

18 Princeton Theological Review

THE

✓
P R I N C E T O N
R E V I E W .

By **Whom**, all things; for **Whom**, all things.

FIFTY-FOURTH YEAR.

JANUARY—JUNE.

NEW YORK
1878.

EVOLUTIONISM RESPECTING MAN, AND THE BIBLE.

I N discussing the relations of Science and Religion, it is frequently said that Evolutionism is not inconsistent with either Theism or Revealed Religion. That it does not necessarily exclude the idea of a personal Creator of the universe may be admitted. At the same time it should be borne in mind that the hypothesis was originally proposed by old Greek atheists; and within the past century it was revived in the interest of atheism; and at the present day, as stated and defended by many of its most prominent advocates, it is avowedly atheistic. This historical attitude of Evolutionism cannot be wholly accidental, and deserves the consideration of those who may be disposed to regard the hypothesis as a harmless scientific speculation.

That it may be held in consistency with Theism is, however, a matter of comparatively little moment. The important question is its relation to Revealed Religion.

It is sometimes said that it is not necessarily inconsistent with the Scriptures, or hostile to the system of truth therein revealed. This is maintained by Mivart, a devout Romanist, in his work on "The Genesis of Species;" it is distinctly intimated by Professor Gray, a devout Protestant, in the Introduction to "Darwiniana;" and is avowed by some eminent believers in and even defenders of the inspiration of the Scriptures who are not Evolutionists. It is, moreover, implied in the admonition nowadays frequently given, that believers in revelation should treat the truth or falsity of Evolutionism as an open question, assured that, however it may be ultimately

determined, the Scriptures can be interpreted in accordance with the result.

It will scarcely be denied that, if this opinion is erroneous, it is a serious error, and none the less but all the more dangerous, when avowed by those who accept and defend the inspiration of the Scriptures. Nor are the consequences of the error—if it be an error—avoided or mitigated by maintaining, as most of those referred to do, that Evolutionism is as yet an unproved hypothesis. The assertion in question has really nothing to do with the truth or falsity of Evolutionism. It has respect to the teaching of the Scriptures, and asserts that, whether the hypothesis be true or false, it is not inconsistent with the Bible. The question is therefore one of present interest and of vital importance, affecting, as it does, what men are to believe, and what the Christian ministry is to teach concerning the origin of man, his nature, and his destiny.

Believing that Evolutionism, however it may in other respects be harmonized with the Scriptures, is in direct conflict with Biblical Anthropology, and the entire system of truth connected therewith, in the Word of God, we feel that the opinion referred to ought not to be permitted to pass unchallenged. We propose, therefore, for consideration, *Is Evolutionism, as it respects man, consistent with the Bible?*

It is proper here to state that we recognize it as a just and important principle, in interpreting Scripture, to avoid, as far as possible, collision—or the liability to collision—with scientists. At the same time, in contracting the lines, to present as few vulnerable points as possible, care should be taken not to abandon a position that may command the citadel. Whether the Anthropology of the Bible is such a position will appear in the progress of the discussion.

We deem it proper also to say, we have no sympathy with those who are disposed to magnify the so-called conflict between Science and Revealed Religion. Between believers in the Scriptures and scientists not avowedly atheistic, the only subjects that need occasion serious controversy are, the one proposed for discussion and the order of creation. This latter subject, moreover, apart from its bearing on the question of inspiration,

is comparatively unimportant, as it in no way affects the system of spiritual truth taught in the Word of God.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the question proposed, it is proper to define what is here meant by Evolutionism. This is the more necessary from the fact that in discussing the relation of Evolutionism to Religion, the precise issue is frequently obscured by an ambiguous use of the term *evolution*. It is asserted that the growth of every thing that lives—plant, tree, insect, animal, man—is an *evolution*; that the development of man's intellectual and moral faculties is an *evolution*; that there is an *evolution* in history, operating on men in the mass, elevating them from a lower to a higher state of civilization, developing a more and more completely organized social and national life; that there is *evolution* in the kingdom of grace, both in the spiritual growth of the individual Christian and in the development of doctrine and spiritual power in the Church—"first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Now if any one sees fit to designate every form of progressive development in nature, providence, and grace, as an *evolution*, he may, of course, so far as the etymology of the word is concerned, do so without any serious impropriety; yet, in view of the real question at issue in existing controversies concerning *evolution*, such language is misleading. As to the truth of evolution in any of the senses above mentioned, there is, and has been, no dispute. In any issues that have been raised between theologians and evolutionists, the term is used in an entirely different sense. It has been technically appropriated to designate *a certain scientific hypothesis as to the genesis of the universe*, namely, that out of an original mass of nebulous, amorphous matter all the various forms of inorganic matter and living organisms—including all the properties of such organisms—were evolved by pre-established physical laws. The term is frequently used with particular reference to that part of the hypothesis which relates to *the origin of species*, namely, that out of an original germ or germs of life in its lowest form—however they may have originated—higher and still higher forms were evolved by "natural selection," or some other physical law or laws, and that thus all the different forms, varieties, and species of vegetable and animal life—man in-

cluded—that have existed or now exist, originated. As mentioned above, some evolutionists accept, while others reject, the doctrine of a personal Creator of the original material of the universe, the source of the original physical forces, and the author of the laws of their action. Between atheistic evolutionists and believers in the Scriptures, the issue is, of course, radical and irreconcilable. Between theistic evolutionists and believers in revelation, the main issue has respect to *the Origin of Man*, and what is involved therein, as to his nature and his destiny. Darwin's first work on "The Origin of Species" was not generally regarded as involving any serious or irreconcilable conflict with the Scriptures. Intimations as to the extent to which the hypothesis might be pressed did incite some apprehension, but it was not until these intimations were distinctly avowed and laboriously advocated in his subsequent work on "The Descent of Man," that the great mass of believers in revelation and the entire mass of unbelievers felt that the Scriptures were assailed, and that Evolutionism had become a religious question, and one of vital importance.

