

EVOLUTION

AND

THE ORIGIN AND STATE OF MAN

BY

C. F. HOGG



*PICKERING
& INGLES LTD*

3^D
NET

Evolution

AND

The Origin and State of Man

BY

C. F. HOGG

Author of "The Epistles to the Thessalonians,"
"The Epistles to the Galatians," etc., etc.



PICKERING & INGLIS Ltd.

LONDON

GLASGOW

MANCHESTER

EDINBURGH

Evolution

And the Origin and State of Man

THE writer of this paper is not a scientist, in the sense that he has no expert knowledge of the physical realm. If he were challenged as to his qualifications for discussing his subject, he would reply that one of the foundations of the liberties of the race in whose language these words are written, is Trial by Jury. Matters of moment, involving property, reputations, life itself, are submitted to the judgment of twelve average citizens, who give their verdict on evidence offered by experts. The experts themselves, however, are neither juries nor judges. They are witnesses to facts, and that alone. It is assumed in the pages that follow that persons of average intelligence and experience are competent to consider the evidence offered by the scientific expert, and to pass judgment on the facts as ascertained by him and to which he testifies.

It is human nature to be pontifical, to pronounce judgments and to demand submission to authority, sometimes ecclesiastical, sometimes theological, sometimes scientific. The scientific priest is the enemy of freedom as is the ecclesiastic, and eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. Let the reader beware of the man who, in any sphere, pretends to authority

without the credentials of well-attested fact. It is an evil to yield easily to the prestige of great names.

Writer and reader claiming nothing more, then, than average intelligence and experience, may proceed to consider the Theory of Evolution.

Fact and Theory.

It is necessary, however, first to remind the reader of the essential difference between fact and theory. Discussing our subject recently, a writer in the columns of the foremost English newspaper declared that the time had come to speak of "the fact of Evolution," instead of the "theory of Evolution." So the warning is not unnecessary.

Sir Isaac Newton saw an apple fall from the tree to the ground, and deduced the theory of gravitation to account for that fall. Gravitation, however, is not a fact but a theory. That an apple falls is the fact; gravitation is a theory suggested to account for the fact.

Another fact is that man is an animal. Nature is obviously divided into three kingdoms—mineral, vegetable, and animal. To the third of these man belongs. Among animals he is classed with the vertebrates, animals that have spines, and the mammals, animals that suckle their young, inasmuch as in his body he presents many and close resemblances to these. Of all animals man is the most highly organised physically, and the only one that gives evidence of possessing capacity for thinking of his origin and of his destiny.

How is man to be accounted for—whence is

he? According to the Book of Genesis (and its inferential confirmation by the Lord Jesus Christ in such passages as Matthew 19. 3-8), man is the product of a creative act on the part of God, Who formed his body of earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.

Late in the eighteenth century biologists began to move toward the formulation of a theory of the evolution of the more complex from the more simple forms under which life manifests itself. All life, according to these speculations, began with a single cell, but how this cell originated is not suggested, for science is knowledge arrived at by observation; in the nature of the case origins lie without its scope.

No two of the germinal cells from which all living bodies develop can be distinguished the one from the other, either by aid of the microscope, or by any chemical process. It has been said, by way of illustration, that there is no discoverable difference between the cells that produced Newton, his dog, and his apple. Inherent difference there must be, but what that difference is defies the investigator as much as does the origin of the cell itself. Genesis tells us that to all living things the Creator gave power to reproduce themselves, but only under the strict limitation expressed in the words of chapter 1, verse 11, "after its kind," a law apparently inviolable and universal, inasmuch as, in fact, no exception thereto has ever been found.

This theory involves that the power determining the varied developments of form, function, and so forth, of the more complex

from the more simple in character, is not imposed upon them from without, but is inherent in these simpler forms, and, further, that every living thing was in a single original cell, as Levi was in the loins of his father Abraham (Heb. 7. 10).

Evolution or Creation?

Evolution, *ex hypothesi*, is a process which continues in virtue of an inherent energy, and which varies its manifestations in response to varying environment. Creation, according to Genesis, was completed by the fiat of the Creator, and by Him has been maintained and perpetuated. It is clear, then, that the theory of Evolution cannot be deduced from the teaching of the Bible—they differ to such an extent as to be mutually exclusive.

According to the hypothesis, man also is a product of the evolutionary process. But whereas Genesis accounts for man, Evolution accounts only for his body, leaving the mental, moral, and spiritual elements out of the account altogether. For the essentials of manhood lie not in what man has in common with the brutes, but in that in which he differs from them.

