which is certainly not mechanical."

It was not Newton who first invented the principle of gravitation, in explanation of the "laws" of celestial motion which earlier mystics pretended to have discovered, and who represented the planets as describing

elliptical orbits, in one focus of which was the sun! These men utterly ignored the idea of a Divine Ruler and Regulator of the starry host, and ascribed such motions to the influence of a distinct animating principle or soul, which was supposed to reside in each planet! Pythagoras, the first inventor, was a pagan and a fire worshipper; and because the sun appeared a ball of fire, he deemed it worthy of the principal position in the celestial firmament, and made all the other planets (*the earth included*) swing in terrific orbits round it as their centre! Did the pious Isaac Newton ever venture to insist that this idolatrous notion was a *fact* on which he could demonstrably establish a practical system of cosmogony? Again, it is an undoubted fact that Newton never once, even in the most cursory manner, attempted to refer to, much less refute, the Mosaic and subsequent sacred records, touching the history of the creation! Does not such omission fully justify the idea that he knew that his philosophy had no possible reference to the physical laws of Nature, as they were designed by the Omnipotent Creator? Had he been treating of facts, Newton could not have avoided the attempt to demonstrate the fallacy of a system of physics so expressly relating to, and yet so totally opposed to his own views. No instance was ever known or conceived of a specialist pretending to ignore the teaching or the declarations of a former writer on the same subject! Either it must be argued that Newton was totally ignorant of the existence of such a record of the creation as the Bible contained, or he must have felt that he was in no way concerned about dealing with the actual facts, but was merely engaged in illustrating a parody on the original design, and showing how mathematics could be made to apply to premises of the most conjectural character. He surely was not insane enough to acquiesce seriously in an idolatrous homage to the sun! But he took the problem as he found it, and was far too nobly disposed to venture to come into collision with the designs of the Creator, or to distort, or improve upon, or pretend to devise the method, by which the laws of Nature were regulated

or had been brought into operation by the only Being capable of such a description or such a design.

If we understand the object of the following papers, the author will contend that nothing but the grossest ignorance of the true principles of philosophy, as laid down by Newton himself, could have prompted the adoption of his mathematical system, as a true and accurate description of the terrestrial physics. If the so-called religious world is content to accept the pagan blasphemy of the idolator Pythagoras, and, for no other reason than he assigned, to regard the sun as the chief and central body, to which all heaven and earth must be subservient, we must say that the infidel and the sceptic are far more consistent in their rejection of the inspired volume, which is expressly ignored and superseded by the Christian to make room for the higher authority of a Kepler or a Galileo and their modern satellites, and which even the Romish cardinals so nobly and sternly condemned! while, for the past 200 years, the so-called Protestant churches have openly endorsed the impious heresies of the sun worshippers, and presumptuously and ignorantly denounced the righteous protests of the only true defenders of the inspired records, from that day to the present.

P.S.—Many are advocating the propriety of teaching little boys and girls the lives of the reformers and other Protestant literature. If they take our advice they will instruct them in the philosophy of the Scriptures and require them to furnish answers to the following questions:—

I. In what part of the Bible is the suggestion made of the earth being a globe, or in motion, or having any sort of connexion with the celestial system?

II. Why are the words "earth" and "world" used over 600 times without any reference to, or suggestion made of, such a curious configuration? Did the Almighty Himself, or did any of the sacred historians, know of this peculiar configuration and of the other conditions inseparable from it?

III. If so, were they seeking to mislead or were they, from the Creator downwards, ignorant of such a phenomenon?

IV. If the method and details of the creation were divinely conveyed to Moses, it could not have been narrated on the authority of any human historian, for none such existed. If, therefore, Moses misrepresented those facts, the misrepresentations must have been conveyed to him by the Almighty Himself!

V. But, is it not marvellously strange, that for the past 6,000 years, no single scientist has ventured to deliberately dispute and disprove any one of the philosophical facts specified by the Hebrew historian?