The proposed inquiry has reference to the issue just mentioned: *Is Evolutionism as it respects Man*—asserting as it does that man was not created by immediate divine agency, but was evolved out of an ape—*consistent with the Bible?*

It should be observed that the question here proposed is not—immediately at least—a scientific question. It does not require for its intelligent discussion an investigation of, or even a knowledge of, the alleged scientific facts on which the hypothesis is based. It has to do simply and solely with the teaching of Scripture.

Nor is the question proposed—immediately at least—a philosophical question. It cannot be decided by first premising certain general principles as to the respective domains of Science and Religion, the authority of each within its own sphere, and their mutual relations to each other, and then—by an application of these principles—determining what the Scriptures do teach, or at least what they must be interpreted as teaching, if their infallibility is to be maintained. The question is simply one of hermeneutics, of exegesis, of the interpretation of the language of Scripture. It is to be determined just

as one would determine whether the doctrine of metempsychosis is consistent with the Scriptures, or whether the Copernican theory of the universe is consistent with the Vedas, or whether the issue of legal-tender notes is consistent with the Federal Constitution—questions evidently to be determined in each case in no other way than by an examination of the document referred to. To this inquiry attention is now invited.

The Origin of Man, as stated in Genesis 2 : 7, is in these words, "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."

Were this the entire Scriptural record on the subject—as many seem to assume—there would be no serious difficulty in interpreting it in harmony with the hypothesis of evolution. The Divine Creator of all things was not only originally the author of the universe, but has continuously been the upholder and controller of the various forces in nature, acting ceaselessly, according to the laws which he has established. Accordingly, phenomena which are immediately the result of these forces, operating it may be through long periods of time, are in the Scriptures frequently attributed to God, and in terms that might at first sight seem to imply the direct divine agency. The declaration, "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light," would undoubtedly at first sight seem to imply—and yet it does not necessarily imply—that the production of light was by the immediate divine agency, and was instantaneous. Moreover, as with the Eternal One "a thousand years are as one day," in interpreting the record of his creative work, we should be careful not to impose limitations of time and mode of operation that are not explicitly asserted. The passage above quoted as to the origin of man contains no such limitations. It simply asserts the important fact that "God formed man of the dust of the earth," but contains no intimation as to the mode of this creative act, or the duration of the process. There is nothing therefore, in this language, *taken by itself*, that is necessarily inconsistent with the hypothesis of evolution.

But the passage referred to by no means exhausts the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the origin of man. This

general statement of the seventh verse is followed at the eighteenth verse by the more specific, and as respects the question under consideration, the far more important declaration, "And the Lord God said, It is not good for man to be alone," thus limiting the reference in the seventh verse to the creation of the individual *man*, Adam. "And God said, I will make a helpmeet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man." Gen. 2: 21-23.

This account of the creation of *woman*—that is, of the first woman, Eve—"the mother of all living," as she is subsequently called (3: 20)—has a most important bearing on the question at issue. Unlike the former passage, its statements are specific and unambiguous. It asserts distinctly, first, that the creation of *woman* was not synchronous with, but subsequent to, the creation of *man*; and, secondly, it asserts with a particularity of detail which precludes all doubt as to the meaning intended, that the creation of woman was not by the ordinary mode of generation, but was strictly supernatural, miraculous, wrought by immediate Divine agency. Now it will scarcely be denied that, if this language is to be taken as a literal record of an historical fact, it is utterly irreconcilable with Evolutionism. To assert the contrary would be simply to assert a contradiction in terms. Evolutionists, with scarce an exception, not only acknowledge the inconsistency, but insist upon it, and accordingly reject—often with ridicule—the scriptural account of the origin of the race.

To those who receive the Scriptures as the Word of God, and yet maintain that Evolutionism is not inconsistent with Revealed Religion, the language above quoted undoubtedly presents a most serious difficulty. In the preface to his work on "Religion and Science," President Le Conte says, "It is an earnest attempt to reconcile the truths of Scripture with those revealed in nature." As might be anticipated from the character of the eminent author—an authority in science, an

accomplished writer and logician, at the same time a believer—his work is a valuable contribution to the discussion of the relations of Science and Religion; and on many of the points involved in controversy he has, in the defence of revealed truth, rendered most important service. And yet—as remarked by Professor Gray in his notice of the work—“one or two topics that would naturally come in his way—such, especially, as the relation of evolution to the human race—are somewhat conspicuously absent.”

Professor Gray, in several articles in “*Darwiniana*,” maintains that Evolutionism is not necessarily inconsistent with *Natural* Religion—and successfully, if Natural Religion included nothing more than belief in an intelligent, personal Creator of the universe. How he would harmonize the Scriptures with the hypothesis, he does not intimate—unless we except the single incidental remark, that Dr. Hodge makes “the implicit assumption that the Bible must needs teach true science.”

To remove the difficulty of harmonizing the Scriptural account of the origin of man with Evolutionism, two theories have been suggested. One is, that the Scriptures were not given to reveal truths of physical science, but spiritual and divine truths, to a knowledge of which men could not have attained by the light of reason or nature; that in regard to the former class of truths, the sacred writers accepted the belief and used the language current in the age in which they lived; that consequently on such subjects they are not to be regarded as infallible. It is alleged that as a matter of fact, their opinions on matters of science were often erroneous—as, for example, Job’s allusion to the want of maternal affection in the ostrich, Solomon’s reference to the foresight of ants in making provision for the winter, and Joshua’s belief that the sun revolved about the earth. On this theory, the Biblical account of the origin of man is simply the opinion which prevailed at the time the Book was written, and is not to be regarded as infallible.

