

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1898.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

THEOLOGY.

(Continued.)

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

The attributes of God are INDIVISIBILITY, IMMUTABILITY, INFINITY, LIFE, INTELLIGENCE, WISDOM, WILL, HOLINESS, JUSTICE, TRUTH, GOODNESS, AND POWER. The first three of the series have been termed *negative, intransitive, quiescent*, or *immanent*, the rest, *positive, transitive, operative*, or *emanent*, attributes. Others have classified the divine attributes as *incommunicable* attributes, or *properties*, which are only in God and in no wise or measure in created things, and *communicable* attributes, or *perfections*, such as holiness,¹⁾ life,²⁾ etc., which may in a mode and measure be communicated to created beings, as men and angels.

INDIVISIBILITY.

God is indivisible inasmuch as he is not a compound being, not made up of component parts, or of a substance and of qualities inherent in such substance, but absolutely

1) Lev. 19, 2. 1 Pet. 1, 15. Matt. 25, 31.

2) Gen. 2, 7. John 10, 28.

Historical Theology.

EVOLUTION IN HISTORY.

The theory of evolution is one of the fundamental errors of modern science, not only of Biology and Geology, where it has made the saddest havoc, but also in other sciences. There is hardly anything in heaven, or in earth, or under the earth, which has not been represented as the product of evolution: God, man, the devil, the heavenly bodies, the earth, physical life, political life, religion in general, Judaism, Christianity, the Bible, Philosophy, Medicine, Law, Mathematics, Theology, education, poetry, painting, sculpture, music, agriculture, commerce, the trades, liberty, marriage, benevolence, fashions, ships, guns, watches, lead pencils, and lucifer matches, have been traced through their various stages of evolution, and evolution itself makes no exception and claims for itself its evolution *ab ovo*. And, what is most remarkable, this seemingly all-pervading principle has no existence but in the minds of those who entertain this fiction. There never was such a process as evolution from a neutral cell to organic life, and from lower to higher organisms, from vegetable to animal life, from lower to higher animals, from irrational to rational beings. In fact, the whole theory of evolution, as it stands to-day, is not a scientific principle, but a huge, thoroughly unscientific swindle, with not one solitary fact to support it, a hypothesis, which does not really explain a single phenomenon and in its application leads the investigator into a maze of inconsistencies, of untrue conclusions, of irreconcilable contradictions with the stubborn facts of nature and history. While there certainly is such a thing as natural growth, there is in all the universe no such thing as evolution from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous. One of

the most eminent naturalists of the age, Agassiz, has said: "These results are of the highest importance at this moment, when men of authority in science are attempting to renew the theory of a general transmutation of all animals of the higher types out of the lower ones. If such views are ever to deserve serious consideration, and be acknowledged as involving a scientific principle, it will only be when their supporters shall have shown that the fundamental plans of structure characteristic of the primary groups of the Animal Kingdom are transmutable, or pass into one another, and that their different modes of development may lead from one to the other. Thus far Embryology has not recorded one fact on which to pass such doctrines."¹⁾ And again: "I cannot repeat too emphatically, that there is not a single fact in Embryology to justify the assumption that the laws of development, now known to be so precise and definite for every animal, have ever been less so, or have ever been allowed to run into each other. The philosopher's stone is no more to be found in the organic than the inorganic world; and we shall seek as vainly to transform the lower animal types into the higher ones by any of our theories, as did the alchemists of old to change the baser metals into gold."²⁾

Of course, we do not claim a hearing as an authority in Biology. Neither do we deem a biological question conclusively settled by a quotation from even such a scientist as Agassiz, and there are some things in what Agassiz has written which we can not endorse. But we have an authority on our side of the question for whom we do demand a hearing also in Biology, the Maker and Preserver of heaven and earth, who says: *And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb YIELDING SEED, and the fruit tree yielding fruit AFTER HIS KIND, whose SEED IS IN ITSELF upon the*

1) Methods of study in Natural History, by L. Agassiz, pp. 303 f.

2) Ibid. pp. 318. 319.

earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass and herb YIELDING SEED AFTER HIS KIND, and the tree yielding fruit, whose SEED WAS IN ITSELF, AFTER HIS KIND: and God saw that it was good. . . . And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, AFTER THEIR KIND, and every winged fowl AFTER HIS KIND: and God saw that it was good. . . . And God made the beast of the earth AFTER HIS KIND, and cattle AFTER THEIR KIND, and everything that creepeth upon the earth AFTER HIS KIND: and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let us make man IN OUR IMAGE, AFTER OUR LIKENESS. . . . And God created man IN HIS OWN IMAGE.¹⁾ This definitely and forever shuts out the theory of evolution from the genesis of vegetable and animal life on the earth and from the origin of man.