NOTE.—Lucretius, who was nearly contemporary with Pythagoras, 300 or 400 years before the Christian era, in his work *De Rerum Natura*, thus expressed his views on the philosophy of the Pythagoreans:—"The earth, which was formed of heavy particles, is situated in the middle of the world. Nor is there any point within the earth which is the centre of gravity, for all heavy bodies fall in parallel lines, there being, as in the universe so on the earth, one region above and another below. The doctrine that there are upon the earth antipodes is therefore false. The earth is in the form of a circular plane; it is preserved from falling by a substratum or substance with which it is congenial, and upon which, therefore, it does not press; their mutual action destroying the effects of gravity."

Goethe, the greatest of all poets, gives his opinion on modern astronomy in the following lines:—"In whatever way or manner may have occurred this business, I must still say that I curse this modern theory of cosmogony, and hope that perchance there may appear in due time some young scientist of genius who will pick up courage enough to upset this universally disseminated delirium of lunatics. The most terrible thing in all this is that one is obliged to repeatedly hear the assurance that all the physicists adhere to the same opinion on this question. But one who is acquainted with men knows how it is done: good, intellectual, and courageous heads adorn their minds with such an idea for the sake of its popularity; they gather followers and pupils, and thus form a literary power; their idea is finally worked out, exaggerated, and with a passionate impulse is forced upon society."

Last of all, let us hear Newton himself. Speaking on his own mathematical system, he says, "It is, however, inconceivable that inanimate brute matter should, without the mediation of something else which is not material, operate upon and affect other matter *without mutual contact*. That gravity should be innate, inherent, and essential to matter, so that one body may act upon another, is to me so great an absurdity, that I believe no man, who in philosophical matters has a competent faculty for thinking, can ever fall into it."

After this, would any one venture to say that Newton intended his mathematical system to be regarded as an exposition of physical truth? And the University of Cambridge is seriously compromised by the wilful concealment of facts which it must know would so entirely alter the impression now left on the public mind with respect to the Newtonian philosophy.

Were it not for the apparently insurmountable and un-English cowardice of the public press, and the university journals in particular, this baseless fiction could not last as many weeks as it has done years. No other branch of science in the world, that did not feel it was perpetrating a hoax, would display such an abject dread of inquiry and discussion.

The *Cambridge Review* lately made some insolent remarks about the Zetetic Society, and, in the most cowardly manner, refused to insert any reply, or offer any apology for its vulgar wit. It is thus the real truth seekers are duped into submission to the most pernicious fables; and indeed truth on any subject, if, as is generally the case, it runs counter to popular ignorance or prejudice, is boycotted and stifled. Our very Protestantism is a sham, and all evangelistic agency must be carried on under the most adverse circumstances, so long as this pagan superstition is encouraged both in the schoolroom in the current literature of the day. And if rampant paganism and infidelity ever again prevail in this country, it will be through the direct influence of the mongrel Protestantism now so vigorously promoted.

Professor Elmsley has recently written an article in *The Young Man*, for February, "How to Study the

Bible," and in the course of his remarks he asserts:—
 "Everything in the Bible is not of equal authority; physical truth, science, and philosophy are not to be looked for. What it contains is a message from God's heart to our heart."

Now, we most dogmatically affirm that the very reverse of the above is the truth! If the professor is right, every man must be a credulous dupe who believes one single verse in the Bible. There is only a very small portion of it which "contains a message from God's heart to our heart." The very commencement of it is an account of the creation; and unless it is true, in every single particular, the whole volume is a tissue of fables and fictions; and our Huxleys, and Spencers, and Bradlaughs, and Ingersolls are our truest friends for exposing its unreliable and pernicious character. Professor Elmslie ought to be thoroughly ashamed to be found in such company and just repeating word for word, the pernicious blasphemy they do not scruple to utter. We are amazed and confounded that Christian ministers should so dishonour the Word of God! The mere suggestion that any philosopher can tell us more of God and His works than Moses and the other inspired historians shows a condition of ignorance and unbelief which is almost incredible.

