

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY

DR. TORREY

AND

THE BIBLE

FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

THE PIONEER PRESS
2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

1905

DR. TORREY AND THE BIBLE

INTRODUCTION

DR. TORREY has been conducting Missions in the principal cities of Great Britain and Ireland. He is now conducting the great Albert Hall Mission in the metropolis. He hopes to "save" London: and he believes that if he saves London he will save the world—which is probably true.

The regular Christian preachers take a back seat now that Dr. Torrey is in London. According to the secretary of the Albert Hall Mission, it is intended that the people of this metropolis shall have a chance of hearing the Gospel fairly and squarely laid before them. Now this is very interesting. London swarms with churches and chapels, to say nothing of mission rooms and Sunday schools; it has thousands of professional teachers of Christianity—Catholic priests, Church clergymen, Nonconformist ministers, and Salvation Army officers; these are all engaged week by week, and year after year, in preaching the Gospel to the inhabitants of this mighty city; yet it has been thought necessary to bring a hustling American revivalist to London, at a cost of £17,000, in order to give its citizens a chance of having this very Gospel presented to them. Can you imagine anything more wonderful?

We are told that most of the Christian Churches of London—with the exception, of course, of the Roman Catholic Church—are promoting the Albert Hall Mission or have given it their blessing. It seems, therefore, to be a co-operative enterprise; and, on this understanding, one is entitled to ask whether the leading men in those Churches endorse Dr. Torrey's teachings, especially in relation to the Bible.

You will see that this is a most important point. What the American revivalist may think about theatres, dancing,

and such things, is insignificant in comparison. The Bible is the Holy Scripture of the Christian religion. A Christian cannot exist or be conceived without it. The Bible is his Word of God. This is what all Christians say; and if they say no more you might fancy they were all agreed. But they do say more. They differ as to *how* the Bible is the Word of God. Dr. Torrey says one thing on this point, and men like General Booth and Father Ignatius agree with him. But the leading men in most of the Churches do *not* agree with him. Many things in the Bible which he regards as absolutely true they regard as legends and fictions; and some of the things which he defends as the highest morality they abandon as plain savagery.

Now if people call the Bible the Word of God, and yet read its contents so differently, is it not absurd to say that they agree simply because they use the same shibboleth?

What we ask the reader to do is to follow us in a brief examination of Dr. Torrey's views on the Bible, and a comparison of them with the views of men of light and leading in the Christian Churches. And before we finish we think they will see that he is fifty years behind the time in the matter of Biblical criticism—just as he is more than fifty years behind in the matter of modesty, charity, and philosophy.

THE STORY OF GENESIS

Dr. Torrey is the author of a little work on *Hard Problems of Scripture*, and its opening section deals with "The First Chapter of Genesis." It starts as follows:—

"One of the favorite points of attack upon the Bible by infidels is its opening chapter. It is said that the teachings of this chapter are proven to be absurd by the assured conclusions of modern science."

This is denied by Dr. Torrey, who tries to refute it. But before we deal with his attempted refutation let us see how other Christians look upon the story of Genesis.

It is safe to say that there is not a single scholar in any Christian Church who regards the Bible story of creation as possessing any scientific value. Consequently these scholars must be included amongst the "infidels" at whom Dr. Torrey is so fond of railing. Not only Churchmen like Canon

Driver, Bishop Gore, Professor Sanday, and the late Dean Farrar, but Nonconformists like the Rev. Dr. Horton, the Rev. R. J. Campbell, the Rev. Dr. John Clifford, and the Rev. Dr. Guinness Rogers, would laugh at Dr. Torrey's denunciation of the "infidels" who have no respect for the "science" of the first chapter of Genesis. They are such "infidels" themselves. And the fact ought to be told to the people who flock to Dr. Torrey's Mission.

Bishop Gore, of Birmingham, calls the story of the Creation and the Fall of Man a "myth or allegorical picture" (*Lux Mundi*, p. 357). Dean Farrar makes a sweeping admission which covers this point and a great deal more.

"The knowledge of the writers of Scripture on the subject of exact science was simply the human and individual knowledge of those writers, and that was the knowledge, or rather the ignorance, of the most unscientific of all nations in the most unscientific of all ages. To the Hebrews by whom the greater part of the Bible was written science was unknown; their immemorial habits of thought were wholly alien from the scientific spirit" (*The Bible: its Meaning and Supremacy*, pp. 146, 147).