It is not necessary to show, as might be done, that these alleged errors of the sacred writers furnish no basis for the theory referred to. For the present purpose it is sufficient to

reply, *first*, this theory does not deny, but was framed for the very purpose of accounting for (therein acknowledging) the fact, that Evolutionism and the Scriptural account of the origin of man are irreconcilable. This is the precise point of the present inquiry. *Secondly*, if the alleged errors of the sacred writers were admitted, it is a palpable fallacy to deduce a principle of interpretation from certain *incidental allusions* in the Scriptures to scientific truths, and then apply this principle to the interpretation of an extended, detailed, and explicit statement, recorded evidently for no other purpose than to communicate truth on the subject treated of—truth moreover, of which, from its very nature, man could not have any knowledge except by revelation. *Thirdly*, while it is true that the Bible was not given to teach men science, it is just as true, that as incidental to its main object—in regard to the subject in question we may even say as *necessary* to its main object—it does contain the distinct statement of certain scientific facts. Now so far as the Bible professes to teach such facts, it cannot be maintained that its teaching is untrustworthy without admitting a principle which vitiates the authority of the Scriptures on all other subjects. On this point Principal Dawson, in his “Nature and Religion”—a work which admirably exposes how inconclusive is the alleged scientific evidence in favor of evolution—maintains, “I wish to enforce the important principle that with respect to the history of creation and the subsequent reference to it, we cannot rest in the general statement that the Bible is not intended to teach science any more than we can excuse inaccuracy as to historical facts by the notion that the Bible was not intended to teach history.” *Fourthly*, it is impossible so to define the boundaries of the respective domains of Science and Revealed Religion that they shall not at certain points overlap each other. From the very nature of the case, there is unavoidably a common ground covered by truths which in one aspect are scientific and in another aspect are religious—it may be, religious truths of the highest importance. Now if the teaching of the Scriptures on such subjects be distinct and unequivocal, are we at liberty to treat it as obscure or erroneous, because forsooth, it is in conflict with some current scientific speculation? Certain scientists maintain that miracles are im-

possible with as much confidence and for precisely the same scientific reason that they deny the Scriptural account of the origin of man—namely, the invariability of the laws of nature. Is the meaning or the authority, therefore, of all that is miraculous in the Scriptures to be regarded as an open question? Moreover, the distinction between scientific truths and spiritual truths, however just in reference to other subjects, is wholly inapplicable to the particular subject in question. The important bearing of the doctrine of evolution on the spiritual truths revealed in the word of God will be made manifest in the progress of this discussion. *Fifthly*, the theory in question is in direct conflict with the teaching of the Apostle, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

The other theory referred to is that the Biblical account of the creation and fall of man is not to be regarded as history, but a myth or allegory—to be interpreted, not literally, but figuratively. This theory has the advantage of the preceding in that it recognizes the plenary inspiration of the Mosaic record. And as the Scriptures do undoubtedly contain parables and allegories, it is not necessarily inadmissible. The question is simply an exegetical one. In view of the connection in which the language occurs, is the reader at liberty to treat it as a myth or an allegory? In answer to this question, we reply, the language referred to is inseparably joined to the record which follows, reaching down to persons and events that are beyond all question historical. The genealogical links which connect the Israelites in Egypt with Adam and Eve in Eden are explicitly given. The children of Adam are mentioned in language identical with that used in reference to the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Now unless it be assumed that allegorical parents can beget historical children, the theory would seem to be untenable.

But further—in reference to both the theories referred to—throughout the Scriptures there are repeated references to the Mosaic account of the origin of the race, and not only is there no intimation that the record in question is either mythical or untrustworthy, but it is uniformly regarded as veritable history, and its literal interpretation both assumed and asserted.

In the First Book of Chronicles the descent of the historical

nations of that day is traced back to Noah and through him to Adam—the writer evidently regarding the narrative in Genesis as the literal record of an historical fact.

The genealogy of the Saviour, given in the third chapter of Luke is, that he was, “as was supposed, the son of Joseph, who was the son of Heli,” and so backward through David, and Abraham, and Noah to “Seth, who was the son of Adam, who was,” according to the Evangelist, not the son of an ape, but “*the Son of God.*”

In the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, Paul assumes the historical character and the infallible truth of the record in Genesis concerning the origin and fall of man, and makes it the basis of one of the most important doctrines of Scripture—in fact, a fundamental doctrine in the evangelical system of religion. “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” “Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him who was to come.” “If through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.” If the record in Genesis is not veritable history, then Paul has misapprehended its meaning, and his argument is a fallacy.

Again, in his notable argument in defence of the doctrine of the resurrection, in the 15th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul assumes the literality and the truth of the Mosaic record. “By man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” “And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.” “The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.”

Again, in the 11th chapter of this same Epistle, Paul accepts as literally true that portion of the Mosaic record most troublesome to those who would harmonize Evolutionism and revelation—the account of the supernatural creation of *woman*, and the priority of the creation of man. “The man,” says he, “is not of the woman, but the woman of the man; neither

was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." So also in 1st Tim. 2:12-15. "I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Now again, it should be observed, if the Mosaic account of the creation and fall of Adam and Eve is not to be regarded as veritable history, then not only has the Apostle misapprehended its meaning, but his argument, based upon the literal truth of the record, is fallacious.

Once more, when Jude refers to Enoch as an historical character, "the seventh from Adam," he evidently regards the entire record in Genesis as veritable history.

From the above quotations it is evident that the question as to the consistency of Evolutionism and revelation involves not the Mosaic record alone, as many seem to assume—the Scriptures just referred to are equally entitled to consideration. And further it should be observed, these Scriptures have a twofold bearing on the question at issue—first, as an inspired interpretation of the Mosaic record; and secondly, as independent Scriptural teaching concerning the origin of man—teaching, moreover, in regard to which no believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures will maintain that either the mythical theory, or the theory that the sacred writers are not to be regarded as infallible when treating of matters of science, is applicable.

