

[*From The Times, February 1, 1892*]

this subject ; and while the superficial and the sceptic take for granted that " what Genesis says " is known to all, a deeper knowledge and closer study of the sacred page will make us hesitate to dogmatize as to its meaning. But I claim to have answered Mr. Huxley's main attack upon the cosmogony, an attack which has disturbed the faith of many and confirmed the unbelief of thousands.

I am, yours, &c.,

R. ANDERSON.

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

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—While desirous to waste neither your space nor my own time upon mere misrepresentations of what I have said elsewhere about the relations between modern science and the so-called " Mosaio " oosmogony, it seems needful that I should ask for the opportunity of stating the case once more, as briefly and fairly as I can.

I conceive the first chapter of Genesis to teach—(1) that the species of plants and animals owe their origin to supernatural acts of creation ; (2) that these acts took place at such times and in such a manner that all the plants were created first, all the aquatic and aerial animals (notably birds) next, and all terrestrial animals last. I am not aware that any Hebrew scholar denies that these propositions agree with the natural sense of the text. Sixty years ago I was taught, as most people were then taught, that they are guaranteed by Divine authority.

On the other hand, in my judgment, natural science teaches no less distinctly—(1) that the species of animals and plants have originated by a process of natural evolution ; (2) that this process has taken place in such a manner that the species of animals and plants respectively have come into existence one