Some evolutionists assert that man is not a lineal descendant of the ape or other anthropoid, but that he and they, in ages inconceivably remote, had a common ancestor, and that "each has come by its community of structure independently." Keith, however, takes another line, saying ("*Concerning Man's Origin*," p. 12): "All the evidence now at our disposal supports the conclusion that man has arisen, as Lamarck and Darwin suspected, from an anthropoid ape

not higher in the zoological scale than the chimpanzee." He goes on to say, however, that "Geological research . . . has not produced so far the final and conclusive evidence of man's anthropoid origin."

Evolution not Proven.

Is the evolutionary theory to be accepted? I judge that, on the evidence, the verdict must be "not proven." I say on the evidence, for, at the moment, we are not appealing to the Bible, but to testimony adduced by experts. Neither is it here claimed that the verdict is that of an unprejudiced person—a claim easy to make, hard to establish. A wiser course will be to say with B. F. Westcott, "so far as the human mind is capable of divesting itself of prejudice." The present writer frankly acknowledges prejudice in favour of the Bible, and of the Lord Jesus Christ in all the judgments that He expressed in all matters whatsoever. The highest and safest prejudice is prejudice in favour of truth, and He called Himself "The Truth." No falsehood can be of any service to Him, and this those who bear His Name should ever keep in mind.

It follows, of course, that the Christian who understands his calling cannot be an obscurantist. So far from discouraging investigation, he will be intelligently sympathetic with every inquirer into the secrets of nature, persuaded, indeed, that these are God's secrets, and that He endowed man with his distinctive faculties that they might be exercised in their discovery.

**"The works of the Lord are great,
Sought out are they of all them that have pleasure
therein" (Psa. 111. 2).**

The glory of the discoverer is acknowledged, the benefits he bestows recognised; how much greater the glory of God, Who stored Nature with powers and resources to be discovered! It is universal truth that "there is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested; neither was anything made secret save that it should come to light" (Mark 4. 22).

The reason for arriving at this conclusion (that the theory of Evolution cannot be accepted to account for the facts presented by contemporary life, and by the fossilized remains of the life of past ages), is that there is no evidence that the lower or simpler forms preceded the higher or more complex. The simplest forms of life, the one-celled plants and animals, are plentiful still. Why do they survive? Should they not have developed into more complex forms long since? In a word, what is the matter with Evolution is, that the evidence adduced is inadequate to support it. Paleontology knows nothing of a missing link between man and ape, nor, indeed, of any other of the many missing links necessary to vindicate the theory; nor has a missing link between any two species been discovered in living nature.

It will be necessary here, as it will surely be sufficient, to quote some of the utterances of men who speak authoritatively in the name of science. Thus before a meeting of the British Association in Liverpool in 1922, Dr. D. H. Scott declared that there is no evidence for

Darwinian Evolution, that "the Darwinian period is past," but that he himself remained an evolutionist "by an act of faith." In this he follows Dr. Bateson, who spoke to the same effect at a meeting of the same body in Toronto in 1921. In 1929, in Johannesburg, Dr. D. M. S. Watson said that while "Evolution is accepted by every biologist, the mode and the mechanism are still disputable." Again, "We know as surely as we ever shall that evolution has occurred. But we do not know how that evolution has been brought about. The data which we have accumulated are inadequate . . . in their character to allow us to determine which, if any, of the proposed explanations is a *vera causa*. Nevertheless, Dr. Watson also maintains the theory, "not because it had been observed to occur, or was supported by logically coherent arguments, but because the only alternative, special creation, was clearly incredible." We observe, then, that so far as the evolutionary theory is concerned, the verdict of these scientists also is "Not proven." They, too, believe where they cannot prove.

The Fossil Record.

Regarding the fossils, scientific testimony takes the same general direction. Thus Dr. Austin H. Clark (of the Smithsonian Institution, U.S.A.), in the *Quarterly Review of Biology* for December, 1928, pp. 523-541: "We see that the fossil record, the actual history of the animal life upon the earth, bears us out in the assumption that at its very first appearance animal life in its broader features was essentially in the same

form as that in which we now know it." "As far back as Cambrian time, the status of the animal world was, in its broader features, just what it is to-day." "There is not the slightest evidence that one of the major groups arose from any other . . . each is a special animal complex related, more or less closely, to all the rest, and appearing, therefore, as a special and distinct creation." Dr. J. Ambrose Fleming, D.Sc., F.R.S., of London University, discussing the theory that man and the simians have a common, though remote, ancestor, says: "This theory is an unverified hypothesis . . . it has a most slender basis of fact, and has been rejected by some of the most eminent naturalists." A final quotation, in this connection, may be taken from Dr. Austin Clark's paper mentioned above. He says: "So far as the major groups of animals are concerned, the creationists seem to have the better of the argument."