The conclusion seems inevitable that whether the doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the origin of man be true or false, there can be no reasonable doubt as to what that doctrine is, and that it is not consistent with the hypothesis of evolution. If the teaching of the Bible on this subject can be regarded as an open question, then none can assert with confidence what it teaches on any subject. The doctrine of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Personality of the Spirit, the true theory of the Church, of the Christian ministry, of the Christian Sabbath, the subjects and mode of baptism, and other important doctrines that might be mentioned, are not taught in the Scriptures more distinctly and conclusively than is the doctrine that the human race is descended from a single pair—not *evolved* by "natural selection," or any other physical law or laws, out of

apes, but *created* supernaturally, by immediate Divine agency. The teaching of the Scriptures concerning the other doctrines above mentioned has for ages been, and continues to be, controverted. The Scriptural teaching as to the origin of man has not until recently been called in question, and doubtless would not now be, were it not for the supposed exigency in consequence of recent scientific speculations. However urgent the exigency, unless the speculations of scientists, or even the logic of facts, can alter the language of a written document, it would seem to be impossible to harmonize Evolutionism as it respects the origin of man, with revelation.

The discussion has thus far been restricted to an examination of the direct teaching of the Scriptures as to *the origin of man*. A more serious conflict, if possible, between Evolutionism and the Bible remains to be considered.

Whatever question may be raised as to the authority of Scripture on scientific subjects in general or the interpretation of the language of Scripture on the particular subject above mentioned, all who accept the Bible as a revelation from God agree that it teaches important truths concerning spiritual and divine things, and that on such subjects its authority is supreme and final. Now Evolutionism is not only inconsistent with the direct Biblical teaching concerning *the origin of man*, but is utterly irreconcilable with all that is taught in the Word of God concerning *man's nature, the nature of sin, the way of man's salvation, and his destiny*—in a word, the entire system of spiritual truths for the revelation of which the Scriptures were given.

First, the hypothesis is in conflict with the teaching of the Scriptures concerning *man's spiritual nature*, both as to what it was originally, and what it subsequently became—in the language of the Catechism, “the estate in which man was created,” and “the estate into which he fell.”

It might be fairly urged that the idea of a spiritual nature in man, in any proper sense of the expression—certainly in the ordinary sense of the expression—is excluded by the hypothesis as defined and defended by many of its prominent advocates. With them, Evolutionism is Materialism. It maintains as a prime principle the correlation, not of physical forces

merely, but of all forces, physical, vital, intellectual, emotional, moral and (if there may be any thing so called) spiritual. It regards beliefs and disbeliefs, likes and dislikes, the emotions of love and of patriotism, the perception of beauty and the sense of duty, as in their ultimate analysis, phenomena of matter, secreted by the brain as the liver secretes bile. It makes Psychology to be but a department of Physiology. The volition of the murderer in pulling the trigger, and the explosion of the powder and velocity of the bullet, are alike due to the operation of fixed, invariable, physical laws. Whether disposed to accept Professor Tyndall as a leader in scientific speculation or not, all must admit that no higher authority can be quoted as to what Evolutionism is. In his "Fragments of Science" he asks: "What are the core and essence of this hypothesis?" And he answers, "Strip it naked, and you stand face to face with the notion that not alone the more ignoble forms of animalcular and animal life, not alone the nobler forms of the horse and lion, not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body, but that the human mind itself, emotion, intellect, will, and all their phenomena, were once latent in a fiery cloud." "I do not think that any holder of the evolution hypothesis will say that I overstate it or overstrain it in any way. I simply bring before you, unclothed and unvarnished, the notions by which it must stand or fall." After maturer thought, he subsequently utters the same sentiment *ex cathedra*, as President of the British Association, in the memorable sentence in which his elaborate discussion of the relations of Science and Religion—or, as he would probably prefer to state it, their conflicts—culminates. "Abandoning," says he, "all disguise, the confession I feel bound to make before you is, that I prolong the vision backward across the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in that Matter which we, in our ignorance, and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its creation, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." True, he subsequently uses language that seems intended to disclaim the inference to be legitimately drawn from this formal, deliberate, and carefully-worded avowal of his belief. It is, however, with this avowal, and not with his

consistency, that we have to do. Now the distinctive characteristic of *matter* is, that its phenomena are determined by physical forces acting in accordance with uniform, inflexible physical laws. The distinctive characteristic of *spirit* is, that it is self-determining, and its actions voluntary. If there is in matter "the potency of every form and quality of life"—spiritual life included—then there is no such thing as volition, and what is called man's spiritual nature is but a name for a certain class of physical phenomena.

In his Belfast Address in 1874, on the question, "Are Animals Automats?" Professor Huxley, after endeavoring to establish the affirmative, adds, "Undoubtedly, I do hold that the view I have taken of the relations between the physical and mental faculties of brutes applies in its fulness and entirety to man." It need scarcely be said that this theory—that the activity of man's spiritual nature is determined by physical law and not by volition—is inconsistent with human freedom and therein with human responsibility.

In reply to the objection to Materialism, that it destroys human freedom and responsibility, the *argumentum ad hominem* is sometimes presented—that the same objection may, with equal propriety, be urged against the orthodox doctrine of predestination. To this Professor Huxley refers in connection with the passage above quoted, and says in reference to the "logical consequences" of his theory, "If for preaching such doctrine I am to be cited to the bar of public opinion, I shall not stand there alone. On the one hand, I shall have St. Augustine, John Calvin, and Jonathan Edwards."

Now, the *certainty* of the occurrence of a future event is one thing; the *nature of the agency* by which it occurs is an entirely different thing. By noting this distinction, the fallacy of the reply referred to will be manifest. Materialism and the doctrine of predestination may be said to agree, as to the *certainty* of the occurrence of the actions of men as predetermined. But they differ, *toto cælo*, as to the *nature of the agency* by which they occur. According to Materialism, the *certainty* is due to the fact that the action is the result of the operation of physical forces acting in accordance with physical laws, which

are fixed and invariable. The idea of the volition of a free agent is excluded.

