

Darwin's Genesis.

BY THOMAS HENSON.

WE have two accounts of the origin of man. The first is an old-fashioned one, found in the book of Genesis. Thus it reads: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air; and over the cattle, and over all the earth; and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

The other account is not so old, but neither is quite modern. It is given by Charles Darwin, in his "Descent of Man," second edition, 1875. Thus it reads: "The most ancient progenitors in the kingdom of the vertebrata, at which we are able to obtain an obscure glance, apparently consisted of a group of marine animals, resembling the larvæ of existing Ascidiæ. These animals probably gave rise to a group of fishes, as lowly organised as the lancelet: and from these the ganoids, and other fishes like the Lepidosiren, must have been developed. From such fish a very small advance would carry us on to the Amphibians. We have seen that birds and reptiles were once intimately connected together; and the Monotremata now connect mammals with reptiles in a slight degree. But no one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes, namely, mammals, birds, and reptiles, were derived from the two lower vertebrati classes, namely, amphibians and fishes. In the class of mammals the steps are not difficult to conceive which led from the ancient Monotremata to the ancient Marsupials: and from these to the early progenitors of the placental mammals. We may thus ascend to the Lemuridæ, and the interval is not very wide from these to the Simiadæ. The Simiadæ then branched off into two great stems, the New World and the Old World Monkeys; and from the latter, at a remote period, Man, the wonder and glory of the Universe, proceeded."

The first of these accounts is simple, beautiful, grand, and unoppressive. The second reminds us of a huge, lightless lantern, in a dark, starless night; and after reading it, we have to stop and recover breath, before proceeding. We think with John Stuart Mill, that this theory of evolution in the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest, "is very startling, and *prima facie*, improbable." Evidently the two stories do not agree, nor can they be reconciled. Either Darwin, like the lean and ill-favoured kine coming up from the Nile, must eat up and destroy the beautiful story of Genesis, or, he must pale before it, as the glow-worm does before the sun. Indeed, he has set himself to accomplish the former, for he says, "I have at least, as I hope, done good service in aiding to overthrow the dogma of separate creations." We have read his book with much care, and feeling much like Galileo as he rose from his knees and recantation of truth, we cannot help saying, Darwin notwithstanding, "Man was created though."

Mr. Darwin relies upon three lines of evidence in support of his theory, viz., (1.) Homologous structures in man and the lower animals;

(2.) similarity of embryonic development with the lower animals ;
(3.) rudimentary remains of the lower animals in man. The edifice which the indefatigable naturalist has built up out of these materials, suggests the idea of a pretentious castle, constructed of cardboard and sand. No wonder that his reasoning and illustrations have provoked a good deal of mirth, and his position been assailed and demolished from every side by earnest men, philosophers, scientists, and theologians—his doughty champion, Professor Huxley, notwithstanding. The similarity of structure in man and the lower animals may be true to a certain extent ; but it is equally true that the dis-similarity is also immensely great. Cellular tissues and blood corpuscles differ so widely, that that which is life and hilarity to them would be agony and death to him. Even so it is also in the vegetable kingdom. Mr. Darwin wishes us to believe that similarity of structure is due to community of origin ; but if so, to what is the well-known greater dis-similarity due ? As a writer in the *British Quarterly*, October, 1871, said, “The fact of similarity of structure may be accepted, but the proposed explanation of the fact, is, after all, only an assertion.” Nor does the second line of argument, embryonic development, fare better at the hands of men qualified to deal with it. Again and again it has been shown that Mr. Darwin might have made more of the fact than he has done ; but that when the most has been made of it, the argument falls to pieces, crumbles to dust by the weight of its own materials. The third argument, “Rudimentary remains of the lower animals in man,” raises the question whether Mr. Darwin really hoped to produce conviction, or only intended to amuse. He defines rudiments as “Organs which are absolutely useless, or they are of such slight service to their present possessors, that we can hardly suppose they were developed under the conditions which now exist.” But how does he know that these organs are useless ? Does the anatomist or the naturalist fully understand all the uses of each and every organ of the human body ? Elsewhere he says, “I am convinced, from the light gained during even the last few years, that very many structures which now appear to us useless, will hereafter be proved to be useful, and will therefore come within the range of natural selection.” We are convinced by the study of Mr. Darwin’s book that these structures, which appear to him to be useless, are even now, and from the first have been, useful, and that they have ever been within the range, not of that blind, inanimate, lifeless deity, natural selection ; but of that living, loving Designer and Preserver, the Eternal God.