A popular misconception occasionally finds expression in newspaper paragraphs, with some such caption as, 'An Expedition in Search of the Missing Link,' whereas the truth is that the missing links between species are legion, at least as numerous as species themselves. So that if (and this is the crux of the whole matter) species are evolved from species, then the fossil beds and living nature alike would abound in transition species, which is what is meant by missing links. Indeed, every species would be manifestly linked on the one hand with simpler, on the other with more complex, species, but this is simply not the case. In fact, no single link exists where, on the evolutionary hypothesis,

such links should abound. Moreover, the fact that these links have to be sought in inaccessible regions, and in the remains of remote ages, raises a strong presumption against their existence, a presumption that experience has hitherto confirmed.

There have, indeed, been found, in different parts of the world, portions of skeletons which have been declared to exhibit features of an indeterminate character, something between ape and man. But these remains are so fragmentary that attempts to reproduce the skeleton of their original owner differ with the preconceived ideas of the men who work upon them. Owner, I say, though there is no evidence at all that these scattered bones did originally belong to one and the same frame; indeed, the contrary may well have been the case.

In the museum at San Deigo, California, there is exhibited a series of models of the human head, representing its different stages of development from *Pithecanthropus erectus* (well described in Chambers' Dictionary as "hypothetical ape-man," for, of course, he is hypothetical and nothing more), to *Homo sapiens*. Yet there is no word of warning that the whole series is imaginary, and without any real scientific basis. This, of course, is not evidence, but an astute attempt to influence the jury!*

**Pithecanthropus erectus*. The name given by Dr. Eugene Dubois to the imaginary creature which he constructed from fossilised remains found by him in Java. These remains were a thigh bone, two teeth, and the upper part of a skull. The bone was found fifteen yards from the place where the other items were

Living nature presents the same feature. Evolution, however it may be defined, is such that it cannot cease. So far as is known, man is now just what he has been for as long as he has left any trace of his existence in the crust of the earth, and there is no contemporary evidence that he is advancing to the production of a new, a higher, and more complex species. It is no more possible to imagine the cessation of an evolutionary process than it is to imagine its beginning.

If man is indeed evolving from the brute condition, his anti-social lapses are but reversions to ancestral type for which it were unreasonable to hold him responsible. That which was natural and congruous in the stock from which he sprung can hardly be reprehensible, and certainly cannot be criminal, in him. Yet men know remorse. Why should they be uneasy in themselves, and why should they incur the condemnation of their friends on account of that which was perfectly natural in their ancestry?

Moreover, there is Christ. How account for Him? After 2000 years there is all but unanimous acknowledgement of His moral and spiritual supremacy. If Christ was indeed 'emergent,' that is, if He was a new departure consequent upon the intervention of the Creator in the evolutionary process, why did not that process continue in the new direction? Yet He remains unique; without successor as He was, and is, without peer.

discovered a year before. The date is 1891-2. See the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Fourteenth Edition, Vol. 17, p. 972.

Man and the Ape.

If, against these considerations, there be urged the obvious resemblance between man and the ape, we do well to note that these resemblances are structural only, they do not appear to extend beyond the physical frame. Thus Keith declared before the British Association in 1927 (*"Concerning the Origin of Man,"* p. 3): "Huxley . . . settled for all time that . . . *as we anatomists weigh evidence*, his (man's) nearest living kin are the anthropoid apes" (the italics are mine). Looking deeper, however, than the anatomist does, the resemblance is found to be less striking than that between man and some other members of the animal kingdom. A parrot can be taught to reproduce human speech; no anthropoid has ever been known to pronounce a single word. Among mammals the beaver builds a house for himself, selecting and transporting the material with nicety and care, and thus approaches man more nearly than does the ape.

