DARWINISM.

ITOR OF THE IRISH YOUNG MEN'S JOURNAL.

IR—It may have already occurred to ers that "G.E.W." has no right to assume rimitive days referred to in the Mosaic f creation are periods of indefinite length, he vast majority of those who form any the subject are satisfied that the time does not mean a day in the ordinary n of the term." This much is gratui- amed in favour of his more extravagant n regarding "the origin of species," ause any other interpretation stands in opposition to the theory of develop- t we have more reasonable grounds to .W." this position than he has to assume ely we cannot be expected to accept as of an argument, a dogmatic assertion f which cannot possibly be established. we find it distinctly stated that "on h day God ended his work which he had He rested on the seventh day from all which he had made." But it is one of principles of geology that the various hich we notice at work in the world at ve produced all the previous changes rface has undergone. And if the work is as really in progress now, *in the iod*, as it was at any former time, in are we to suppose that God has rested k that has not yet terminated, or of act, there can be no conceivable cessa- then, if the days of creation were periods of time, how are we to under- reference made to them in the fourth ent? "Remember the Sabbath day to . Six days shalt thou labour, and do k" And immediately following we in six days the Lord made heaven and ea, and all that in them is, and rested day." Now, how can any one consis- that in the latter instance the word etaphorically used, while in the former rybody else, must take the time spoken iteral days of twenty-four hours?

act which affords a strong presumption correctness of this interpretation is discrepancy observable between the six days' work and that disclosed by rticulars of which I need not wait to rd. Many other objections, to which ory answers can be given, might be ced, so that every one who respects ist see that the hypothetical vantage which "G.E.W." would presume to theory is utterly untenable. That the ften figuratively employed in Scrip- of course denies, but that it is to be d in this connection I refuse to admit. desire satisfactorily to reconcile the the rocks with the truth of revelation ke the time spoken of in Genesis to d of *six natural days*. Not that they moment question the high antiquity or countenance the notion that it was xistence at the commencement of the k. The "unknown millions of years" account for geological phenomena ay, an interval between "the begin- solute creation, and the time when so constituted as to suit the condition as to occupy upon it.

diately preceding his creation—when the six days commenced—the earth t form, and void;" its surface was water, and "darkness was upon the leep." Hebrew scholars tell us the of Moses, translated in our English *ut form and void*, means simply and *sible and unfurnished*. Some render h was waste and desolate;" others vacuous." Nor can the slightest evi- uced that is not in perfect conformity rative; for we know, from the estab- iples of comparative anatomy, that present races could not have existed us condition of the earth's surface; e every reason to infer, from facts he science of geology, that the chaotic world, to which the Sacred Writer e last of a series of changes and revo- gh which it passed in order to render abode for man.

indeed, that attempts have not been show that the common notion regard- *l disorder* is without foundation. Not fessor Tyndall (in words that seem to ut as much reverence and love for he strictures of Dr. Colenso) casually it, in the course of a professional the legend of the spirit brooding over some one has been ingenious enough rule of interpretation, according to ars that the *earth*, described by Moses id, does not mean the earth generally, icular portion of it afterwards filled elling place of the human family.

ers cooly repudiate the simple inte- ipture, or try to force upon it an that would favour the speculative en who are, for the most part, mere ifidels, I think it is the part of every kes a profession of Christianity, to that which, while it may with con- egarded as strictly and literally true, ce at the root of the principles on eories are based, instead of placing gument in the hands of those whose our is to unsettle and falsify the ur commonly received theology.

Dr. J. Pye Smith says:—"Our planet was brought into a state of disorganisation, detritus, or ruin from a former condition; and it pleased the Almighty, Wise, and Benevolent Supreme, out of that state of ruin, to adjust the surface of the earth to its now existing condition, the whole extending through the period of *six natural days*."

"The earth," says Dr. Chalmers, "lapsed into a chaos, from the darkness and disorder of which the present system or economy of things was made to arise."

"The Bible," says Dr. King, "recognises in the first instance the great age of the earth, and then tells us of the changes it underwent at a period long subsequent in order to render it a fit abode for the family of man. The work of the six days was not, according to this view, a creation in the strict sense of the term, but a renovation, a remodelling of pre-existing materials."

This is the opinion commonly received. It would be easy to quote the testimony of many other distinguished authorities in proof of its correctness. But this is unnecessary. No one acquainted with the scientific works of the writers I have just referred to can for a moment doubt their competency to form a judgment either of Biblical exegesis or geological evidence fully entitled to our confidence.

