

[From *The Times*, February 4, 1892]

having been obliged to trouble you at this length about objections which, in my judgment, have no importance,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. H. HUXLEY.

Eastbourne, February 2.

[From *The Times*, February 8, 1892]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,— My rejoinder to Mr. Huxley shall be brief. Anyone who will be at the pains to turn to his *Nineteenth Century* articles will see that "his argument from Leviticus," instead of being, as he now pleads, "incidental" and "superfluous," was vital to his attack upon Mr. Gladstone's position. Upon it depended the only allegation of fact, as contrasted with theory, in his indictment of the Mosaic cosmogony. According to science reptiles existed before birds, but according to Genesis birds existed before reptiles, so he asserted. And the ground of his assertion was that, while birds belong to the fifth period of creation, "creeping things" belong to the sixth, and that "creeping things" are defined by "the Mosaic writer" himself in Leviticus xi. to include reptiles.

Now that this is proved to be merely an *ad captandum* appeal to the phraseology of the English Bible, Mr. Huxley takes refuge in the plea that the word used in Genesis i., 24, may include reptiles. But this, even if true, will not help him. The fact remains that the word in Leviticus xi. is wholly different from the word used in Genesis i., 24, whereas the validity of his argument depends on its identity with it. And the argument is his, not mine. He it is who insists that Genesis i. must be interpreted by