According to the doctrine of predestination, events occur as predetermined, "yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." Conf. of Faith, Chap. III., Sec. 1. The fact of human freedom is asserted just as distinctly as the fact of divine fore-ordination. As regards the agency, therefore, by which human actions occur as pre-determined, Materialism and the doctrine of predestination are in direct conflict. Now the objectionable "logical consequences" referred to, have respect *to the point on which Materialism differs from the doctrine of predestination*, and not on any point on which they may be said to agree.

Edwards does indeed speak of the actions of men occurring by "necessity," but he is careful to state that he means "a moral or metaphysical necessity," and not "a natural or physical necessity." "As to the objection," says he, "against the doctrine which I have endeavored to prove, *that it makes men no more than machines*, I would say, that notwithstanding this doctrine, *man is entirely, perfectly, and unspeakably different from a mere machine*, in that he has reason and understanding, with a faculty of will, and so is capable of volition and choice." So far from holding with Huxley that man is "an automaton," he explicitly repudiates the doctrine, and teaches the very opposite.

It may be proper to say, that Calvinistic theologians at the present day discard the term "necessity" in this connection—even as explained and qualified by Edwards—in consequence of its liability to misinterpretation.

But doubtless, that class of evolutionists—or apologists for evolution—who would be interested in the present discussion would disclaim the bald Materialism avowed by many prominent advocates of the hypothesis. We proceed, therefore, to remark, that in the least objectionable form in which it can be stated, the hypothesis would seem to be irreconcilable with what the Scriptures teach as to man's original and present spiritual condition. According to the hypothesis, out of an

assumed original germ—or germs—of life in its lowest form, higher and still higher forms, terminating for the present at least, in man, were evolved. In “The Descent of Man,” the attempt is ingeniously made to trace the genesis of the faculties of man’s spiritual nature out of the irrational impulses and instincts of the lower orders of the animal creation.

According to this theory, that *being* to which—or to whom—the term *man* might for the first time be appropriately applied was, undoubtedly, man at his very lowest estate, intellectually, morally, spiritually—at the very bottom, so to speak, of the scale of humanity. Moreover, according to this theory, whatever might be called *sinful* in man’s nature or conduct, whether when in his original lowest estate, or at any subsequent stage of his ascent, was but a necessary incident to a condition of progressive and hence incomplete development. This condition, and whatever in connection therewith that might be called *sin*, is not, if the hypothesis be true, any thing abnormal, but *normal*—the legitimate result of the law of his being—just as much so as rectitude would be when, by the same law of his being, he had attained to a higher state of development. On this point, Principal Tulloch—whom no one will accuse of illiberal prejudice against either the *advanced* science or thinking of the present day—in his “Christian Doctrine of Sin,” says, “The favorite conceptions of modern science involve, if they do not start from, a definite view of human nature at variance with the old Biblical or spiritual view.” “It leaves, for example, no room for the idea of sin. For that which is solely a growth of nature cannot contain any thing that is at variance with its own higher laws. If the individual and social man alike are merely the outcome of natural forces working endlessly forward toward higher and more complex forms, then, whatever man is, he is not and cannot be a sinner. The mixed product of internal and external forces—of what is called *organism* and *environment*—he may, at certain stages of his progress, be very defective. But he has not fallen below any ideal he might have reached. He is only at any point what the sum of natural factors which enter into his being have made him. The two conceptions of sin and of development, in this naturalistic sense, cannot coexist. I cannot be the outcome of natural law,

and yet accountable for the fact that I am no better than I am." Such, then, is the theory of man's original and present spiritual condition involved in the development hypothesis. A simple statement of the Scriptural theory will exhibit how the two are not only not consistent, but at every point directly antagonistic.

With respect to other living creatures, the Biblical record is, "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life." (Gen. 1 : 20.) "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind." (Gen. 1 : 24.) This command to "the waters" to bring forth "the moving creature," and to "the earth" to bring forth "the living creature," may be intended—we do not say that it certainly was intended—to intimate, that the generation of the lower orders of animals was in accordance with pre-existing physical laws. The language in regard to the creation of *man* differs entirely from that just referred to, and this difference was doubtless not without design and significance. The record here is, "And the LORD GOD"—not "the earth," or "the waters," or any other pre-existing thing or creature, but "the LORD GOD—JEHOVAH ELOHIM—formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2 : 7.) Further, according to the Scriptures, not only was the manner of man's creation thus peculiar, but a fact of even greater importance in its bearing on the point immediately under consideration is asserted. It is taught that in pursuance of a special divine purpose, man was made in *the image of God*. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Then follows the record, "So God made man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." (Gen. 1 : 26, 27.) Now is it credible that by this language the sacred writer intended to assert that man as originally created—made in the image of God—his spiritual nature directly inbreathed by Jehovah—was but one remove above the brute ? Is it credible that the writer of this record intended to teach, that within the limits of the variation of an animal from the typical form and faculties of the parent, the son of one of the highest orders of apes was superior to its—or his—immediate progenitor, and that in virtue of this

variation, it—or he—became a human soul—made in God's image? And yet this must be accepted as the teaching of the inspired record, to harmonize the Scriptures with the hypothesis of evolution.

Still further, the Scriptures teach that the original progenitors of the human race, made in the image of God and left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate in which they were created, by the voluntary transgression of the divine law; that this transgression of God's law was *sin*; that this sin was culpable, and by the just judgment of God its penalty was death; that, in consequence of the fall of man from the estate in which he was originally created, the moral history of the race, *apart from supernatural influence*, has been constantly and only a retrogression and not a progression, a descent and not an ascent. That this is the teaching of the Scriptures, no extended quotation is needed to prove. Let a single reference suffice. In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, Paul gives what may be called the Scriptural theory as to the degradation of so large a portion of the human race. He declares of the heathen, that "when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God gave them up to uncleanness and vile affections." "They did not like to retain God in their knowledge, therefore God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Moreover, Paul did not regard the idolatry and debasing vices of the heathen as excusable because the necessary outgrowth of an imperfectly developed condition, but expressly declares that, "in the judgment of God, they who do such things are worthy of death." Now mark—the immediate inquiry is not whether the Bible doctrine concerning man's original and present spiritual condition concerning sin and the moral history of the race is true, but, is this doctrine consistent with the development hypothesis on these subjects?