Here, then, is the precise point to which I would ask the attention of your readers. Darwin's theory requires the various tribes to have been in progress of development during cycles of ages—from the earliest period of geological history. But according to the express teaching of Scripture, at a comparatively recent date every order of animated beings on the surface of our world must have been destroyed. This at once precludes the idea of development, and shuts us up to the conclusion that the earth on being changed from a shape of superficial ruin, must have been furnished by special exercise of creative power with the races, which we have in existence in the present day. "Is there aught in the rude and boisterous play of a great physical catastrophe," Dr. Chalmers asks, "that can germinate those exquisite structures? * * * We see in the sweeping energy and uproar of this elemental war enough to account for the disappearance of all the old generations, but nothing that can cradle even generations into existence." "Nor can we," he again very naturally remarks, "better account for so goodly a creation emerging again into even forms of animation and beauty from the wreck of the old one, than that the Spirit of God moved on the face of chaos, and that nature, turned by the last catastrophe into a wilderness, was again repeopled at the utterance of His word."

But independently of anything stated in Scripture, we learn from the testimony of geology that violent agencies have in numerous instances interfered with the regular sequence of nature's operations, and swept existing races off the surface of the earth. It is a fact, now well established by the researches of Palæontology, that during past periods of geological history our world has changed its inhabitants at least half a dozen times; and anatomists tell us that the changes in organic life are so complete—each successive group of animals so distinct and separate from that which preceded it—that the different races could not possibly have existed in the same state of climate and general condition of the earth's surface. Geologists for the most part are of opinion that new species were introduced in large numbers at particular epochs; and some have endeavoured to show that there is a well marked coincidence between the disappearance of extinct tribes and the various physical revolutions, which have produced the mountain systems of the globe. But it is of no material consequence whether we believe this, or suppose that old races were destroyed by a change of climate or some other cause. The great question is how to solve the enigma of the several distinct and new creations by which they were always replaced. Are we to suppose with the author of "The Vestiges" that "it is a mean view of the Great Author to suppose Him obliged to come in on frequent occasions with new feats, or special interferences," and in accordance with the views of your correspondent, believe that new species always grew out of the old ones by a process of natural development? Sir Isaac Newtown has said that "the growth of new systems out of old ones without the mediation of Divine power seems to me apparently absurd;" and the absurdity must appear more evident still to those who feel satisfied that before new species came into existence the old ones had entirely disappeared. "Thus," as the Rev. Mr. Conybeare remarks, "we see that geological evidence strikes at once at the root of every sceptical argument against miracles." Dr. Hitchcock says, "Even Hume would hardly deny that the creation of whole series of animals and plants was miraculous." And again, "everything," says Sir Charles Bell, "declares the species to have its origin in a distinct creation—not in a gradual variation from some original type. * * * And any other hypothesis than that of a new creation of animals suited to the successive changes in the organic matter of the globe, the condition of the water, atmosphere, and temperature, brings with it only an accumulation of difficulties. It is not necessary to be informed of the method according to which species were introduced at first. However, we are not forbidden to inquire into the matter; and I suppose there can be nothing wrong in so doing. But facts alone can establish our reasonings on a basis worthy of being trusted. Conclusions which can only be arrived at through the influence of mere hypothesis have no rational claim on our acceptance. And, indeed, the theory under discussion is entirely hypothetical, for apart from vague and extravagant conjectures, there is not the slightest evidence of its truth. And, besides, we can more easily conceive how the various animated tribes may have been called into existence by no other instrumentality than the mere utterance of a word, than prepare to swallow half the monstrous absurdities involved in the belief that "no organism is, or ever has been created, that was not microscopic;" that "whatever is larger has not been created but developed." It is readily admitted that the special interposition of the Almighty was required to originate the simplest species of animalculæ at the beginning. And surely no reasonable man can doubt but it was as easy with Omnipotence to form the most complicated and perfect race of beings in maturity, by a single act of creation, six thousand years ago, as at an earlier period to create the embryotic mounds from which it is presumed that, by a process of development, they have arisen.

Next month I hope to be able to show your readers that the assumption is not less opposed to the facts disclosed by "the great stone record" than it is to the testimony of the Bible.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. B.

DARWINISM.

