

This was too apt to degenerate into a modern language lesson, and, besides this, the most important points of variation were often not raised at all. Other masters corrected the Authorised Version by translations of their own, or those of good commentaries; but such corrections were apt not to be remembered, or to be remembered wrongly, and to leave on the boy's mind only a general and vague impression that the true sense of the writer was always something different from that which he found in his Bible.

Though not so essential to those who can read the Greek, it is useful also to them as emphasising definite points of question.

I have spoken only of *teaching*. For public *reading* I hope we may some day have a third version—the Authorised Version corrected from the Revised Version in places where the correction is absolutely necessary to the sense.

E. C. WICKHAM, M.A., *Headmaster*.

*United Services College,
Westward Ho!*

We do not use the Revised Version, except for reference.

C. PRICE, M.A., *Headmaster*.

Darwinism and Revelation as now Related.

BY THE REV. CHARLES CHAPMAN, M.A., LL.D., PRINCIPAL OF WESTERN COLLEGE, PLYMOUTH.

IT is now thirty-two years since Dr. Darwin issued his principal work, *The Origin of Species*; and twenty-nine since Mr. Herbert Spencer issued his prospectus of the *Synthetic Philosophy*, of which the "First Principles" was the introduction. Early in the summer of 1858 Mr. Wallace had also written an essay, while in the Malay Archipelago, on "The Tendency of Varieties to depart indefinitely from the Original Type,"—thus sharing with Dr. Darwin the distinction of originating, independently and contemporaneously, the doctrine of Natural Selection as the method by which organic forms have been evolved. It is thus interesting to see that the conception of organic evolution took formal shape, in a scientific work, about the time that the wider conception of Cosmic Evolution was being elaborated by the most prominent thinker of the age on those questions. It is now a matter of history how the publication of these works produced a profound impression on the educated world. The impartial historian will assuredly note the appearance of these works as an epoch-making event. Outside strictly scientific circles, concerned as they were exclusively with the scientific aspect of the subject, the depth and breadth of the impression produced was owing almost entirely to the supposed bearing of the conclusions arrived at on certain views entertained within the realm of religion and

theology. The most favourable interpretation of the Spencerian philosophy was held to be inconsistent with any belief in a personal God; and, as a consequence, involving an utter denial of the truth of the Christian religion. "Force" usurped the place of a Supreme Intelligence, and Christianity was merely one of the many forms of superstition evolved in the ascent of the race from barbarism to a future civilisation to be characterised by a clear intelligence. A defence of Revelation was useless, apart from the settlement of the prior question, as to whether there was a God to reveal Himself, and a moral nature capable of knowing Him. The Darwinian position, however, did not touch the question of Theism and the possibility of a revelation to man. Indeed, the closing sentence of the first edition of the *Origin of Species* reverently recognises the Creator, and claims that the view of the order of nature, presented in this book, gives a loftier conception of His wisdom and power than does the ordinary doctrine which ascribes the appearance of different species of organic forms to special, separate acts of the Almighty. As distinguished from the Spencerian wider theory of the universe, the first and immediate bearing of the Darwinian position was rather upon the record in the early chapters of Genesis, as that record was ordinarily interpreted. The prevalence of *post*-Reformation views on the

nature and authority of Scripture seemed to require that the account of the origin of organic forms, and especially of man, should be taken as strictly literal; and, consequently, there arose a storm of indignation when it was affirmed, on the one hand, that the views of Dr. Darwin were justified by a full consideration of the facts bearing on the case; and, on the other, that the Book of Genesis was either wrong, or our conception of its place and purpose in Revelation must be modified. The subsequent publication of the *Descent of Man* only emphasised the impression, that, if evolution be true, the Bible is either wrong or misunderstood by its professional interpreters. Here and there men of calm spirit and far-seeing gaze were to be found who thought they could see a way out of the confusion, without any rejection of the legitimate authority of science or disparagement to the supreme authority of Scripture. This clue lay along the lines of a true conception of the nature and method of Divine Revelation, and a treatment of Dr. Darwin's view as a tentative hypothesis only.

But this fresh form of the conflict between Science and Revelation soon widened out into more serious and perplexing issues. Dr. Darwin's work was strictly scientific: it dealt with bare facts in connection with organic life, and sought to find the law of their occurrence. Continuity was affirmable of the organic succession. But here it was that the philosophic spirit came in, and pushed the principle thus recognised in the organic sphere to what seemed to be its legitimate issue. If the natural was found alone to prevail through the entire organic series, from the lowest speck of protoplasm up to man, notwithstanding anything in Scripture, really or apparently, to the contrary, was not this suggestive that the natural alone would, in the same sense, prevail through the entire course of human development, physical, intellectual, moral, social? And as religion is, in one aspect, the most remarkable form assumed by the development of the race, may not even this be interpreted along natural lines alone? If the Divine Wisdom and Power were conspicuous in the natural order of organic forms, why not equally conspicuous in the natural order of the whole of human development? Continuity of natural causes and effects in one department of the world pointed to a like continuity in another; for God is the source of order and not of confusion.