But far heavier objections lie against Mr. Darwin’s theory, when we consider his account of the origin of man’s mental, moral, and religious nature. •Nothing is allowed for Divine implanting, communication, or creation. Natural selection did not develop these bodies with all their adaptive organs, and then offer the thing, like an earthen bottle, to some greater deity, to be filled up with subtle mind, moral faculties, and religious propensities. No. Man has been called “a religious animal ;” but he evolved his religion, as he did his bones and muscles, out of his material surroundings and constitution. So Mr. Darwin teaches. It would be immensely amusing, were it not almost infinitely saddening, to follow him through the tortuous maze of reasoning by which he seeks to establish his false position. An illustration or two must suffice.

“Man,” he says, “manifestly owes his immense superiority to his intellectual faculties, his social habits, and his corporeal structure.” Perhaps so; but how came he with those intellectual faculties? Mr. Darwin feels that the great difference in mental power between man and the lower animals, suggests an error in his conclusion as to man’s descent from them. He is conscious that the difference in this respect is enormous, even between the lowest savage, who cannot count higher than four, and the most highly organised ape; but he says, “It can be shown that there is no fundamental difference of mental power between them.” No fundamental difference between the lowest savage and the highest ape! Look at the Cherokee and other North American Indians, at the Fijian cannibals and the Erromanga savages; you have taught these and others as low as them to read, to write, to understand the grammar of language, to cultivate literature, to understand and to glory in the cross of Christ and the story of redeeming love: has Mr. Darwin or Professor Huxley ever done that with the chimpanzee or the orang? Has any one before them done it? Can it be done? Will Mr. Darwin leave his pigeon breeding, and devote his time and energies for the remainder of his life to the effort of educating and exalting ape minds to the level reached by these low savages, by way of demonstrating that there is no fundamental difference of mental power between them? A fundamental difference of mental power might constitute the impassable barrier; but if there is no such difference, let him at least make the attempt. He thinks it as hopeless to find the origin of mental development as to find the origin of life itself; yet he seems to account for mind as a development of the lowest instinct, step by step, simple, then complex, through endless variations, until emotions, first simple, then complex, gave rise to sensations, these to passions, and so on, till the mind, whatever it was, was completed in the lowest savage—from which civilisation and culture have made it what it is. Mr. Darwin finds that the hands of a man and an ape are constructed on the same general principle; and he learns from his friend Huxley “that there can be no dispute as to the similarity of fundamental character between the ape’s brains and man’s.” If this is so, we ask again, Why has not the ape advanced beyond the limited circle of its instinct into the road of endless progression pursued by man? Listen to the Duke of Argyll. “The difference between the hand of a monkey and the hand of a man may seem small when they are both placed on the dissecting table; but in that difference, whatever it may be, lies the whole difference between an organ limited to the climbing of trees or the plucking of fruit, and an organ which is so correlated with man’s inventive genius, that by its aid the earth is weighed, and the distance of the sun is measured.” Mr. Darwin points to the opening of mind in a child as analogous to the opening of it in a dog, and says that “to doubt the progress of animals in intellectual and other mental faculties, is to beg the question of evolution of species.” Well, we beg nothing. We demand proof that mind is incipient in a dog as it is in a child. All along the known history of man, he has been a thinking, inventive being, progressively reducing earth, air, fire, water, metals, minerals, and even lightning, to his use and pleasure; but nowhere in geologic records, nor in later history, can Messrs. Darwin and Huxley find traces of this being done by the most highly organised gorilla, orang, or chimpanzee.

Darwin v. Genesis.

No. II.

BY THOMAS HENSON.