Dean Farrar treated the Genesiac story of the origin of things as an "allegory" or a "philosopheme." This is the view now taken by all well-informed persons, although the story may have been regarded as literally true by the ancient Jews, as it was until quite recently by the modern Christians. Even the great Sir Oliver Lodge, the Principal of the new Birmingham University, in his recent reply to Professor Haeckel, refers as a matter of course to "the old Genesis legend" and "legends of apples and serpents and the like" (*Hibbert Journal*, January 1905, p. 329).

This is the attitude of all decently educated people nowadays. But it is not the attitude of Dr. Torrey. He defends the scientific character of the first chapter of Genesis. Let us see how he does it.

His first answer to the "infidels" is that the Bible use of the word day is not limited to periods of twenty-four hours" but is "frequently used for a period of time of undefined

length." To prove this he refers to four texts in which the expression "that day" is used as meaning "that age" or "those times." But what trifling this is! There was no need to refer to texts at all. Everyone knows that when a man says "in my day" he does not mean "in my twenty-four hours." Words have often a primary meaning and a secondary meaning; a literal meaning and a metaphorical meaning; and which is intended in any particular place is to be determined by the context. Now the first chapter of Genesis not only speaks of six *days* of Creation, but it keeps saying that "the evening and the morning were the first day," the second day, the third day, and so on to the end of the narrative. It is this that fixes the meaning of the word "day" in the present instance. But the great Dr. Torrey did not think it worth mentioning.

Dr. Torrey proceeds to administer another dig in the ribs to the "infidels."

"It is further urged against the credibility of the account of Creation given in Gen. i. that 'it speaks of there being light before the sun existed, and it is absurd to think of light before the sun, the source of light.' The one who says this displays his ignorance of modern science. Anyone who is familiar with the nebular hypothesis, commonly accepted among scientific men to-day, knows that there was cosmic light ages before the sun was a separate body."

This is mere trifling. What the Bible says is that evening and morning, which involve day and night, existed on this earth three days before God made the sun; while school-boys now know that the earth is a child of the sun, and that night and day depend upon the earth's revolution in its orbit around the centre of the system to which it belongs. The Bible also says that vegetation, including fruit trees, was brought into existence before the sun. Are we to suppose, then, that the apples and oranges were grown in "cosmic light"? Or is Dr. Torrey—a native of the land of Artemus Ward and Mark Twain—playing off an elaborate joke upon the innocent Britishers?

Will it be believed that, after dwelling on "the marvellous accord of the order of creation given in Genesis with that worked out by the best scientific investigation,"

Dr. Torrey gives the show away by declaring his opinion that Genesis does not relate the history of creation at all? Here are his own words:—

“There is grave reason to doubt if anything in Genesis i. after verse 1 relates to the original creation of the universe. It seems rather to refer to the refitting of a world that had been created and afterwards plunged into chaos by the sin of some pre-Adamic race to the abode of the present race that inhabits it—the Adamic race.”

Thus the great American revivalist saws off the bough of the tree on which he has been sitting. At the same time he displays his wonderful knowledge of up-to-date science. His friends should really ask him to state in what standard work on biology or anthropology they may find an account of the “Adamic race.” It would also be interesting to know what the “pre-Adamic races” were like. And while Dr. Torrey is about it he might tell us what men of science teach that the world was ever “plunged into chaos.” He might even tell us in what scientific book, or what dictionary of scientific terms, the word “chaos” is to be found.

CAIN'S WIFE

Dr. Torrey starts the second section of the little work we are criticising with another dig at the “infidels.” This is what he says:—

“One of the favorite questions with infidels of a certain class is ‘Where did Cain get his wife?’ I have also met many young Christians who have been greatly puzzled and perplexed over this question.”

“Infidels” do not spend their time over this question. It is clear that Dr. Torrey knows nothing about them. It is also clear that the “young Christians” he meets with possess little education and intelligence. Only the ignorant believe in the actual existence of Cain or Cain’s wife nowadays,

Dr. Torrey puts in a bit of buffoonery about “a sceptic” who came to him to ask where Cain got his wife. With the keen instinct of his profession, Dr. Torrey asked him “Isn’t there something wrong with your life?” And it soon transpired that “the real difficulty was not about Cain’s wife, but about another man’s wife.” Such is the character,

and such is the fate, of "sceptics" in Dr. Torrey's farthing novelettes.