Structurally there is nothing less like man than the bee. Yet the bee sallies out in search of its food, returning with it and storing it up for the winter. In the scale of intelligence, then, the bee also stands nearer man than does the ape. The ant, too, manifests a higher mentality (if I may use the word, though perhaps 'instinct' would be less objectionable) than almost any animal save man. It builds its home, it even keeps cows—aphides, which exude a sweet secretion when caressed by the antennae of the ant. The ant not only fights as an individual, he goes to war, marshalling host against host, the victor carrying off his

prisoners to make them work as his slaves. Again, how much more like man than any ape? Only a considerable volume devoted to each of these insects could exhaust what is known of their complicated lives, and of the evidences of an instinct which falls short of intelligence mainly in that it is apparently inherited, not acquired. Is it not possible that we may be mistaken in dwelling upon physical resemblances, ignoring those that are less evident but not less real and significant? And mistaken, too, in assuming that resemblance necessarily implies relation, either of cousinship or of descent?

Cultivation is not Evolution.

It is true that flowers, birds, and animals have developed in certain directions. The multipetalled rose, for example, is a descendant of the dog-rose of the hedgerow. This, however, is not Evolution, but development under the hand of the gardener; when that is removed, the queenly flower degenerates and becomes the dog-rose again.

The pigeon fancier has produced quite a number of varieties of pigeon, but when he ceases to superintend their mating, they all revert to the original blue rock. No variety is self-evolved, and none is permanent.

So far from the simpler evolving the more complex, the reverse seems to be the case—the more complex degenerates into the primitive, invariably losing acquired characteristics when the external pressure is removed. Why does not man, if indeed he has evolved from some cruder form, not revert to type as do the pigeon

or the rose? Why is he an exception, as to his body, to the law of degeneration? The answer seems to be that he never was other than he is to-day. According to Austin Clark, quoted above, all fossil remains are either apes or men.

If, however, it be urged, as it may with some show of reason, that man does degenerate, and that in his degeneration he approximates to the brute, it must be replied that, while this is in measure true, yet there is a fundamental difference. Degenerate man never loses his distinctive human characteristics, such as speech. Moreover, the degeneration of man brings with it physical and mental enfeeblement, and tends to extinction, whereas domesticated animals, for example, degenerating, or, to speak more accurately, reverting to type, gain in vigour thereby. Hence we may conclude that human degeneracy is not reversion to type.

The Law of Reproduction.

The law of reproduction seems to hold good universally—"after its kind" (Gen. 1. 11, 12, 21, 24). There is no instance on record of one species giving rise to another species. Mating takes place only within the limit of species, except under artificial conditions, and then only in the case of a few species, such as the dog and the wolf; there is said to be a lion-tiger hybrid in the London Zoological Gardens. The hare and the rabbit run wild in the same fields, but they do not mate, notwithstanding the marked resemblance they bear the one to the other, and the fact that their blood is harmonious when transfused. They are of different species.

Nor can they be forced by man to mate; nature is imperative, and too strong to be resisted. But dogs and pigeons, differing widely within the limits of their own respective species, attract each other and mate fruitfully. The domesticated horse and ass will mate of their own volition, but the result is always sterile—there is no second generation of mules. Species vary as all life varies, but only as all life varies, each within its own order, "after its kind." It seems that Moses must be credited with this simple, but quite adequate, formulation of a universal law.

The animal lives by following its instincts; apparently no animal has even a rudimentary sense of moral responsibility. A dog may learn by experience that certain acts are followed by unpleasant consequences, but he knows nothing of their moral qualities. To adapt an illustration used by a modern writer, if a large ape took a nut from a small one, you would not expostulate, 'Be an ape, and leave the little fellow alone,' though you might well say, 'Be a man' under similar circumstances to *Homo sapiens*, as man describes himself at his present stage of development.

Man lives by denying or controlling the instincts he has in common with the animals; so only is social life possible to him. Society makes laws to restrain the man who will not restrain himself voluntarily. His differentiation from the beasts is just the knowledge that only as he directs, controls, or denies the natural "desires of the flesh and of the mind" can degeneration be kept at bay. We speak of men

as savage or civilised, as they govern instinct by intelligently directed will, or give it rein.

Man is the only animal that stands erect naturally without constraint, the only animal whose skeleton is so articulated that he can "stand looking steadfastly into Heaven" (Acts 6. 10).

Embryology.