MR. DARWIN has done so much to popularise the doctrine of man's evolution from the lower animals, that just as John Wesley immortalised his name with an *ism*, so has he; and Darwinism is now very widely talked about, but very narrowly understood. With certain modifications it has made its way into religious circles, and there are those who ask, "Is there not room for Darwinism in the Bible?" Attempts are made to reconcile Darwin's account of man's evolution under natural selection with the Mosaic account of his creation. But it must be remembered that Mr. Darwin plumes himself upon "having done good service in aiding to overthrow the dogma of separate creations"—so that any reconciliation must be entirely at the expense of Moses.

At the same time, let it not be assumed that he atheistically ignores God. He speaks of a God hating sin and loving righteousness; and to love that Being, he says, "is the grandest form of religion, which was unknown in primeval times." Nor must it be said that in aiding to destroy the dogma of separate creations, he altogether ignores or denies a primary creation; so far as his book is concerned he is silent on that point, a fact which Professor Tyndal complains of in his Belfast address. It is due to the eminent naturalist to mention this, seeing that we have a heavy charge to lay against his doctrine. The doctrine of man's evolution from the lower animals, under natural selection, and by the survival of the fittest, is entirely subversive of the Scripture account of his creation in the image of God, of his fall through transgression, and of his redemption through the atonement of Jesus Christ. We think this will become increasingly evident as we proceed.

Having by the aid of a brilliant imagination satisfied himself as to the development of mental powers, Mr. Darwin proceeds to the "moral sense." He fully subscribes to the doctrine, "that of all the differences

between man and the lower animals, the moral sense or conscience is by far the most important." This conscience he sums up in the short but imperious word "*ought*." Perhaps when we consider conscience, not as a sense developed out of correlations of animalised dirt, but as an implantation by a divine, loving Creator, we may feel that it is worthy of a more comprehensive word. Mr. Darwin is very great in assumptions and probabilities, and he lays down the following proposition as seeming in a high degree probable, namely, "That any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, the parental and filial affections being here included, would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well, or nearly as well, developed, as in man." Now before we can discuss that proposition itself, we must agree with Mr. Darwin as to its terms, and that may be impossible. First, we must remember the wide difference between parental and filial affections, as manifested by men and by the lower animals; and we must determine how far this difference is due to the well-developed intellectual powers in man, and to the moral sense, which according to Mr. Darwin is the result of those powers. Secondly, we must determine whether it is possible for such an animal to have intellectual powers, and to have them developed as well, or nearly as well, as in man. The brightest instinct of Mr. Darwin's dog is not equal to the weakest intellect of his lowest savage. A better form of the proposition would be, that if any animal whatever could only become a man, it would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience: but here again it is at fault, for how can a man be a man, if he have to acquire the moral sense or conscience?

It is always interesting to watch the growth and development of a plant, and more so to a mother to mark the physical growth of her child; but it would have been entrancingly interesting, could we have been present to have witnessed, through countless variations, the development of this moral sense. This pleasure is for ever lost to us; but if we will trust the brilliant imagination of the eminent naturalist, he will help us to retrace the past; he will lift the veil and let us see our animal progenitors arrived at a stage of well-developed social instincts, taking pleasure in each other's society, feeling sympathy, and serving each other. Then, those social instincts developed highly into mental powers—and images of past actions and motives would be ever returning through the developed memory, giving rise to feelings of dissatisfaction. Then, the power of speech and language being acquired, the expression of communal wishes and opinion as to how each member *ought* to act for the public good would naturally become, in a paramount degree, a guide to action. And lastly, habit in the individual would ultimately play a very important part in guiding the conduct of each member. Thus, if we can only accept Mr. Darwin's philosophy, we may see how conscience was developed.