The upshot of Dr. Torrey's discussion of the Cain's wife episode is that "Cain married his own sister." Precisely so. That is what the "infidels" have always said. They have also said that Cain's marriage with his sister throws the stain of incest upon the cradle of the human race—which might have been obviated if Jehovah had created *two* first pairs of human beings instead of *one*. But this objection is not noted by Dr. Torrey. He prefers to answer what nobody says.

According to the Bible story the second generation of human beings—the offspring of Adam and Eve's children—were all first cousins. This leads Dr. Torrey to observe that "the intermarriage of cousins is fraught with frightful consequences," but "in the dawn of human history it was not so." Well, he knows as much about the dawn of human history as he knows about present human history. The "frightful consequences" he refers to are imaginary—as he would know if he were acquainted with the researches of Francis Darwin and others on this subject.

HUMAN SACRIFICES

This is the heading of the third section of Dr. Torrey's work. He complains that "the enemies of the Bible" have tried to make capital out of the story of Abraham and Isaac. But he also admits that "not a few Christians have been bewildered and distressed by this story."

It is urged by Dr. Torrey that Abraham was not ordered to "kill Isaac" but to "offer him." Could anything be more ridiculous? The story is serious enough in the Bible, but Dr. Torrey reduces it to a pantomime. He admits that Isaac was bound upon the altar and "presented to God as a whole offering," yet he contends—although he does not say it in so many words—that Abraham had no idea that his son was to be actually offered up as a sacrifice. But in that case the whole proceeding was an utter farce. We are told that it was a trial of Abraham's faith; and what sort of a trial could it be if there were no apprehension of danger to Isaac?

Dr. Torrey deals in the same fashion with the story of

Jephthah. "We are nowhere told," he says, "that Jephthah did burn his daughter." Well, the words mean that, or they mean nothing. Jephthah was going forth to fight the Ammonites. Before he went "the spirit of the Lord" came upon him.

"And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands,

"Then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering" (Judges xi. 30, 31).

Jephthah came back victorious, and his daughter came out to meet him. She was his only child, and he loved her, but he could not go back upon his word, and he "did with her according to his vow."

It is difficult to imagine anything plainer. If the Bible does not mean that Jephthah sacrificed his daughter as a burnt offering to the Lord, we may as well put it on the top shelf as a book of puzzles.

Dr. Torrey says that the Hebrew word translated "burnt offering" simply means "offering" and "does not necessarily involve the thought of burning." But is it fair to raise such a point before a popular audience? How are they to be judges as to the proper translation of Hebrew? The English Bible says "burnt offering." And this is in harmony with the Mosaic Law; for, according to Leviticus xxvii. 28, 29, both lower animals and human beings devoted to the Lord were not to be redeemed, but "surely be put to death."

Canon Cook, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, says that "whatsoever" in Jephthah's vow should be "whosoever," that Jephthah intended his vow "to apply to human beings not animals," and that the original words "preclude any other meaning than that Jephthah contemplated a human sacrifice."

Dr. Torrey may reply that he prefers his own version. But what right has he to dogmatise in opposition to scholars of far greater reputation than himself?

Josephus, the Jewish historian, distinctly says that Jephthah "sacrificed his daughter as a burnt offering." All the early Christian fathers—including St. Ambrose, St.

Jerome, and St. Chrysostom—took the same view. The great Catholic theologian, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Calmet, the famous Catholic scholar, follow this opinion. So does the Protestant historian of the Jews, Dean Milman, who laughs at the idea that Jephthah's daughter spent the rest of her days in a kind of convent, and says "it is certain that vows of celibacy were totally unknown among the Hebrews." Bishop Warburton, the learned author of the *Divine Legation of Moses*, poured contempt on the efforts of the Dr. Torreys of his day, who advanced all sorts of theories in preference to admitting that Jephthah's daughter was burnt on the altar of Jehovah. "Solutions like these," he said, "expose sacred scripture to the scorn and derision of unbelievers."

Jephthah's vow had its parallels in Pagan history or legend. One of the best known instances is that of Agamemnon, who led the Greeks in the war against Troy, and immolated his daughter Iphigenia to appease the gods, and procure favorable winds for the fleet which was detained at Aulis.