Again, Evolutionism is not only inconsistent with the Scriptures as to man's origin, the nature of sin, and man's

original and present spiritual condition ; its teaching as to *the future of the human race* is alike irreconcilable with the teaching of the Scriptures as to the way of man's salvation, its nature, and man's destiny.

To show that the hypothesis, as it respects the future, "is not necessarily hostile to our religious faith," it has been said, "Were we constrained to trace our descent from apes, or frogs, or infusoria, we could look with no little complacency on our humble origin, from which we might anticipate further development in a posterity of angels and archangels, as far superior to ourselves as we are to the brutes or the animalcula from which we sprang. When we compare the alleged beginnings of our race with its present condition, there is no limit to what it may become, and the brightest visions of prophecy may be transcended by the history that shall yet be written."

The first thought suggested by this language is, that the progressive development which, according to the hypothesis, men are permitted to anticipate, is one with which *moral character and conduct* have nothing to do. Its occurrence is predetermined by the very constitution of man's being, by a law of his nature. Any connection between the performance of present duty and future destiny is excluded, and has no more place in the development of angels out of men, than it had in the development of men out of apes. Is this Scriptural?

But further, by the evolution of the human race out of apes, frogs, and infusoria, is not meant that all individuals of the lower races were, or are to be, developed into men, but simply this, that through exceptional individuals of each lower race—especially favored by "natural selection"—higher and still higher orders of animals, in a gradually ascending series, terminating for the present in man, have been evolved. According then to the hypothesis, the further development which men are permitted to "anticipate," is not that of *individual* angels and archangels out of *individual* men, but a race of angels out of the human race, and this through a long succession of intervening races in a gradually ascending scale, and after countless ages—the only connection between immediately succeeding races in the series being the exceptionally favored individuals of each race, the elect by "natural selection."

Now, it is respectfully submitted, in such an anticipation, have we any special reason for "complacency"? The same and no more than had the great mass of apes, and frogs, and infusoria of past ages reason for complacency, because forsooth, through certain individuals of their respective races, as links in a long series, the human race was, after millions of years, to be evolved. Or whatever complacency such an anticipation may afford, does it in any measure satisfy the wants of man's spiritual nature? Can it be made the substitute for a religious hope? What our immortal spirits crave is the prospect of a future higher, happier, holier state, not for certain individuals merely—of the human race—much less for another and entirely distinct race of beings, but for ourselves. Little reason is there for complacency in the prospect of the development of higher orders of beings out of the human race, if men individually, at death, are to become like "the beasts that perish"—or as Professor Tyndall more poetically, but with no more satisfaction to the cravings of our spiritual nature, expresses it—"shall have melted like streaks of morning cloud into the infinite azure of the past."

As if appreciating that the development above mentioned would not be regarded as justifying the statement it was made to establish, that Evolutionism "is not necessarily hostile to our religious faith," the writer adds, "When we are told that the individual human being actually passes through the various forms of his lower ancestry, why may he not in his own person pass successively through all the higher forms of which finite being is susceptible?" The physiological fact to which we understand this language to refer is, that the human being, in its embryonic development, assumes successively certain forms resembling the forms of certain of the lower orders of animals at the same stages of development. On this ground, it is not indeed asserted, but after the manner of the author of "The Origin of Species," when he would intimate what he does not feel at liberty to assert, it is asked, "Why may he not"—that is, why may not each individual of the human race—"pass successively through all the higher forms of which finite being is susceptible?" Our first remark in reply is, that the statement as to "what we are told," is inaccurate, and the

inference intimated is based on the inaccuracy. "The individual human being" does not "actually pass" through the forms of the lower orders of animals. The simple fact referred to is this, and nothing more, that in the elementary stages of foetal development, the human embryo *closely resembles* the embryo of the lower orders of animals at the same stage of development. Darwin himself, in "The Descent of Man," states the physiological fact with scientific precision. He says, "The (human) embryo at a very early period *can hardly be distinguished* from that of other members of the vertebrate kingdom." Again, "The embryo of man *closely resembles* that of other mammals." He gives drawings of the human and of the canine embryo, in which the points of resemblance, and at the same time of unlikeness, are distinctly exhibited. The precise fact, therefore, is a very different thing from that which is asserted, when it is said that "the human being actually passes" through the forms of the lower orders of animals. Close resemblance is not identity. Were the resemblance so exact and entire that under the microscope of highest power the two embryos were absolutely indistinguishable, it would prove nothing as to the point in question. For that which differentiates a living organism in embryo, makes it to be what it is in kind and nature distinguished from other living organisms in embryo, is not the external form or even the apparent physical features of the ovule, but the *quality of the life* which animates it—that mysterious principle in the ovule (which no microscopic power can discern), that determines the form and character of the subsequent developmet. Now this plastic principle—this *nisus formativus*—is as to kind or nature just as peculiar, distinct, and definite a thing, in the germ *ab initio*, as in the developed living being. Whatever be the seeming resemblance in the early stages of embryonic development, the ovules of animals of different orders or species—man included—invariably develop into beings after their kind, and this unquestionably in virtue of their distinct and peculiar nature *ab initio*. In the physiological fact accurately stated, there is nothing to justify the confidence with which evolutionists refer to it as well-nigh conclusive in favor of their hypothesis. As an argument to prove that individuals of the human race may

hope for development into beings of a higher order, it is certainly wholly irrelevant.