EDITOR OF THE IRISH YOUNG MEN'S JOURNAL.

SIR—It may have already occurred to ders that "G.E.W." has no right to assume primitive days referred to in the Mosaic of creation are periods of indefinite length, the vast majority of those who form any of the subject are satisfied that the time ed does not mean a day in the ordinary ion of the term." This much is gratui- umed in favour of his more extravagant ion regarding "the origin of species," ecause any other interpretation stands in at opposition to the theory of develop- But we have more reasonable grounds to E.W." this position than he has to assume rely we cannot be expected to accept as of an argument, a dogmatic assertion of which cannot possibly be established. is we find it distinctly stated that "on th day God ended his work which he had d He rested on the seventh day from all which he had made." But it is one of l principles of geology that the various which we notice at work in the world at have produced all the previous changes surface has undergone. And if the work n is as really in progress now, *in the* eriod, as it was at any former time, in so are we to suppose that God has rested rk that has not yet terminated, or of fact, there can be no conceivable cessa- d then, if the days of creation were periods of time, how are we to under- reference made to them in the fourth ment? "Remember the Sabbath day to y. Six days shalt thou labour, and do rk." And immediately following we e in six days the Lord made heaven and s see, and all that in them is, and rested h day." Now, how can any one consis- , that in the latter instance the word taphorically used, while in the former verybody else, must take the time spoken literal days of twenty-four hours? fact which affords a strong presumption e correctness of this interpretation is g discrepancy observable between the e six days' work and that disclosed by articulars of which I need not wait to ard. Many other objections, to which tory answers can be given, might be aced, so that every one who respects ust see that the hypothetical vantage m which "G.E.W." would presume to s theory is utterly untenable. That the often figuratively employed in Scrip- y of course denies, but that it is to be od in this connection I refuse to admit. desire satisfactorily to reconcile the of the rocks with the truth of revelation ake the time spoken of in Genesis to iod of *six natural days*. Not that they moment question the high antiquity , or countenance the notion that it was existence at the commencement of the rk. The "unknown millions of years" o account for geological phenomena ay, an interval between "the begin- bsolute creation, and the time when so constituted as to suit the condition was to occupy upon it.

ediately preceding his creation—when of the six days commenced—the earth ost form, and void;" its surface was h water, and "darkness was upon the deep." Hebrew scholars tell us the s of Moses, translated in our English *ost form and void*, means simply and *isible and unfurnished*. Some render rth was waste and desolate;" others d vacuous." Nor can the slightest evi- duced that is not in perfect conformity arrative; for we know, from the estab- ciples of comparative anatomy, that present races could not have existed ous condition of the earth's surface; e every reason to infer, from facts the science of geology, that the chaotic e world, to which the Sacred Writer the last of a series of changes and revo- ugh which it passed in order to render abode for man.

indeed, that attempts have not been show that the common notion regard- *al disorder* is without foundation. Not fessor Tyndall (in words that seem to ost as much reverence and love for the strictures of Dr. Colenso) casually it, in the course of a professional the legend of the spirit brooding over d some one has been ingenious enough rule of interpretation, according to ean that the *earth*, described by Moses ood, does not mean the earth generally, rticular portion of it afterwards filled elling place of the human family.

ers coolly repudiate the simple inte- ipture, or try to force upon it an n that would favour the speculative en who are, for the most part, mere olds, I think it is the part of every akes a profession of Christianity, to that which, while it may with con- regarded as strictly and literally true, ts at the root of the principles on theories are based, instead of placing guments in the hands of those whose our is to unsettle and falsify the ost commonly received theology.

Dr. J. Pye Smith says:—"Our planet was brought into a state of disorganisation, detritus, or ruin from a former condition; and it pleased the Almighty, Wise, and Benevolent Supreme, out of that state of ruin, to adjust the surface of the earth to its now existing condition, the whole extending through the period of *six natural days*."

"The earth," says Dr. Chalmers, "lapsed into a chaos, from the darkness and disorder of which the present system or economy of things was made to arise."

"The Bible," says Dr. King, "recognises in the first instance the great age of the earth, and then tells us of the changes it underwent at a period long subsequent in order to render it a fit abode for the family of man. The work of the six days was not, according to this view, a creation in the strict sense of the term, but a renovation, a remodelling out of pre-existing materials."