Embryology was formerly supposed to contribute to the doctrine of Evolution, but judging from the words of A. Rendle Short, F.R.C.S., this line of argument may not now be pursued. He writes: "In recent pronouncements, for instance, we were told the arguments which are consistent with the evolution of man from an anthropoid ancestor, but we were not told the facts which create difficulties on that hypothesis. For instance, the evolutionist lays great stress on the argument that each animal climbs up its own genealogical tree; thus the fact that the early embryo shows gill arches is taken to prove a fish-like ancestor. We are, therefore, expecting to be told that the later human embryo shows a receding forehead, massive jaws, a small brain, and a thumb-like great toe, like its anthropoid ancestor. But the truth will out, and the fact is, that the human embryo shows none of these characters. Either the argument is valueless, then, or it is proved to a demonstration that man did *not* descend from an ape-like ancestor. No wonder Professor Keith, in a book on anatomy, wrote: 'Now that the appearances of the embryo at all ages are known, the general feeling is one of disappointment. The human embryo at no

stage is anthropoid in its appearance.' Every surgeon will bear testimony that he has seen many deformed feet in children, but never a foot at all like that of an ape. As a matter of fact, if the Recapitulation Theory is to be trusted, a very good case can be, and has been, made out for the view that so far from men being descended from apes, apes are degenerated men! Certainly the embryonic ape is more like man than the adult ape in many respects."

The embryonic history of the butterfly affords another means of testing this theory of Recapitulation. It begins with an egg, and becomes in turn caterpillar, chrysallis, and imago. The chrysallis may lie apparently dead for months, taking no food, its internal organs converted into a creamy mass of cells. Can it be credited that this is its ancestral history, its genealogical tree, that it was evolved through these different stages, each of which was, in turn, a terminal, and a new point of departure on the way to butterflyhood?

This theory, moreover, encounters another difficulty in the complete absence from all embryos of any trace of the plant stage in evolutionary history.

Another line of proof, once pursued with more confidence, perhaps, than at present, lay in the presence in the human frame of certain organs the purpose of which has not been discovered. These were supposed to be remnants left from the earlier stages of evolutionary progress and not yet quite eliminated. It is on record that a Hebrew poet declared that man "is fearfully and wonderfully made," but how

wonderfully he can have had little conception. Even modern surgery has not yet penetrated every mystery of the human body. The Psalmist knew, not by anatomical investigation, indeed, but by that intuition characteristic of the Bible, and which we know to be Divine inspiration, for he adds "that my soul knoweth right well" (Psa. 139. 14). It will be sufficient here to make one quotation as a warning against the danger of reasoning from ignorance. On page 40 of "*The Diagnosis of Nervous Diseases*," Purves Stewart writes: "The Pineal Gland was formerly regarded mainly as a 'Vestigial' organ, a portion of which, in some reptiles, develops into a rudimentary pineal or parietal eye. Modern observations, however, show that, so far from being a mere vestigial organ, it is a glandular structure whose activity is necessary for normal metabolism in early life, and that prior to the age of puberty the pineal gland is an important organ of internal secretion." And obviously the uses of other organs may yet be discovered.

The Alternative to Evolution.

The question still remains to be asked, How are the marked resemblances that do indubitably exist between man and other animals of his class and order to be accounted for? An analogy with the world of mechanics suggests an alternative to the hypothesis of Evolution. In every piece of machinery, whether it be as simple as a wheelbarrow or as complicated as a printing press, it is obvious there are two elements, and but two—the lever and the wheel, the straight line and the circle in three dimensions. The

primitive vehicle of the farm yard and the field is to the turbine what the lower forms of life are to man; the agricultural labourer is the ancestor of the engineer whose hand on the switchboard sets in motion the complicated machinery that lights a city or provides and transmits the power for its system of transport. Similarity of design, therefore, is not evidence of descent. If the engineer may, and does, use these elemental forms, varying their relations and multiplying the methods of their application to an all but infinite extent, why may we not conceive of God as using in an all but infinite number of ways certain simple methods with which to accomplish His multitudinous designs? Here, surely, is a legitimate doctrine of uniformity—the unity to be discerned under the variety of living things.

There is, to take an example ready to hand, a blood stream in all mammals, which, among other things, supplies oxygen to all parts of the body. In order to discharge this function, the oxygen of which it becomes exhausted must be continually replaced. This is accomplished by means of a lung. Why may we not suppose that God has applied this method in the case of all animals living in a suitable environment? If in His wisdom the Creator gave a lung to the ape, or to the horse, why may we not conceive of Him as giving a lung to man, with the modification necessary to adapt it to the conditions of human life? Why postulate Evolution? Why not a Creator? As machinery postulates a mechanic, so living nature postulates a life-giving God.

The Golden Age.