What is certain is that the Jews were a Semitic people, and that all the Semitic gods were ravenous for human victims. Nor is it reasonable to expect the Jehovah of early Jewish history to be any better than the other deities of whom he is said to have been "jealous." Tolstoy calls him a "terrible and wicked monster," and the ancient annals of the Jews, as preserved in the Old Testament, reek with bloodshed and cruelty.

SLAUGHTER OF THE CANAANITES

Bloodshed and cruelty were never worse exemplified than in the Jewish extermination of the original inhabitants of Palestine. In some parts of the country, by Jehovah's express order, the natives were to be butchered indiscriminately. The Jews were to slay all, man, woman, and child, and leave alive nothing that breathed. In other parts cruelty was mixed with lust. Dr. Torrey puts it that "the adult males were to be slain, but the women and children to be spared." "Spared" is a good word, and as Dr. Torrey refers us to Deuteronomy xx. 10-15, we will see what it means.

"But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle,

and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself."

The women were part of the "spoil." The Jews were to "take them unto" themselves. They were to become the wives or concubines of the men who had butchered their fathers, brothers, and husbands. That is how they were "spared."

When the Jews defeated the Midianites they brought "all the women and children" with other spoils of the war "unto Moses," and his orders throw a flood of light on that same "spared."

"Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves" (Numbers xxxi. 17, 18).

That is how they were "spared." The male Jews kept the Midianite virgins for themselves. It may be added that "the Lord's tribute" (verse 40) was thirty-two virgins. What the Lord wanted them for is not very intelligible. No doubt they fell to the share of the priests. Divided between Aaron and Eleazar they would be sixteen apiece—and a veil may be drawn over their fate.

Dr. Torrey defends the slaughter of the Canaanites. He almost rejoices over it. He declares that the command to exterminate them was "a command big with mercy and love." They were not fit to live. They were utterly and irredeemably depraved. Their death was a blessing to the Jews, whom they might have contaminated if they had lived. It was also a blessing to themselves, for the sooner they died the sooner they stopped sinning. This is a point on which Dr. Torrey feels strongly. He says that it is "an act of mercy" to kill children who are likely to grow up vicious. Were it not for the hope that they may awake to the saving Gospel of Christ, Dr. Torrey "could wish that all the babes born in the slums might be slain in infancy." He would kill them out of sheer tenderness—this wonderful American reformer!

But let us pause to ask on what authority we are to believe that the Canaanites were too wicked to be allowed to live? The only authority is that of the very men who

massacred them and took possession of all their property. It reminds us of a committee of butchers sitting in judgment on a flock of sheep. It is a travesty of honor and justice. And a man who defends it in this age of civilisation is absolutely unfit to be a moral teacher of his fellow-men.

There are many Christian divines of all Churches who are now ready to brand as infamous the very things that Dr. Torrey praises as exhibitions of divine benevolence. One instance will suffice to show what we mean. Dean Farrar speaks of the "worse than Armenian atrocities" which the Jews inflicted on their enemies. He denounces the "ghastly-massacre of women and innocent children." He refers to the "miserable pleas which have sometimes been urged in favor of the righteousness of the wars of extermination." But what, he asks, can "excuse the cold-blooded butchery of captive women and innocent little ones, and the retention of others to be slaves and concubines?" And he declares that it was only "in their moral ignorance" that the Israelites could have imagined that "by such deeds they were pleasing God and obeying his commands" (*The Bible*, pp. 75, 76).

Thus it appears that what Dean Farrar regards as atrocious Dr. Torrey regards as a blessing and a mercy. Well, there is no accounting for taste—or the want of it.

IMPURE BIBLE STORIES

This is Dr. Torrey's heading, not ours; it stands over the fifth section of his little book.

There are things in the Bible that its best friends often wish out of it. Dr. Torrey is of a very different opinion. "We may well praise God," he says, "that he has put these things in the Bible." He seems to regard them as the clearest proofs that it is the Word of God.

He takes the position that "the Bible is in part a book of moral anatomy and therapeutics," and that it necessarily "describes sins that cannot wisely be dealt with in a mixed audience." But he argues that "to speak plainly of sin, even the vilest of sins, in order to expose its loathsomeness and in order to picture man as he really is, is not obscenity."

Let it be observed that this is no vindication of a book

which is placed in the hands of children. Does it suffice in the case of adult readers? Let us see.