This application of the principle of continuity involved in the theory of natural selection was, of course, *ultra*-Darwinian. At that time, and indeed even now, Darwinism is a purely scientific view of a definite part of the Cosmos—the organic, and that too on this globe. But this extension of the principle of continuity, as seen in Darwinism, was an expression of the philosophic spirit as distinguished from the purely scientific. A justification of this procedure was found in the belief of many that the Darwinian position was necessarily included in the wider Spencerian system which found place in the universe only for an anti-Theistic naturalism. Those who took this view, as a consequence, ruled out from the course of human affairs the supernatural in any sense recognised by theologians and ordinary believers in Scripture. Accordingly, Christianity, as well as Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and the Fetichism of Africa, was ascribed to the action on human nature only of strictly natural causes; in fact, Christianity is an evolution in the same sense as are the organic forms known as Ascidian or as Human. Later on, Dr. Darwin did not hesitate to express himself in accordance with this view. "For myself," he says, "I do not believe that there ever has been any revelation."¹

To sum up the position as it stood thirty years ago, Cosmic Evolution, as interpreted by Mr. Spencer, involved a rejection of Christianity as a divinely-instituted religion, and also a negation of Theism; Organic Evolution, as expounded by Dr. Darwin, was at variance with what had been held to be the teaching of Revelation concerning the origin of species and pre-eminently of man; and in so far as it seemed to imply the universal action only of natural causes, it discredited any supposed supernatural element in Christianity.

The question has naturally arisen, What is the position of Evolutionists at the present time, and have there been any modifications of the doctrine which render the conflict between its teaching and religion less acute?

Unquestionably there has been a vast amount of research and corresponding discussion both of principles and of detail. The weak points in the system have been exposed to the most unsparing criticism. Christianity has been variously expounded by its defenders, and a *modus vivendi* with science and philosophy has been sought by

¹ *Life and Letters*, i. p. 309.

the ingenious. But has Evolution itself changed either in its principles or its main conclusions? The answer to this question must undoubtedly be in the negative. The ground on which Mr. Spencer stood when he wrote his "First Principles" remains unchanged. The strong assertion of Dr. Darwin that he believed that the main conclusion he had arrived at would not be shaken by subsequent investigations, is held by his followers to be warranted by more recent inquiries. It still remains for us to insist and to endeavour to show, as some of us have done, that Mr. Spencer's agnostic position is not warranted even by the data from which he himself reasons in the elaboration of his system. Elsewhere,¹ I have pointed out that one cannot be a Cosmic Evolutionist, in any reasonable sense, without believing in the ordered universe as the outcome, by a process of change from the most simple to the complex and harmonious, of a Supreme Intelligence or Personal Being. If one may venture an opinion on so great a question, I believe that the course of philosophical discussions during the past thirty years has tended to place Theism on a far sounder basis than ever. Men, once somewhat positive in their denials, are now more hesitating; while others have come to recognise the existence of a Supreme Intelligence as the most rational hypothesis for the solution of the facts embraced in the ordered universe. This may be a long way from that strong faith and adoring love which are characteristic of the Christian Theist, but we may well count it as no mean spoil of victory. The logic of the concession, to say nothing of the spiritual craving of the heart, cannot but lead on to something more decided, and more influential on the whole tenor of life.

With reference to Organic Evolution, it cannot be denied that belief in it is more widely spread than ever. The difficulties felt by many scientific men, as indicated in his *Life and Letters*, to the acceptance of Dr. Darwin's main position, one by one passed away; and it is averred that, although demonstration is not admissible, from the nature of the case, yet every step taken of late years by science is in the direction of a gradual verification of the hypothesis assumed. One section of the scientific world has become more Darwinian than was Dr. Darwin himself, and has merited the rebuke administered by Professor Huxley in an

address delivered a few years since before the Royal Society.

At the same time, certain modifications of Darwinism have been strongly insisted on by good authorities, while a few hold judgment in suspense. It has been asserted by Mr. Spencer, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, October 1886, that Dr. Darwin did not give due prominence to the action of environment. This, however, only touches the degree in which environment is recognised, and not the fact. Dr. Darwin did not deny what Lamarck had insisted on; he only made it subordinate to, and not co-ordinate with, natural selection. A more important modification is found in the modern insistence, by a powerful school, on the inheritance of functionally produced modifications. Mr. Spencer joins the party who think that Dr. Darwin was wrong in claiming that only useful variations were determinative. Dr. Romanes has even gone so far as to say that in order to account for all the facts, and especially those connected with the sterility of allied species, it is necessary to supplement natural selection and sexual selection by what is called physiological selection. But it may well be doubted whether in substance Dr. Darwin did not, in his later editions, distinctly recognise the functional peculiarity of the generative organs insisted on, and consider its action as being embraced in the action of natural selection.