If neither the theologian, scientific, or educational professor has intelligence or moral courage enough to determine the truth or otherwise of our remarks and the baseless character of the system we condemn, our armies and navies and coast defences are merely attempting to resist the approaching judgments of God, in doing which they will utterly and signally fail! Let the nation then, know what it has to expect, and the terrible guilt of allowing the infidel and the agnostic to set aside the teaching of GOD'S WRITTEN WORD.

NOTE II.—So little confidence did Sir Isaac Newton entertain with respect to the *Principia*, that had it not been for the persistent earnestness of Dr. E. Halley, who voluntarily undertook to issue it at his own expense and to revise all its proofs, this wonderful medley of squares and angles would never have been

given to the world. This fact has only very recently come to our knowledge. But it serves to confirm what we have long maintained, that Newton's innate candour and love of truth would have resisted and did resist, as far as possible, the impression that his mathematical works were to be accepted as statements of physical facts. (See the Minutes of the Royal Society for June, 1687.)—EDITOR.

MODERN ASTRONOMY.

THE NEWTONIAN SYSTEM. IS IT SCIENTIFIC?

PART I.

Discussion respecting the principles which regulate the Natural Phenomena of the heavens has probably existed throughout the entire historic period. Speaking generally and admitting slight variations, the gist of the subject would turn upon the question as to whether the earth is a stationary object relatively to the heavenly objects, and, specially with regard to the sun? or the reverse, whether the fabric of the heavens in general, and the sun in particular, be stationary with respect to the earth? In a simpler form is it the earth or the sun which is in motion?

It may be a matter of indifference to the great body of the community, which view may be held by men of culture and leisure; but in our own day the question has come to assume a very practical bearing, through the action of a section of the community, the secularists. This body is revolutionary in its objects, and expects to be yet in the ascendant. It so happens there is a book comprising the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, the Bible, whose teachings are not very favourable to the spirit of their designs. Men's belief in the Bible is a sore obstacle. One of their lecturers declared that "when he had converted a man to Freethinking in Religion he had no more anxiety about such an one, as he knew he would *vote right* politically.(a)

(a) Lecture by G. W. Foote, subject: "An Hour in Hell," delivered at Cardiff, about the early part of 1887.

Hence their aim is to undermine the authority of the book; so in another lecture it was declared "that the statements of the Bible upon subjects of Modern Science were utterly childish by the side of the statements of Modern Science." (b)

The term Science was not defined, neither was a case in point introduced. Without irreverence, it may be asked, if the Bible be not true, do we really require it?

The secularist thus puts the Bible in antagonism to Modern Science; and in presuming upon the issue of a conflict being undoubtedly in favour of Science, considers he has a strong vantage ground for his especial purpose.

The intention in this series of papers is to take the Secularist upon his own ground; to neither ask nor grant any other favour than a fair field for the conduct of a candid examination, allowing nothing but the most impartial enquiry.

Truth itself fears no inquiry: creeds or theories may totter.

The method of procedure is simple; we have to find a suitable case, illustrating the lecturer's declaration, *i.e.*, if such case can be found, or it may be put thus, we have to find a case in which a bible statement is in opposition to modern scientific theory.

We have it in the Book of Joshua, ch., x. verses 12, 13, 14.

It is here stated that "The Sun Stood Still" or according to the revised version, "And the sun stayed in the midst of Heaven." This supposes the sun to be in motion, and therefore it would be deemed "childish" because modern Astronomy teaches that the *sun is still*, relatively to the earth.