Suppose we take the story of Lot and his daughters. What is there to redeem its filthiness? Lot's wife was killed for looking back at their burning home, but no condemnation is passed upon the other persons in this delectable narrative. Neither did Josephus, the Jewish historian, condemn them; and his English translator, the Rev. Dr. Whiston, was "not satisfied" that Lot's daughters had acted wrongly "in a case which appeared to them of unavoidable necessity."

Who can discern the slightest moral lesson in this disgusting story? Its real object can be stated in a few words. The Moabites and the Ammonites were hereditary enemies of the Jews; and the Jewish annalists represented Moab and Ammon, the supposed founders of those two nations, as having been the fruit of incest between a drunken old man and his beastly daughters. It was a "patriotic" libel on the hated foreigners.

Dr. Farrar pleads that the "coarseness" of the Bible must be excused on the ground of its Oriental origin. What shocks the modern Western mind "gave no such shock to ancient and Eastern readers." This, of course, is a rational plea, as far as it goes. At least it recognises the difficulty. Dr. Farrar even admits that "There are other passages of Scripture, happily disguised by the euphemism of translations, which, if their exact meaning were understood, could not be read without a blush" (*The Bible*, p. 221).

Dr. Torrey thinks he helps his case by a foul-mouthed attack on "infidels." Part of it is a disgraceful libel on the late Colonel Ingersoll, which we are dealing with in a companion pamphlet to this one. The temper of this American apostle of the religion of Christ is displayed in the following sentence:—

"The child who is brought up on infidel literature and conversation is the easiest prey there is to the seducer and the procuress."

"Infidels"—by which he means Secularists, Freethinkers, Agnostics, Rationalists, and even Deists—can afford to smile at the convulsions of this malignant mountebank.

Even if "infidels" were *all* wicked, and ten times *more* wicked than Dr. Torrey represents them, it would not prove that a black spot in the Bible is white. Dr. Torrey has mistaken the argument.

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE BIBLE

Most of Dr. Torrey's sixth section is occupied with a farcical tale of one of the many "infidels" he has put to shame. This particular "infidel" was great on Bible contradictions, and Dr. Torrey found him looking for the book of Psalms in the New Testament!

The Higher Critics admit that there are plenty of contradictions in the Bible. But they do not stand up for its verbal inspiration. Dr. Torrey does, and he will not admit any contradictions at all. He takes the New Testament text, "No man hath seen God at any time," and the Old Testament text to the effect that Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy elders, went up a mountain and "saw the God of Israel." This "certainly looks like a flat contradiction," he says, but he devotes two pages to showing that it is not so. Those who have a taste for verbal jugglery may follow him in this argument. We regard it as beneath contempt.

CHRIST'S THREE DAYS IN THE GRAVE

Dr. Torrey's seventh section is of no importance. His eighth section deals with the difficulty of understanding how Jesus spent "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" between late on Friday afternoon and early on Sunday morning. Dr. Torrey soon settles this difficulty. He affirms that Jesus was crucified on Wednesday. This leaves three clear days—and where's the trouble then?

This beautiful theory is based upon the statement in John xix. 14 that the day on which Jesus was tried and crucified was "the preparation of the Passover." But the three other Gospels represent Jesus as having already eaten of the Passover with his disciples before his arrest. Dr. Torrey describes this as one of the "false impressions" they conveyed. He says that John wrote later than the other Evangelists, with "an evident intention to correct false im-

pressions that one might get from reading the other gospels." Here then is one of those Bible contradictions which we were told did not exist. John is on one side; Matthew, Mark, and Luke are on the other; and, when the great Dr. Torrey jumps into the scale with John, the other scale—with three against two in it—soon kicks the beam.

This method of solving Bible difficulties is bound to succeed—if the audience will stand it. And it must be allowed that Dr. Torrey's audiences are expected to stand a good deal.

JONAH AND THE WHALE

Dr. Torrey complains that the story of Jonah is "a favorite butt of ridicule with unbelievers," and he proceeds with a long face to argue that it is true in every detail—barring the whale. The animal that took Jonah in out of the wet is called a whale in the New Testament, but the Greek word means a "sea monster." Any other person than Dr. Torrey would see that this is a very insignificant point. The wonder of Jonah's three-days submarine excursion still remains.