If we ask what is the standard and tribunal of this moral sense, this "*ought*," it is simply the public good. Some one has said that "Conscience is God's detective in the soul;" but Darwinism knows nothing about such a theory. With the Bible in our hands, we gather a different conception of conscience, as to its origin, its province, and its destiny. We understand it to have been, in man's original estate,

divinely implanted within him, and to have very closely linked him to his Creator. We feel that as God given, it must have been in perfect harmony with all divine attributes, and entirely amenable to the divine will. But according to Mr. Darwin, as a developed sense, under natural selection, it is quite a variable quality; for, he says, "had man been reared under the same conditions as hive bees, his conscience would then be what theirs is; and unmarried females, like worker bees, would think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and no one would interfere!" Well, have bees a conscience, or moral sense? If not, all this talk about men reared as they are is empty and useless. If they have—and according to it, wholesale murder is the right thing for its society—and man so reared would have had such a conscience, what is the value of such a variable quality in relation to the spiritual interests, present and future, of man and of God? What a miserable standard and tribunal of moral responsibility! Conscience, evolved during the long, blind, fortuitous process of development, under the bungling care of natural selection and necessitarian pressure, destroys all moral responsibility to God as its final Judge, and opens the door for the rankest fatalism. Mr. Darwin says "we ought not to deny the development of moral faculties, because we daily see them develop in every infant." But if they were not innate in the infant mind, would they daily develop? If they are as innate in the chimpanzee or gorilla infant, why do they not daily develop there? From rose stems and rose buds, roses will daily develop; but so long as a thistle possesses a different nature to a rose tree, and is minus the peculiar correlation of forces, saps, and cells which go to make a rose, you will never develop a rose from a thistle. The Bible represents man as created holy, pure, loving, in the image of God, and as having fallen from that high estate to his present sinful and corrupt condition. Darwinism represents him as immensely superior now to anything he has ever been before; and we repeat the charge, that Darwinism is entirely subversive of the Bible story of man's original estate in the image of God, and of his ruin by the transgression and fall.

From morals to religion is but a step. Mr. Darwin says "there is no evidence that man was originally endowed with the ennobling belief in the existence of an Omnipotent God." We leave that assertion as a moot point, simply remarking, that we find greater difficulty respecting it at the feet of Darwin, than at the feet of Moses.

He proceeds, "If, however, we include in the term religion, the belief in unseen or spiritual agencies, the case is wholly different, for this belief seems to be universal with the less civilised races." To a creature altogether material, whence came such a belief? How came it to be universal, especially among the less civilised? Is it more universal than the belief in a great Supreme Spirit—a God, of some sort? He does not admit the objective reality of these unseen spiritual agencies, and he accounts for their subjective rise in a creature of matter, whose mental and moral powers are only developments of brain and cerebral organisation, by supposing that dreams in the early savages had something to do with it. He says, "The soul of the dreamer goes out on its travels, and comes home with a remembrance of what it has seen." The *soul* of the dreamer went out; and came

home again! What is that soul? Lucretius, Tyndal, Huxley, Herbert Spenser, and Darwin cannot tell us; but it seems it went out from its matter-home, travelling into the darkness, and found spiritual agencies, and brought the remembrance of them back with it to its matter-home! Wonderfully strange that! But he tells us that until the faculties of imagination, curiosity, and reason were fairly well-developed in man, his dreams would never have led him to believe in spirits any more than a dog would." Thus the early savage progenitors came to believe in spirits, and "the belief in spiritual agencies would easily pass into the belief in the existence of one or more gods." Again, he says, "The feeling of religious devotion is a highly complex one, consisting of love, complete submission to an exalted and mysterious Superior, a strong sense of dependence, fear, reverence, gratitude, hope for the future, and perhaps other elements. No being could experience so complex an emotion until advanced in his intellectual and moral faculties to at least a moderately high level. *Nevertheless we see some approach to this state of mind in the deep love of a dog for his master, associated with complete submission, some fear, and perhaps other feelings.*" The italics are ours. Now let us put down the Bible, extinguish all our biblical light, ring the curfew over all the moral and spiritual fire we ever gathered from the torch of revelation, and ask ourselves, is it possible to believe in the development of such beautiful bodily forms, with such exquisite adaptations, of such mental powers, of such moral faculties, of such religious capabilities and ideas, by the mere correlations of force and matter, blindly acting under the fixed law of so-called natural selection, through an illimitable process of variations, stretching along from the sexless, invertebrate worm or ascidian, to ourselves?