The Apologist for the bible would be ready with the reply that the book was not intended to teach science, that upon such subjects it spoke in language adapted to the apprehension of those to whom the words were

(b) Lecture by Mrs. Besant, subject: "Why I do not believe the Bible," delivered at Cardiff, January, 1887.

addressed. But if a prior postulate be admitted to the effect that all Scripture was given by inspiration of God, then the inevitable conflict of the nineteenth century would have been foreseen. Another would rejoin, that the translation is faulty; that the original Hebrew should have been rendered "Solar Light" instead of "Sun." But when we and our utmost surroundings are enveloped in light is it possible for us to mark its progress apart from the direct rays emanating from the object which emits the light? Also the phrases "upon the mountain" and "midst of heaven" would imply high day, how under such circumstances could the progress of moonlight be marked? For the "moon stayed" also. If solar light stayed, so also would moonlight; but if moonlight would be invisible under such conditions, it was the moon which stayed; and if the moon itself be understood why not the sun be taken to mean that luminary itself?

Now look at the statement itself; not less than four times is that statement *virtually* made; there is reference to another book as being corroborative, there are the marks or elements of precision, and there was abundant testimony. Would any modern judge in law dare to rule out of court evidence of such a character?

If we are uncertain as to the requirement of a *literal* interpretation in this case, why not close the book altogether? Without irreverence it may be asked, of what use to us is the Bible, if we cannot be sure that we understand what we read.

There is in this passage no difficulty to the truth-seeker; but there may be difficulty to him who endeavours to harmonise two opposites.

We spontaneously concede to the Secularist the *literal* rendering of that passage, "That the sun stood still." We freely admit it is in opposition to modern astronomy on the point. Therefore, the next question to be settled—is modern astronomy scientific?

In selecting this we have chosen, perhaps, the strongest possible case in the Secularist's favour.

The Newtonian system is accepted by the leading nations and the chief men of learning throughout the civilised world. It is said to be founded upon the

strictest mathematical demonstration. Mathematical pursuits demand the highest mental training. The mathematician claims to present truth, and also by his construction of a body of results, to exhibit the effect of any error in the premises, as also to distinguish between certainty and mere probability in the premises; he glories in his occupation as a study in which self-interest can neither lay down the premises nor deduce conclusions.

By his methods of calculating distance, the astronomer lays down the rules and details of navigation; and in the matter of time, not a day is lost in verifying the dates of events in calculating backwards for some thousands of years.

It is said the untrained cannot comprehend the operations of the mathematician; and therefore the great mass of the community must needs accept his results without question.

Yet let the untrained be of good cheer. No less an authority in logic than J. S. Mill has written that "Drawing inferences is the business of life," meaning thereby that correct conclusions are reached even by those who do not happen to proceed according to formal scholastic methods. Professor Huxley has said concerning science, "that its mode of investigation which yields such wonderful results to the scientific investigator is in no wise different in kind from that employed for the commonest purposes of every day existence: that science is simply common sense at its best, that it is rigidly accurate in observation, and merciless to fallacy in logic."

Such statements of leading men of to-day were anticipated by our forefathers in a practical manner, as exemplified in that institution of our land, Trial by jury, which assumes upon the part of the individuals of the mass of the nation, ability to bring in a verdict according to evidence.

The common weal demands that the professor tender evidence in the case before us, in a form suited to the comprehension of an intelligent though technically untrained jury: that he regard himself as subpoenaed at the instance of the Secularist: that he be careful to

state "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," when under cross examination.

We have found one case in which the Bible statement conflicts with modern theory; we have now to enquire as to the definition of the term "Science."

It is said to be derived from the latin *scientia*, knowledge: We have it thus, 1st, knowledge; 2nd, connected knowledge; *i.e.*, 3rd knowledge, wherein conclusions are demonstrably connected with the premises. So that knowledge may be simple in character at the outset, or it may be profound, when embodying results which have been attained only at the end of many laborious, intervening, connected steps.

But what are "premises?"

