

[From *The Times*, February 3, 1892]

after another throughout the whole period since they began to exist on the earth; that the species of plants and animals known to us are, as a whole, neither older, nor younger, the one than the other.

The same holds good of aquatic and aerial species, as a whole, compared with terrestrial species; but birds appear in the geological record later than terrestrial reptiles, and there is every reason to believe that they were evolved from the latter.

Until it is shown that the first two propositions are not contained in the first chapter of Genesis, and that the second pair are not justified by the present condition of our knowledge, I must continue to maintain that natural science and the "Mosaic" account of the origin of animals and plants are in irreconcilable antagonism.

As I greatly desire that this broad issue should not be obscured by the discussion of minor points, I propose to defer what I may have to say about the great "shehretz" and "rehmes" question till tomorrow.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
T. H. HUXLEY.

Eastbourne, February 1.

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

#### TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—In Professor Huxley's letter in your issue of yesterday he completely shifts his ground. He now asserts that Genesis ascribes creation to acts which he calls "supernatural," whereas, he urges, science asserts that it originated in a "process of natural evolution."

This antithesis is absolutely unknown to the literature both of the Old Testament and the New. It is equally unknown to science and also to philosophy. The Bible knows nothing of what men now