While on the subject of "sea monsters" Dr. Torrey tickles his readers' bump of wonder. Let us hear him:—

"It is recorded that a man fell overboard in the Mediterranean and was swallowed by one of these sea monsters, the monster killed, and the man rescued alive. A whole horse was taken out of the belly of another.

It is recorded! Dr. Torrey might have told us where. Was it in an American journal—in the silly season?

Whether the "whale" swallowed Jonah, or Jonah swallowed the whale, it is evident that Dr. Torrey is prepared to swallow both. He says that anyone who believes in an Almighty Being

"will have no difficulty in believing that he could without the least difficulty prepare a fish with a mouth and a throat big enough to swallow not only Jonah, but the whole ship too, and with a belly capacious enough to furnish Jonah with all the space and air needed for three days and three nights' lodging, even without occasionally coming to the top of the water for ventilation."

What a swallow! Nearly as large as Dr. Torrey's. And what physiology! Fancy air enough for Jonah to breathe in safety for seventy-two hours, when an average man would exhaust a tank of air eight feet each way in a few minutes! And what sort of a "sea monster" is it that "ventilates" through its "stomach"!

Dr. Torrey gravely rebukes "those who would have us believe that the Jonah story is not historic fact, but allegory." He says that no one who "accepts the authority of Jesus Christ" can believe this. In the next section he affirms that all who reject Jesus Christ will be tormented day and night for ever. All the Higher Critics, therefore, and all the Christian clergy, as well as laymen, who believe that the Jonah story is allegory, and not history, are treading the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire. Dr. Torrey says so, and *he* knows, *he* knows.

Probably not one Christian clergyman in a thousand believes that the book of Jonah is a record of actual facts. All the Higher Critics are agreed on this point. Canon Driver puts the sceptical case quite strongly in his standard *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (p. 303), and Dean Farrar does the same in his well-known work *The Bible* (pp. 233-239). The latter, indeed, asks whether anyone could ever have been supposed to understand the book of Jonah *literally*. He supposes that even the Jews could hardly have been so foolish.

The fact is that Dr. Torrey is terribly behind the times. He is not a sign of the growth of orthodoxy, but a sign of its decay. He is not only behind the "infidels," but behind the leading men in nearly all the Churches, and behind even the man in the street. If he were to mix freely with ordinary people, and talk to them under the rose, he would learn that they have nothing but laughter for tales of talking serpents and asses, of women turned into pillars of rock salt, and men taking submarine trips in living "sea monsters."

CONCLUSION

It is thirty years ago since Matthew Arnold told the Christian world, not the "infidels," that "the reign of the Bible miracles is doomed." From this fate there is no escape.

The Higher Critics see it, and are gradually descending to the ground of Naturalism to avoid a catastrophe. Dr. Torrey does not see it. Perhaps he is incapable of seeing it. But the spirit of progress will not await *his* convenience. Nor will Dr. Torrey succeed in making any impression on the vast public outside the Churches. He may convert the converted, he may infuse a little temporary enthusiasm into the lukewarm. More than this he has not done, and more than this he will never do.

When he winds up his old-fashioned little treatise on the difficulties of the Bible by consigning all who do not share *his* views of it to "everlasting anguish," he simply makes himself ridiculous. The doctrine of eternal hell is dead. It is not so much as mentioned in the new Free Churches Catechism. And a man who cries "Believe what I teach, or be damned" is now looked upon as a curious relic of old times, or as a person suffering from a bad attack of swelled-head.

Nothing that Dr. Torrey can say, nothing that any man can say, will ever restore the Bible to its old position. Everyone who knows the facts is perfectly aware that the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible is doomed. While the American revivalist is consigning people to hell for not believing that theory, it is repudiated by the leaders of all the principal Christian Churches in England. It is the "Higher Criticism" that is really at the bottom of the great disruption in Scotland. And when the Church Congress brings forward a scientist like Sir Oliver Lodge to adorn its meetings, he frankly advises them to provide Jesus with two human parents instead of one. Even the narratives of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection are now under debate in Christian circles. What childishness it is, then, on Dr. Torrey's part to try to frighten people into retaining the more fantastic and less important miracles of the Old Testament.

Readers of this pamphlet are invited to read "The Freethinker," edited by the writer of this pamphlet, and published at 2 Newcastle-street, E.C., every Thursday, price twopence.