Or, again listening to the Bible, teaching us whence we came, what we are, and whither we go; teaching us what God is, what He has done for us in Christ Jesus, by the Holy Ghost—can we, with such experience of religion as it inspires, touching us so sympathically in our deepest misery and woe, and lifting us up by grace to the Godlike and divine,—can we consent that all this wealth of love, all this grandeur of truth, and all this triumph in us of revealed religion, shall be shrivelled down to the level of the instinct of Mr. Darwin's dog? To believe this out-miracles all the miraculous of the Bible. We infinitely prefer Genesis, and separate creations. There is grandeur of simplicity in the Mosaic story, "And God said, Let us make man in our image." "Here alone the Almighty paused to consult, as it were, before making His masterpiece of creations. And this pause may aptly represent to us the almost infinite hiatus between man and all the inferior animals, the enormous chasm over which the Creator passed at this period of creation, from the mere living organism or animal, to the essential mind of man; even to the everlasting individuality, involving the consequent responsibility of the human spirit."* Evolution leaves the enormous chasm between man and the lower animals unbridged—it denies man's original glory and fall. It shuts out the necessity for the incarnation of Christ to redeem the lost sinner. It degrades man from the position which God gave him, and exalts him to one which God has not given. It robs God of His glory and honour in redemption.

* Dean Macgregor.

Darwin v. Genesis.*

No. III.

BY REV. THOMAS HENSON.

WE have said that "Darwinism entirely subverts the Bible story of man's original creation in the image of God, and of his ruin by the transgression and fall." We feel that that is a grave charge, and it is only right that we should substantiate it, so that we may not seem to bear false witness.

First, then, Mr. Darwin entirely ignores the account of man's origin given in Genesis. He does not accept the Bible as a fact, and then proceeds to disprove its statement; he cuts it—calmly and deliberately leaves it out. Now whatever may be thought of Genesis as an authority in this question, we cannot burke the fact that for many centuries good and intelligent men have respected it, and still believe it to be of divine veracity.

Secondly, as we have seen in the first paper, Mr. Darwin's account of the origin of man is utterly irreconcilable with Genesis. If his showing be right, man was not created, or made at all by God (a point at which he rejoices in "having aided to destroy the dogma of separate creations"), and he was not, in any sense, produced in "the image of God." He was slowly and fortuitously evolved; not as a flower is evolved from its bud under the influence of sunshine only, but rather as if a thistle should accidentally produce grapes. From Genesis we conceive of man's creation as one of those grand works of divine power and wisdom requiring but little time; but Mr. Darwin's theory is as far as possible from such a creation, and according to his own geological estimate of time, may have required at least 300,000,000 of years to work in.

Thirdly, according to Genesis, man, as he is now, is a ruin; a ruin from some original form of greatness and goodness, *i.e.*, from the image of God. But, according to Mr. Darwin, man is what he is by nature, and has reached his present position as a glorious attainment in his progressive evolutionary changes by the survival of the fittest, under the law of natural selection. Instead of his having fallen from the highest Godlike image, he has gradually risen from the lowest mindless form of life, from a worm. If Genesis be correct, being in the image of God was man's glory, and he lost it. If Mr. Darwin be correct, he never had that image, and so never could lose it; and his present position is the greatest glory he ever had. According to Genesis we believe that mind, moral faculties, and religious susceptibilities were created within man; but, according to Mr. Darwin, man gradually evolved all of them; nay, the human idea of God Himself is not God's revelation of Himself in man, but an idea gradually evolved out of the "soul's dreams of surrounding spirits." Mr. Darwin's book knows nothing whatever of primeval man living in holy fellowship and daily communion with God; knows nothing of primeval man delighting in righteousness, holiness, and divine love; it knows nothing whatever of the catastrophe of sin which desolated Eden and shut away the tree of life. It knows only of man struggling his way up through every form of animal brutishness to

something which he calls "semi-human;" struggling his way through countless ages out of the semi-human, in which state the males fought and tore each other with ferocious canine teeth in order to gain possession of the more beautiful females; struggling on until he passed out of the semi-human and became a human savage, and began to develop finer instincts into conscience, etc., as noted in previous papers.