Man's body, however, is not the whole of man. Genesis accounts for his physical frame and his relation to the animal kingdom by stating that "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," and for that element in him which differentiates him from the animals by stating further that God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life" (2. 7). That there is such a difference is self-evident, but we may notice this, that among animals man alone is discontented with himself; he alone, so far as we know, has a vision of a higher order of life, and a desire to attain to it.

It is perhaps an anomaly that notwithstanding this sense of unrealised potentiality, men everywhere conceive of the Golden Age of the race as belonging to the remote past. This, I understand, is true of all the peoples of the earth. Ethnology offers no evidence that man began as a savage. No nation or tribe has preserved a tradition of emergence from the brute state. It is true that poets and idealists have written of Utopias yet to be, but it is significant that the forward look is taken only among peoples who have been, directly or indirectly, influenced by the Bible. Under that influence the Jew looked, and the Christian looks, for a kingdom of God in which righteousness and power will no longer be found in opposite camps, but wherein the will of God will be accepted as the highest good, and universally obeyed. Every hope and scheme of social betterment in the world is, directly or indirectly, a by-product of the Biblical revelation. The worthy elements in Western

civilisation must be put to the credit of the influence on public opinion of the ethic of the Gospel of Christ.

Language and Art.

If there is an evolutionary process at work in the universe, it seems relevant to ask whether its effects will not be observable in realms other than the physical. Remembering that this process moves, *ex hypothesi*, from the simple to the complex, it is noteworthy that language develops in the opposite direction. The tongues of civilised men are simpler than those of savages. The grammar of the aboriginals of Africa, philologists tell us, is highly elaborate, in some cases at least including every conceivable noun and verb form. Comparison of the language of Chaucer with that of any good writer of modern English affords another illustration of this tendency to simplification.

In the world of art the same characteristic is to be observed. There is no modern European or American architecture. Modern buildings merely combine ancient forms, Corinthian, Doric, Gothic, Saxon, or other; mark of originality there is none, save in the varying of the combinations to secure a greater measure of serviceability under differing conditions of climate and of need. Poetry and the drama still look to the remote past for their supreme examples in a Homer or a Euripides, or an Aeschylus, as oratory does to a Demosthenes or a Cicero. The most successful reproductions of the human form came from the hands of the sculptors of ancient Greece, a Phidias or a Praxiteles,

In the world of mind the same feature presents itself. Lord Haldane, in his Gifford Lectures, declared that in philosophy we have not got a step beyond Plato and Aristotle. In imaginative literature Isaiah stands unapproached in lofty idealism. For cogency in reasoning, according to Sir William Hamilton, the logician, Paul's Epistle to the Romans is without an equal. Yet these writers lived between three and (nearly) two thousand years ago.

There is one problem that men in every age have had to face, the problem of suffering. More books have been devoted to its discussion, I suppose, than to any other subject. Adam probably asked why his innocent son Abel should be killed and his wicked son Cain be permitted to live. We still hear Jeremiah cry: "Righteous art Thou, O Lord, when I plead with Thee; yet would I reason the cause with Thee; wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper?" (Jer. 12. 1).

The treatment of this poignant theme by the Greek tragedians two millennia and a half ago commands the admiration of our own day. Yet their works are dwarfed by the anonymous Book of Job, which, at a conservative estimate, must have been written hundreds of years earlier still.

Progress in scientific discovery, and in the application of such discoveries to practical ends, is sometimes adduced as evidence of an evolutionary process. But this is to make the modern mechanic superior to Archimedes, Harvey the inferior of the modern surgeon. The pioneer is surely greater than his successors in the fields he opened, and to which he showed the way.

Four Unbridged Gaps.

It is common ground that there are four gaps in our knowledge unbridged by science. These may be expressed in the form of questions:

1. How did something come to be where nothing was before?

2. How did that something become living?

3. How did the living become moral?

4. Is there a higher state still, and if so, what is it, and how is it to be reached?

One attempt, and only one, has been made to answer these questions. It is to be found in the Prologue to the Gospel according to John, where the questions are answered thus:

1. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him (the Word), and without Him was not anything made that hath been made." Thus all that is came to be.

2. "In Him was life" (explained by Paul in his speech at Athens: "The God that made the world . . . Himself giveth to all life"—Acts 17. 24, 25). Thus the inanimate, the not living, became animate, living.

3. "And the life was the light of men . . . the true light which lighteth every man . . ." Thus the living became moral.

4. "The Word became flesh (*i.e.*, assumed Manhood in addition to the Divine nature which was His essentially, eternally) . . . and as many as received Him (even to them that believe on His Name) to them gave He the right to become the children of God."