To exhibit this still more conclusively, if possible, let the inquiry above quoted be put in this form : "We are told that the individual *ape* actually passes through the various forms of his lower ancestry ; why may he not in his own person pass successively through all the higher forms of which finite being is susceptible ? There is no apparent reason why the argument is not just as good for monkey as for man.

Still further, by way of reply to the above inquiry, it may be asked, Were the existing orders of finite beings higher than man—"angels and archangels"—evolved out of the human race by "natural selection," or in any other way ? If not, is there any reason to believe that such beings will ever be thus evolved ?

We confess our inability to see how the doctrine of the *immortality of the individual man* can in any way be reconciled with the development hypothesis. According to the hypothesis, out of an original germ of animal life in its lowest form, higher and still higher forms terminating in man have been evolved by *slight gradations*—such as are possible within the limits of the variation of the offspring of an animal from the parent type. This idea of *gradual* development is so marked a feature of the hypothesis, that by some of its recent advocates evolution has been designated "the law of Continuity." Now, with respect to all the forms of animal life preceding man, we presume *the immortality of the individual* will not be maintained. And we presume none will maintain that the human spirit has become immortal by the gradual approach to immortality in the spirits of the different orders of animals preceding man in the ascending scale. If then, man be now immortal, the only other alternative, as it would seem, is that the wide—not to say impassable—gulf between mortality and immortality of spirit must have been crossed *per saltum* ; and yet this, regarded scientifically, would be fatal to the hypothesis, and theologically, would justify, if it did not indeed demand, the supposition of direct divine intervention.

In the development intimated in the inquiries above quoted, there is presented all that man is permitted to anticipate according to the hypothesis of evolution. The immediate inquiry

is not, whether this is the truth, but is this only hope set before us in the Gospel of Science, the "hope set before us in the Gospel" of Revelation? Or is not such teaching not only inconsistent with, but directly antagonistic to, the whole system of spiritual truth taught in the Word of God, concerning the nature and the way of man's salvation?

According to the Scriptures, there is for every individual of the human race an immortality of blessedness or woe, and this determined not by the operation of physical law, but "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, to be judged according to the deeds done in the body." According to the Scriptures, for fallen man salvation is possible in no other way than by *supernatural* agency—by direct divine intervention. Men, by nature, "are dead in trespasses and sins"—a state from which there is in man no more inherent power of development into a higher and holier state of being than there is power in a corpse to develop into a living soul. The central idea of the religion of the Bible—not taught obscurely in some doubtful passages, but asserted or implied on every page—is man's salvation through the incarnation, obedience, death, and resurrection of a *supernatural* Redeemer. "God was manifest in the flesh," "It must needs be that Christ should suffer," "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." For such a development as Evolutionism promises, whence the necessity for, or where the possibility of, the intervention of a supernatural Redeemer? Moreover, if Jesus of Nazareth was, as the Scriptures declare, born of a virgin by the power of the Holy Ghost, then in human history an act of creation by immediate divine agency has occurred; and if it occurred some eighteen hundred years ago, in the creation of the second Adam, is it incredible—is it improbable—that it occurred some six thousand years ago, in the creation of the first Adam?

And so it may be asked in regard to the *resurrection* of Christ, Was the reanimation of the lifeless form that for three days lay in Joseph's tomb without corruption an evolution by a law of nature? Or was it not by God's immediate agency—in the language of Scripture, "according to his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead"? And if here—when the occasion called for it—there

was direct divine intervention, is it impossible—is it improbable—that there was direct divine intervention in the creation of the progenitors of that race for whose salvation the Son of God became incarnate, died, and was raised again?

So it may be asked in regard to the other miracles recorded in the Scriptures, Were they but phenomena of the laws of nature, or were they not wrought by immediate divine agency? However some may speculate as to the possibility of explaining certain miracles on the hypothesis of the existence of a higher class of laws of nature, of which we have no knowledge, there are other miracles of which the explanation by any such hypothesis would seem to be inconceivable. And in any case, does not the *Biblical* idea of a miracle exclude such an hypothesis?

But further, the salvation of the Gospel involves not only the incarnation, death, and resurrection of a supernatural Saviour, but the continual intervention of another supernatural agent—the Holy Spirit. To be saved, man “must be born again,”—not from within, but from above—not by any law in his nature, but by the Holy Ghost. Evolutionism rejects alike the necessity for, or the possibility of, any such supernatural intervention.

And once more, the Bible teaches that the salvation of the Gospel is a *redemption*—a restoration of man to a former state of happiness and holiness—the state in which he was originally created. The Saviour of men is not merely a benefactor but a redeemer. The representation in the Scriptures of the consummation of the plan of redemption—whether it is to be understood literally or figuratively—is the earth redeemed from the effects of the curse restored to man redeemed from the effects of the fall. To any such conception, it need scarcely be said, the development hypothesis is directly antagonistic.

In answer, then, to the question proposed for discussion, we feel justified in replying, that Evolutionism is irreconcilable with the direct teaching of the Scriptures as to the origin of man—not only in the opening chapters of Genesis, but repeatedly, distinctly, and uniformly throughout the Bible; that important Biblical doctrines are based on the Mosaic account of the creation and fall of man, interpreted as the literal record of historical facts, and if this interpretation be incorrect, the argu-

ment is fallacious ; that the hypothesis is irreconcilable with the teaching of the Scriptures as to man's nature, his original and present spiritual condition, the nature of sin, the nature and the way of man's salvation, and his future destiny—in short, with the whole system of truth, for the revelation of which the Scriptures were given to men. The late Professor Tayler Lewis did not exaggerate, when, in reference to “ the doctrine of a *primus homo*, a first man made man by the fiat of God,” he said, “ Between Darwinism and Biblical truth there is a *polar* opposition. Adamity and Christianity (if the use of such words may be pardoned for the sake of the parallelism they so briefly present) go together. Here is to be an end of concession to science or any thing else. It is the idea *stantis vel cadentis Christianitatis*. The rejection of it makes havoc of the whole Bible, opening a chasm which no exegetical or theological device can close.”