But the statement of Genesis is objected to as being dogmatic. Certainly it does not apologize for its abrupt entrance, nor justify its existence by ratiocination. Now what is the case on the part of evolution? does it establish its case by solid reasons, or does it rather insinuate on superficial grounds? We ought to expect that a truly scientific writer, dealing with such a momentous question, which assails and involves the integrity of the biblical record, and the hoary beliefs which rest upon it, would not merely hypothecate, but at least try to demonstrate. Now Mr. Darwin sometimes dogmatizes; but he is very great in the use of probabilities, possibilities, and assumptions. From beginning to end his book *assumes* the descent of man from "semi-human progenitors" of "arboreal habits," having tails, and ass-like ears. We say that these are assertions and assumptions, of which Mr. Darwin gives no proof. The following remarks from the *British Quarterly Review** will corroborate our statement. "Mr. Darwin has, however, been careful so to express himself as to lead his readers to adopt the inference he desires, without laying himself open to the charge of undue persuasion, while professing only to be laying facts before their unbiassed judgment. . . . And yet it is not possible for any one who has studied anatomical structure to assent to many of the statements in the very first chapter of Mr. Darwin's book."

It is objected that "religion is always in conflict with science." If by "religion" Romanism and its kindred forms are intended, it must be confessed that there is apparent truth in the objection; still, in its naked form, it covers a great fallacy. It is true that ecclesiastical bigotry and general deficiency of scientific knowledge—ignorance if you will—have opposed the clearest discoveries of science; but it is unfair to charge this upon religion. It is equally true that, of late, scientific men have too often put forth their materialistic speculations as if they were scientific truths; and then what wonder if Christian faith object to surrender its cherished convictions at the mere bidding of science falsely so called? There need be, there can be, no antagonism between sincere faith and true science. Nature and the Bible are two volumes of divine revelation to man: both are by the same author, and there cannot be any contradiction between them. Science, or that which calls itself such, through vain conceits, pride of intellect, deficiency of light, and carnal enmity, is as likely to misinterpret nature as simple credulity is to misinterpret the Bible. Religion is the monarch of the soul; and science, true and genuine, is her beloved and honoured handmaid. Religion believes in the creation of man in holy estate, and in his grievous fall therefrom by transgression, and in his redemption from that fall by the incarnation and sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Science, as represented by Mr. Darwin, denies this, and denies it without proof; and charges us with "arrogance and pride" because, in the name of

religion and common sense, we refuse to surrender. Mr. Darwin says, page 25 of his book, "It is only our natural prejudice, and that arrogance which made our forefathers declare that they were descended from demi-gods, which leads us to demur to this conclusion." Cool and modest that, isn't it?