This is the opinion commonly received. It would be easy to quote the testimony of many other distinguished authorities in proof of its correctness. But this is unnecessary. No one acquainted with the scientific works of the writers I have just referred to can for a moment doubt their competency to form a judgment either of Biblical exegesis or geological evidence fully entitled to our confidence.

Here, then, is the precise point to which I would ask the attention of your readers. Darwin's theory requires the various tribes to have been in progress of development during cycles of ages—from the earliest period of geological history. But according to the express teaching of Scripture, at a comparatively recent date every order of animated beings on the surface of our world must have been destroyed. This at once precludes the idea of development, and shuts us up to the conclusion that the earth on being changed from a shape of superficial ruin, must have been furnished by special exercise of creative power with the races, which we have in existence in the present day. "Is there aught in the rude and boisterous play of a great physical catastrophe," Dr. Chalmers asks, "that can germinate those exquisite structures? * * * We see in the sweeping energy and uproar of this elemental war enough to account for the disappearance of all the old generations, but nothing that can cradle even generations into existence." "Nor can we," he again very naturally remarks, "better account for so goodly a creation emerging again into even forms of animation and beauty from the wreck of the old one, than that the Spirit of God moved on the face of chaos, and that nature, turned by the last catastrophe into a wilderness, was again repeopled at the utterance of His word."

But independently of anything stated in Scripture, we learn from the testimony of geology that violent agencies have in numerous instances interfered with the regular sequence of nature's operations, and swept existing races off the surface of the earth. It is a fact, now well established by the researches of Palæontology, that during past periods of geological history our world has changed its inhabitants at least half a dozen times; and anatomists tell us that the changes in organic life are so complete—each successive group of animals so distinct and separate from that which preceded it—that the different races could not possibly have existed in the same state of climate and general condition of the earth's surface. Geologists for the most part are of opinion that new species were introduced in large numbers at particular epochs; and some have endeavoured to show that there is a well marked coincidence between the disappearance of extinct tribes and the various physical revolutions, which have produced the mountain systems of the globe. But it is of no material consequence whether we believe this, or suppose that old races were destroyed by a change of climate or some other cause. The great question is how to solve the enigma of the several distinct and new creations by which they were always replaced. Are we to suppose with the author of "The Vestiges" that "it is a mean view of the Great Author to suppose Him obliged to come in on frequent occasions with new feats, or special interferences," and in accordance with the views of your correspondent, believe that new species always grew out of the old ones by a process of natural development? Sir Isaac Newtown has said that "the growth of new systems out of old ones without the mediation of Divine power seems to me apparently absurd;" and the absurdity must appear more evident still to those who feel satisfied that before new species came into existence the old ones had entirely disappeared. "Thus," as the Rev. Mr. Conyb.are remarks, "we see that geological evidence strikes at once at the root of every sceptical argument against miracles." Dr. Hitchcock says, "Even Hume would hardly deny that the creation of whole series of animals and plants was miraculous." And again, "everything," says Sir Charles Bell, "declares the species to have its origin in a distinct creation—not in a gradual variation from some original type. * * * And any other hypothesis than that of a new creation of animals suited to the successive changes in the organic matter of the globe, the condition of the water, atmosphere, and temperature, brings with it only an accumulation of difficulties. It is not necessary to be informed of the method according to which species were introduced at first. However, we are not forbidden to inquire into the matter; and I suppose there can be nothing wrong in so doing. But facts alone can establish our reasonings on a basis worthy of being trusted. Conclusions which can only be arrived at through the influence of mere hypothesis have no rational claim on our acceptance. And, indeed, the theory under discussion is entirely hypothetical, for apart from vague and extravagant conjectures, there is not the slightest evidence of its truth. And, besides, we can more easily conceive how the various animated tribes may have been called into existence by no other instrumentality than the mere utterance of a word, than prepare to swallow half the monstrous absurdities involved in the belief that "no organism is, or ever has been created, that was not microscopic;" that "whatever is larger has not been created but developed." It is readily admitted that the special interposition of the Almighty was required to originate the simplest species of animalculæ at the beginning. And surely no reasonable man can doubt but it was as easy with Omnipotence to form the most complicated and perfect race of beings in maturity, by a single act of creation, six thousand years ago, as at an earlier period to create the embryotic mounds from which it is presumed that, by a process of development, they have arisen.

Next month I hope to be able to show your readers that the assumption is not less opposed to the facts disclosed by "the great stone record" than it is to the testimony of the Bible.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. B.

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library