A more effective objection has been raised against Dr. Darwin's early ascription of the useful determinative variations to "chance." The term was unfortunate, and, as Professor Huxley has pointed out, is incorrect. Dr. Darwin's expression was popular, and not philosophical. What he really meant, as indicated by his *Letters*, was, that he did not know, or trouble himself about, the real cause. Eimer has endeavoured to supply what Darwin left uncertain, for he says, in his *Organic Evolution as the Result of the Inheritance of Acquired Characters according to the Laws of Organic Growth*, that the causes which led to the formation of new characters in organisms, and, in the last result, to their evolution, consist essentially in the chemico-physiological interaction between the material composition of the body and external influences; and he also adds, that the Darwinian principle of utility does not explain the origin of new characters. Substantially Weissmann, also, ascribes variations to the same causes; and Mr. Spencer pushes the inquiry

¹ *Pre-Organic Evolution*, published by T. & T. Clark.

further back, as is his wont, and thinks he finds the origin of the very first variations of the first organisms,—“they conformed to the same general law as do the changes of the inorganic mass.”

Now it is obvious, looking on the nature and scope of these suggested modifications of Darwinism, that no alteration is made in its relation to religion. The most conspicuous break from pure Darwinism is that of Mr. Wallace, who places the origin of man as a responsible moral being outside or above the line of organic continuity; but even this is no reversal of anything Dr. Darwin taught concerning Organic Evolution in general. The present scientific position is fairly expressed in Professor Huxley's words, when taking a review of the question before the Royal Society, “The origin of species lies in variation, while the origin of any particular species lies, firstly, in the occurrence, and, secondly, in the selection and preservation of particular variations.”

How far the believer in Divine Revelation can acquiesce in the conclusions thus arrived at, and, at the same time, be loyal to truth, is a question for each one to solve. That it is possible to hold to the certainty of a Divine Revelation for the guidance of man in spiritual matters, and, at the same time, fearlessly and cheerfully accept the *well-attested conclusions* of science, I most firmly believe. It is of no avail to simply affirm that the conclusions are not valid: they must be shown not to be so, or else reasons must be adduced to show that there is a considerable element of uncertainty with reference to them. How far does Evolution extend? Does it cover all that is in man? Then, this being settled, what is the true relation of Revelation to the scientific position? These are the problems to be solved; and that they can be solved with due regard to *real* scientific authority and the real claims of Revelation, I most firmly believe.

Biblical Archaeology and the Higher Criticism.

BY THE REV. HERBERT SYMONDS, D.D., PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

IN connexion with Professor Sayce's paper on “Biblical Archaeology and the Higher Criticism,” which appeared in the December number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, it may be interesting to some readers to note the views of that great Old Testament scholar Ewald.

1. Ewald decides against the use of writing in the patriarchal age. “We must admit,” says he, “that that primitive time . . . did not possess the art of writing” (*History of Israel*, Eng. trans. i. p. 48).

Nevertheless, as a possession of the Semitic peoples, he regards writing as of the most extreme antiquity, its origin being lost “in a distant mist which all our present means are inadequate to explore,” whilst as regards the Israelites “we need not scruple to assume that Israel knew and used it (*i.e.* writing) in Egypt before Moses” (*ut sup.* p. 51). One can hardly help questioning whether, seeing that “Israel did not adopt the Egyptian character” (p. 52), Ewald is quite consistent in denying the possession of this art to patriarchal times, since it would seem to follow that the Israelites must have

taken the Semitic character down to Egypt with them.

2. In regard to Gen. xiv., Ewald says: “All indications tend to show that this whole piece was written prior to Moses” (p. 52, *n.* 2). But it is more important to note that he considers it a document written, not by Hebrew historians, but inserted in Genesis by a later author who derived it from the records of some cognate nation, those of the Canaanites, for example. “When we consider the ancient narrative contained in Gen. xiv., so strikingly different from all other accounts, in which Abraham is described as an almost alien ‘Hebrew,’ much as a Canaanite historian might have spoken of him; . . . then it cannot but appear very probable, or rather certain, that the earliest historians of Israel found many historical works (*cf.* Gen. xxxvi. and Num. xiii. 22) already existing in the cognate nations” (p. 52).

One would be glad to know what Professor Sayce's opinion may be on this account of Gen. xiv.