That which evidence is to the juryman, or a foundation to the builder, such is the premis or premises to the reasoner. It is the starting point, or the material out of which all that follows is evolved, or rests upon. But the testimony may be either false or true: the foundation either of rock, or sand: and the premises may be

(a) Axiomatic—or self-evident.

(b) Postulated—*i.e.*, agreed upon, for the sake of the argument, irrespective of either truth or falsity, in the first instance.

(c) Or the premises may be positive, that is certain; or merely probable, not really ascertained or hypothetical, *i.e.*, assumed apart from any proof, as if true.

Hence we see at a glance how the value of the conclusions must be affected by the nature of the premises. We may also thus perceive that the reasoning process itself, or the science of operation may be conducted quite correctly, and yet the conclusions be of no practical value, because starting from premises having no foundation in fact! Hence the difference in character between real knowledge and the merely pretentious, between true philosophy and sophistry.

Therefore, let us be ever careful to examine well premises and definitions of terms, lest we handle a weapon which shall eventually pierce our own hand.

As pertaining to modern astronomy what is the character of the premises?

As exemplified in its assumptions, they are not (a) self-evident. Human intelligence, generally, does not exhibit the spontaneous conception of the law of gravitation. This was the product of a master mind.

(b) Neither is the law of gravitation positively ascertained to exist, for though an apple may fall to earth from the tree, though lead may sink in water—yet cork floats in the liquid water, and the balloon filled with hydrogen gas ascends in the fluid air. So that equilibrium (equal balance) may be equally entitled to be regarded as the “law,” ever constant, as much so as gravitation; with this much in its favour, that equilibrium is ascertained to exist as a fact in nature.

(c) Hence the Newtonian premise of gravitation is but hypothetical, simply an assumption, without verification, by the discovery of any supporting fact, so far as we are aware, notwithstanding the boasted experiment of the Schehallien mountain, and others of a like kind, more recently made.

Thus the scientist may effect a transition from knowledge the positive, to bold assumption as characterising his premises, in his definition of the term science. Hence his definition is quite arbitrary, and may be quite worthless as to arriving at positive conclusions!

But let us accept for the sake of the argument his own definition of the term science, viz., “Conclusions demonstrably connected with premises.”

Now then, is Modern Astronomy Scientific? We have then to grant gravitation, as an all-pervading law, in the solar system, at least:—

Earth’s sphericity:—its axial and orbital motions:—

The sun, as the relatively fixed centre of our system:—

The planetary motions, as deduced by Kepler and alleged to be demonstrated by Sir Isaac Newton. And we have to confront the fact that the Copernican, otherwise called the Newtonian system, or Modern Astronomy, is regarded by the professor of physics as being incontrovertibly established.

In the succeeding numbers we will commence the examination of the evidence.

INVESTIGATOR.

SCIENCE IN THE BIBLE.

It was said in our hearing that the Bible is not scientific. We thought at the time, and still think, that the man who made this statement knew little about science, and less about what the Bible contains; because the Bible contains more science, than any other book in the world! For example, within the covers of the Bible there are the following great scientific facts, which we cannot find in any book of astronomy in the world!

1. Every eclipse of the sun, whether total, annular, or partial.

2. Every eclipse of the moon, whether total or partial and the time when they have occurred, or will occur.

3. Every transit of the planet Mercury.

4. Every transit of the planet Venus, both in her ascending and descending nodes.

To the above we will add, that if any man can tell us where these astronomical phenomena can be obtained without the Bible, we shall be glad to hear from him. We remember, about seven years ago, being very anxious to obtain the dates of two particular transits of Mercury, and enquired at the Greenwich Observatory for the information. But we could not get it, and should be without it this day if we had not subsequently found everything we wanted in the Bible, by which we were not only able to find the dates, but also to construct a table of the transits of that planet from creation to those we now see, and onwards for a long time to come.

We do not mean that any one of the above impressive and sublime events are definitely stated; because, if that were so, the simpleton we have alluded to would not have hazarded his statement. But we affirm that the means are provided in the Bible for tracing and tabulating *all of them*, and in such a particular and marked way, that you not only find them, but also see what is their special character.