John elucidates these words in his first Epistle (3. 1, 2). "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the children of God: and such we are . . . it is not yet manifest what we shall be . . . we shall be like Him (that is, Christ), for we shall see Him even as He is."

No other voice breaks the silence here. John holds the field. The Christian believes that his is the final word on the subject, a revelation from God.

Thus there is a region of being higher than the mental and the moral, entry into which is in harmony with, while it differs profoundly in method from, the manner in which the lower kingdoms are maintained each by the resources of that beneath. The mineral is laid hold of by the vegetable, on which, in turn, the animal draws either directly or by the mediation of other members of the same kingdom. To man there opens out a spiritual realm into which he enters only through the operation of a spiritual power in regeneration. To make contact with that realm, a man must be born again by the Spirit of God, on the condition of acceptance of Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. Here, for the first time, will comes into play; the will of man submitting to, and co-operating with, the will of God, for so only may man attain to his full moral and spiritual stature, and become "a full grown man," according to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4. 13).

The Doctrine of the Fall.

The sharpness of the contrast between the theory of the evolutionary origin of the human

race and the account of the creation of a completely human pair by the will of the Creator, is nowhere more manifest than in the way taken in each case to account for the evident unsatisfactory state of man, whether he be contemplated individually, socially, or politically. The evolutionary philosopher thinks of an ascent from the brute state, and traces to his ancestry the unworthy things which still survive in man, the elimination of these uglier traits being not yet complete. The Bible teaches that God created man with such qualities as to be not incapable of, and not unworthy of, intercourse with Himself. Man's crown was the gift of will, the power to discern good and evil, and the responsibility to make choice between them, with the necessary corollary that he must bear all the issues of his choice. That at some period in his existence upon the earth man made his choice, with disastrous consequences to himself and to all that part of creation immediately associated with him, can hardly be denied by any candid observer of himself and of his fellows. The Bible account of man's lapse from innocence need not be dealt with here in detail. Suffice it to say that the story given in Genesis seems at once simple and profound, and philosophically adequate. The will to obey God was tested and found wanting. The rest followed.

The doctrine of a "Fall of Man" is peculiar to the Bible, which, indeed, is the only book extant that tells:

- (a) That God is one.
- (b) That God is holy.
- (c) That man was created in God's image.

(d) That man disobeyed God, and so fell from innocence and fellowship with Him.

(e) That there is a way whereby man may return to God and be made holy as God is holy.

No one of these things is found outside the Bible, and those books which owe these elements in their teaching to the Bible.

That "thoughtful men no longer believe in a Fall" is asserted with much show of authority. Yet, with all the relative facts before them, such men as Augustine of Hippo, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Whitefield, Isaac Newton, who were surely not lacking in intellectual powers, accepted the Bible teaching as adequate to account for what they themselves experienced and observed. The Apostles John and Paul were thoughtful men, yet that man presents persistent characteristics to be accounted for only by a fall from a higher moral state, forms the background of their teaching. Take that away, and the whole superstructure built up by them falls in ruin.

All there is to be known of the Apostle Paul and his teaching is to be found in the New Testament, so the evidence is readily available. In his first letter to Corinth he spoke of Adam, assuming the historicity of the account of his creation and fall in Genesis 1. 3: "The first Adam became a living soul . . . the first man is of the earth" (1 Cor. 15. 45-47). A little earlier in the chapter (v. 22) there is the categorical statement "in Adam all die." In his second letter he wrote: "I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ" (2 Cor. 11. 3). Next

of Paul's letters, in chronological order, is that to the Romans, and in it he wrote, "Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed into all men . . . death reigned from Adam . . . even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression . . . through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners" (5. 12-19). That the reference is to Genesis 3 does not call for demonstration, though it should be observed that it is not made by way of illustration, nor is it a mere literary allusion. The facts are adduced as a foundation for an argument; if the facts are not as stated, the argument fails. Some years later, writing to his colleague Timothy, he said: "Adam was first formed, then Eve, and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being (thoroughly) beguiled, hath fallen into transgression" (1 Tim. 2. 13, 14).

Moreover, the apostle's leading doctrines are expressed in words, each of which suggests a condition from which the need of succour is imperative. Thus justification suggests that men are in some respect wrong, and need to be set right; sanctification that they are in some sense defiled and need to be cleansed; redemption that they are enslaved and need to be brought back whence they were taken away; reconciliation that there has been an alienation of those who once were in friendly relation.