Looking at Man as he is now, it is impossible not to see that he is a wonderful compound of good and bad: of much that is beautiful, great, and grand; and also of much that is ugly, little, and base. His mental and moral powers and faculties must excite admiration; but his grossly sensual habits and base passions, when he throws off all moral restraint, and gives himself up to vices and practices unworthy of brute beasts, and such as are never seen in them, is most appalling, especially as we remember his mind and moral nature. For him to have evolved his mind and moral nature out of a material constitution and material surroundings by a fortuitous process of natural selection, is impossible; and possessing these, as he does, if we suppose him to be evolved from the lower animals, we may well say, how has he fallen! Yet Mr. Darwin says, "To believe that man was aboriginally civilised, and then suffered utter degradation in so many regions, is to take a pitifully low view of human nature." Aye, it is indeed, but if it were possible to believe Mr. Darwin's theory of man's origin, and his evolved mind and moral nature, but concerning which he gives us no evidence, no proof whatever, we should be compelled by the evidence of every sense we have to see that man, on his baser side, notwithstanding these fine, noble, powers, is fallen, yes—fallen, lamentably below the brutes. Even Mr. Darwin's erroneous way of originating man as he is, compels us "to take a pitifully low view of human nature" Into the origin of evil we are not trying to pry; we know how the darkness of that mystery baffles all human penetration; but we turn to the book of Genesis, and we read its earlier chapters as a divine record; and though there are in them mysteries which we fain would fathom, our faith is abundantly satisfied with the Mosaic story of man's creation in the image of God, and of his fall through temptation and transgression. But Mr. Darwin utterly ignores Genesis, and writes as if no such account of man had ever been written. On his ground, then, we want to know what is the standard of righteousness? What is the tribunal of human responsibility? If man has ever been rising, and never fallen, how is he to be regarded as a transgressor? What law has he transgressed? How can his inward thoughts and his outward conduct be treated as sin? How is it possible to hold him amenable to the judgment day and to future punishment? If through millions of ages man has been gradually evolving out of the sexless, invertebrate worm—the ascidian—through fishes, birds, reptiles, and apes, into what he is, having risen to his present condition of "mind, knowledge, morals, and religion," and never fallen from some high standard of rectitude and righteousness, where is the necessity for atonement? What wrong has been done to be atoned for? How can he be regenerated? From what, and to what does he need regeneration? Mr. Darwin says, "The highest form of religion—the grand idea of God hating sin, and loving righteousness, was unknown in primeval times." The boldness of that assertion is equalled only by Mr. Darwin's total indifference to evidence in support of it. Utterly unmindful of the evidence of biblical history to the

contrary, he leaves his assertion bold, bald, and naked, without a tittle of support, save his own authority. On the other hand, we see in Genesis that the primeval pair knew in close and sweet intimacy the "God who hates sin and loves righteousness." And so soon after the fall, as it is recorded, we see Abel, so closely related to them, offering an acceptable sacrifice to the same God. We prefer the words of the Duke of Argyle: "The conclusion is that, as man must have had a divine Creator, it seems equally certain that, to some extent also, he must have had a divine Instructor."*

Mr. Darwin says, "I am aware that the conclusions arrived at in this work will be denounced by some as highly irreligious; but he who denounces them is bound to show why it is more irreligious to explain the origin of man as a distinct species by descent from some lower form, through the laws of variation and natural selection, than to explain the birth of the individual through the laws of ordinary reproduction"—p. 613. Now this is a fair specimen of Mr. Darwin's mode of reasoning. We denounce his views of man's origin as irreligious because they flatly contradict what we believe to be a divine record of his creation in the image of God; because by describing man as having persistently risen to his present position of morals and religion, partly "through the advancement of his reasoning powers," aided by "a just public opinion;" and partly by his mind being "elevated by long continued culture," he not only ignores the scriptural statement of man's fall, and his recovery by grace through redemption, but he contradicts it. And when Mr. Darwin says that because we denounce his view as irreligious we are bound to show, etc., as above, we are astounded! We know—Mr. Darwin knows—that a child is born according to the known laws of nature; we do not know, he does not know, that man has descended from some lower form of life, ever ascending in the scale of mind and moral power; and until we know this latter as well as we do know the former, we are not bound to show why it is more irreligious to explain the one, than to explain (or declare) the other. This is an illustration of the facility with which Mr. Darwin can set up a flimsy theory, as if it were of equal value with established and irrefragable fact. To declare the fact of a child's birth according to the laws of nature is in religious harmony with all that we know of truth and right; to explain man's origin and progress as Mr. Darwin has done, in utter disregard of his alleged primeval rectitude—his subsequent fall and redemption, and so utterly contradictory of such facts—seems to us to be in irreligious discord with all the teachings of the Bible. Many of Mr. Darwin's disciples tell us that his views are not inconsistent with religion. Perhaps not. 'Religion' is a wide and vague term. With what religion they are consistent, we have not yet been informed. What we affirm is, that they are altogether opposed to the revelation and religion of the Bible; they cannot harmonise with the scripture doctrines of man's disobedient departure from God; of his reconciliation to God; of his being forgiven and justified through grace; of his regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and return as a penitent prodigal to God, the merciful Father.

* Primeval Man, p. 8.