This is scientific information which surpasses any other book in the world, while the character and practical utility of the information is the most sublime and the highest science which the human mind has yet reached. Had all the astronomy in the world been as good as that in the Bible, we should not have had 13 different systems of time amongst mankind, but we should have had only one—that system by which time alone is produced—the motions of the heavenly bodies.
—“*All Past Time.*”

UNMASK THE SCOFFERS.

WE do not know a more hypocritical class of men than that which sneers at Scripture in the name of science. Nor can we see how men can expect to be regarded as intelligent, when they discredit the genuineness of Scripture history, which they have never investigated. This statement is not one of mere words, because we are justified in making it, owing to the fact that it is true science which now forms Biblical history. But we have waited in vain, when we have asked those who make random assertions in print against the Pentateuch, or any other part of Scripture, to put their arguments in writing and work them out in figures. They cannot do so! Time, in respect of history, is successive production; and, like arithmetic, is a fundamental science, being capable of neither addition or reduction. A man would be laughed at who asserted that the number of minutes in an hour could be either increased or diminished, because an hour is an astronomical portion of time and a true part of a greater period, produced moment by moment by planetary motion. In what way, then, but as an ignorant man, can a person dispute Biblical time?

What, then, are we to say of the men who have attempted to delude mankind—and, forsooth, in the name of stern science—with the idea that the periods, years, and dates of Scripture are “inventions,” “poetic history,” and belong only to “religious enthusiasts.”

Such calumniators thrust out their tongues against the movements of the orbs of heaven. The conduct of a man of this kind is most despicable, and we are determined to strip the wretch of his borrowed plumes. He is a scientific juggler and a deceiver, who puts his finger in derision, or doubt, on one of the historical statements of Scripture.

For many years now have these men attempted, in the name of Science, to impugn the accuracy of Scripture history. They have succeeded with some men, but the great mass of Christians have rightly refused their unfounded assertions, and with much commendation have waited until the time has arrived when all Biblical periods, years, and dates, have become capable of demonstration, by the deductions of the very science which has falsely been used against them.

We affirm—and are always ready to show by figures—that from the “first day of 0 A.M., of the period known as creation to the present day, there is an unbroken line of astronomical time, agreeing with all Biblical statements, which it is not possible for any man to challenge. Instead of maligning the Bible, these deceivers and pretended scientists ought to rejoice in a Book which now proves itself to be the Log Book of the world.

Great discredit, we must add, has been thrown upon science by conduct which we are now rightly condemning. Science is too pure to be sullied by such a “generation of vipers.” Hands off the Sacred page, we would say to such scientific pretenders. Such men are not astronomers, because they do not know the practical use of astronomy. They are mere star-gazers, to whom the great clock-like mechanism of the heavens is unknown. The Great Architect of the Heavens and the Author of Scripture is one; and hence the time of of both one and the other is the same.

J. B. DIMBLEBY

6K90129962



A VINDICATION

— OF —

THE DIVINE AUTHORITY

— AND —

INSPIRED ACCURACY

OF THE

MOSAIC COSMOGONY

AND

SCRIPTURAL PHILOSOPHY GENERALLY ;

INSISTING ON

The Positive and Implacable Antagonism

BETWEEN

MODERN SCIENCE & THE BIBLE

AND THE

Insufficiency of the Laws of Nature ;

WITH A BRIEF DIGEST OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE
APOSTLES, AS UNDERSTOOD BY ALL EVANGELICAL
PROTESTANTS.

By **JOHN DOVE, M.A.,**
1757.

COLLATED AND RE-PUBLISHED

By the **Biblical Science Defence Association.**

Editor & Secretary, **JOHN HAMPDEN, 3, Park Street, Croydon.**

1888.

PRICE FOURPENCE.