The constantly recurring words, sin and transgression, tell of a mark missed, and of a forbidden line crossed, respectively. Salvation the distinctive title of Christ, Saviour, would be meaningless were there not something des-

perate, hopeless, in the case of those whom He came to save.

And what of Christ and His Gospel? "Good news" suggests a state of urgent need arising out of a catastrophe and threatening further evil. If there is nothing wrong with man, why did Christ come into the world, and if not for man's deliverance, why did Christ die? If man is not a fallen being, why did he kill Christ after spitting in His face and scourging Him?

Our Lord's Teaching.

Nor is there anything equivocal in the teaching of the Lord Jesus. His language never flattered men. His contemporaries thought well of themselves in their relation to God. The Pharisee in Luke 18. 9-14 represents the type. "God," said he, "I thank Thee that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week. I give tithes of all that I get." The judgment of the Lord upon such persons is pronounced in the burning words of the sevenfold woe recorded in Matthew 23. 13-36.

Utterances of the Lord, implying man's fallen condition, are plentiful. For example, speaking of the hardness of heart men exhibit in the treatment of their wives, He said: "From the beginning it hath not been so." Otherwise God created men with hardened hearts! He declared that "from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing,

pride, foolishness; all these evil things proceed from within." Did God pack man's heart with all these evil things at his creation? Moreover, that there is no hope of radical change in man's nature, whether by advance in education, in the amelioration of the conditions under which he lives, or by improvement in public opinion under the influence of the ethics of the Gospel, the Lord made evident when He said that "this generation (that is, the character of men, cp. Phil. 2. 15) shall not pass away (*i.e.*, shall not be changed) until all these things (that mark the end of the age) be accomplished" (Matt. 19. 18; Mark 7. 21; 13. 30). And finally, for our present purpose, how plain is the implication of the thrice repeated words to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born anew" (John 3. 3, 5, 7).

Repudiation of the doctrine of the Fall of man is not modern; it was strenuously opposed by some of the earliest of the Antichrists ("even now" wrote the Apostle John, "have there arisen many Antichrists"—1 John 2. 18), the evolutionary theory of the origin and nature of man offers a new ground of attack upon it, that is all. And this is itself an evidence of the inveterate opposition of men, which is the effect of his fall from communion with, obedience to, and enjoyment of his Creator. Like the Pharisees who "rejected for themselves the counsel of God," by refusing to confess and repent of their sins, modern men refuse with indignation to acknowledge that human nature has become warped beyond any hope of self-recovery.

It is not probable that any member of the

animal kingdom finds pleasure in inflicting cruelty save only man. The worst is the perversion of the best, the lowest of the highest. Supremely gifted man not merely reverts to the brute state, he goes beyond the brute in this respect at least, so that a word has been coined to describe the degradation that has become possible to him. Moreover, that word—sadism—is not the coinage of the religious fanatic, nor even of the theologian, but of the student of human nature in the light of experience. Burns spoke of "Man's inhumanity to man," and Sir Philip Sydney reflected that "it is strange to see the unmanlike cruelty of man." And if it be replied that the cat, for example, is cruel to the captive mouse, even were this granted (though the cat will act no differently with a reel of cotton), yet it cannot be said that such cruelty is uncatlike. Our common phraseology testifies to the fallen condition of the race, as when we say, 'Do not be cruel. Be a man!'

Hopeless, indeed, is man's estate if he is not a fallen being. For, otherwise, contemporary man is man not merely as God created him, but as he has struggled to perfect himself through unnumbered years. Let it be seriously asked, and in all reverence, if God could not at the outset have created man perfect in himself and in his adjustment to his environment, would it not have been better to have left him unmade? If, indeed, God made him as he is, what hope is there that he can ever be delivered from his evil case? "Behold," said an astute and experienced observer of men, "this only have I found (*i.e.*, to be true), that God made man

32 Evolution and the Origin and State of Man.

upright, but they have sought out many inventions" (Eccles. 7. 29).

But if the Bible record is true, if God did create man in His own image and after His own likeness, and if by the misuse of the highest gift of his Creator, man brought destruction upon himself, may it not be that in His compassionate grace and infinite wisdom, God will find a means whereby men may be brought to an even higher estate than that from which they have fallen?

Philosophers, ancient and modern, must bow to the wisdom of the Woman of Tekoa who, three thousand years ago, said, "We must needs die, and are as water spilled upon the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God take away life, but deviseth means that he that is banished be not an outcast from Him" (2 Sam. 14. 14).