If this conclusion be well founded, it follows :

First. That in weighing the evidence for and against Evolutionism as it respects man, the evidence that the Bible is from God, and not “ a cunningly devised fable,” must be taken into account. To prove that man is descended from an ape, it is not enough that certain facts of science may seem to favor such a conclusion. When the evidence in its favor becomes more conclusive than the evidence that the Scriptures were “ given by the inspiration of God,” then, and not till then, will the candid seeker after truth accept the hypothesis.

Although the consideration of the scientific evidence on the subject is aside from the present inquiry, it may be proper here to remark, that many whose opinions are entitled to respect, including prominent evolutionists—most notably Wallace, who shares with Darwin the honor of having reintroduced the hypothesis to favor—maintain on scientific grounds, that the origin of man is *sui generis*, and not to be accounted for by the hypothesis. At a meeting of the German naturalists at Munich in September last, Virchow—an authority not inferior to Haeckel—maintained, that “ anthropological investigations directly contradict the doctrine of evolution.”

Secondly. From the argument above presented we think it must be evident how short-sighted, unreasonable, and utterly

impracticable is the admonition frequently given by timid apologists for the Scriptures, that in view of past controversies between scientists and theologians, Christians ought not to commit themselves or the Scriptures to either side in this controversy, but should treat the subject as an open question; assured that whatever be the ultimate verdict of science, it will be found that the Bible can be interpreted in accordance therewith. This language affords some justification for Professor Huxley's sneer at "the marvellous flexibility" of the original Scriptures. Every reader of the Bible must acknowledge that its teaching concerning man's origin, nature, and destiny is, as to extent, explicitness, and importance, wholly different from its teaching concerning the structure of the solar system, or the length of a creative day. To assume that principles of interpretation based on the teaching of Scripture and the history of doctrine on these latter subjects, are applicable to the former, is—to say the least—illogical. As well might one maintain that, because we may treat as an open question, whether negroes are descendants of Canaan, we may therefore treat as an open question, whether the Jews are descendants of Abraham. If we receive the Scriptures as a revelation from God, are we at liberty to treat as an open question, whether man was evolved out of an ape by natural law, or was created by immediate divine agency and in "the image of God"? Can we treat the doctrine of the fall of man as an open question? Can we treat the doctrine of a supernatural salvation by a supernatural Saviour as an open question? Can we treat the doctrine, that the resurrection of Christ and the other miracles recorded in Scripture were supernatural, as an open question? Can we treat the doctrine of the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit in regenerating and sanctifying believers as an open question? Can we treat the doctrine of immortality—the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked—as an open question? On such subjects as these, can a genuine faith be provisional? If such doctrines are to be treated as open questions, or to be accepted provisionally until science has settled their truth or falsity, then is the Bible the most useless of books, the occupation of the Gospel minister is gone, and "Lay Sermons" from distinguished scientists are

"the only infallible rule to direct us what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man."

But some may be ready to ask, Suppose that science should hereafter prove that man was descended from an ape, what then becomes of the Bible and evangelical religion? This question may be answered by asking another. Suppose that, hereafter, it should be discovered that two and two make five, what then becomes of our Mathematics? Suppose that, in the progress of science, it should hereafter be found that matter does not attract but repels matter, what then becomes of our Physics? Suppose that, in the progress of Physiology, it should hereafter be proved that thought, and affection, and emotion, are nothing but secretions of the brain—determined by the proportions present of oxygen, and hydrogen, and nitrogen, and carbon, and especially phosphorus (as it already is said, "no phosphorus, no thought"), what then becomes of our Metaphysics and our Ethics? The answer to these questions—as to the question which suggested them—is, that science can never prove that which is not true, and there is little interest and no profit in speculating as to the possible conclusions that may be drawn from an impossible premise.

If this reply be unsatisfactory to the inquirer, still another question may be ventured. Suppose that science should ultimately prove that the Biblical account of the origin of man is true—what then becomes of those who, in the mean time, accept the false hypothesis and reject the Bible?—or of those who, awaiting the final verdict of science, treat the inspiration of the Bible as an open question? The Scriptures answer this question when they declare that "if the Gospel be hid"—whether through ignorance or the conceit of knowledge, whether through false philosophy or the speculations of "science falsely so-called"—they to whom it is hid "are lost." There is one doctrine which science and revelation agree in teaching—the responsibility of man for his belief. The violation of moral as well as of physical law—whether done wilfully or ignorantly—will be followed by its legitimate consequences. If the Scriptures be but "a cunningly devised fable," and faith in them a delusion, then at death believers in the Bible, together with those who reject it, will—it may be—"melt away like a

morning cloud into the infinite azure of the past." If the development theory of the origin of man shall in a little while take its place—as we doubt not it will—with other exploded scientific speculations, then they who accept it with its proper logical consequences will, in the life to come, have their portion with those who, in this life, "know not God and obey not the gospel of his Son."

This discussion may appropriately be concluded with the confirming words of Principal Dawson: "What we know of primitive man from geological investigation presents no contradiction to the history of his origin in the Bible, but rather gives such corroboration as warrants the expectation that, as our knowledge of pre-historic man increases, it will more and more fully bring out the force of those few and bold touches with which it has pleased God to enable his ancient prophets to sketch the early history of our species. Truth and divinity are stamped on every line of the early chapters of Genesis, alike in their archaic simplicity, and in that accuracy as to facts which enables them not only to stand unharmed amid the discoveries of modern science, but to display new beauties as we are able more and more fully to compare them with the records stored up from of old in the recesses of the earth. Those who base their hopes for the future on the glorious revelations of the Bible need not be ashamed of its story of the past."

JOHN T. DUFFIELD.