What, then, of *history*? Does evolution produce historical quantities and bring about historical events? Before looking for an answer upon this question, we must first remember that in history as in nature not every kind and instance of change must be allowed to pass as evolution or as due to evolution. The evolutionist in history asserts that not only the laws of inanimate nature, but also the laws of human thought are absolutely rigid, inflexible, automatic; that the human mind, like a machine, will, when given the same material, invariably, at all times, and everywhere grind out the same product.²⁾ That the same laws which develop the physical man everywhere into the traits of the species, act also on his psychical powers, and not less absolutely, to bring their products into conformity.³⁾ The question before us, then, is, whether historical phenomena are due to the working together of causes operating by rigid inherent necessity, independent of free agencies.

1) Gen. 1, 11. 12. 20. 21. 24. 25—27.

2) See also THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. I, p. 488.

3) Brinton, Rel. of primit. peoples, p. 7 f.

This being the question, it must be simply denied in the light of both reason and revelation. We apply the test of revelation first by placing a few historical facts in the light of Scripture.

In the first instance, then, the question as to the origin of the world and of created things, including the origin of man, is not a question of natural science, but strictly a historical question, which cannot, therefore, be settled by any amount of speculation or biological and geological investigation, but must be answered from sources of historical information or hopelessly abandoned as an unfathomable mystery. A fully reliable source of historical information we have in the first chapters of Genesis¹⁾ and other texts of Scripture, according to which in the beginning God made the heaven and the earth and in six days created the vegetable and animal world and the parents of the human race, and established the conditions of their continued existence and propagation. The evolutional "descent of man" is purely and simply a fiction. The fall of man was another historical event, a record of which we have in the third chapter of Genesis, which can, again, be supplanted by no amount of speculation. And this change in the nature and condition of man, including the entrance of death into the world, was not brought about by a process of evolution, but the fall was enacted by the will of the devil and the will of man,²⁾ and death, the penalty of sin, was imposed by the righteous will of God. That the diversity of languages is not owing to a process of evolution, but to a special dispensation of God, bringing about a historical event, is just as true³⁾ as that man was not in the course of long ages, by evolution, but from the beginning, by creation, made a speaking creature.⁴⁾ That the human race should multiply and replenish the earth was likewise ordained by the Creator in the beginning,⁵⁾ and the distribution of peoples and na-

1) Gen. 1. 2.

2) Gen. 3, 1 ff.

3) Gen. 11, 1. 6. 7—9.

4) Gen. 2, 19. 20. 24. .

5) Gen. 1, 28.

tions over the face of the earth was not by evolution according to certain fixed intrinsic laws, but according to the decrees of Him who *hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation.*¹⁾ The rise, progress, decline, and fall of the great empires of history came about under the providence and government of God.²⁾ The great turning point of history, and the events which inaugurated a new era nineteen hundred years ago, were determined by a divine counsel and purpose planned before the world was made and executed in the fulness of time.³⁾ Papal Rome, the great power of the middle ages, was allowed to run its course and exercise its sway by the Lord of lords, who had long before predicted Antichrist and described him unmistakably.⁴⁾ The future destruction of Jerusalem and the downfall of the Jewish nation was present before the tearful eyes of Jesus, not only in vague outlines or merely as a coming event, but in its historical details.⁵⁾ And in like manner, the day and hour of the end of the world has long since been fixed,⁶⁾ and the closing events of history are already inscribed in detailed accounts on the pages of God's own book.⁷⁾ Meanwhile, and until the consummation of all things shall have come, no sparrow shall fall to the ground without our father.⁸⁾ And thus the theory of evolution is definitely and for all times ruled out of history just as truly as it is out of nature.

This view of history is fully borne out by sober investigation of the course of human events, of the facts of history itself. There is and can be, strictly speaking, no such thing as a philosophy of history. History cannot be ex-

1) Acts 17, 26.

2) Dan. 7 ff.

3) Gen. 3, 15; 49, 10. Dan. 9, 24. Acts 2, 23; 4, 28. Gal. 4, 4.

4) Dan. 11, 36 ff. 2 Thess. 2, 3 ff.

5) Luke 19, 41—44; 21, 20—24. Matt. 23, 36—39; 24, 1, 2.

6) Matt. 24, 35. 36. Mark 13, 32.

7) Dan. 12. Matt. 24 and 25. Mark 13. Luke 21. 1 Cor. 15. 1 Thess. 4, 13—17.

8) Matt. 10, 29.

plained from any one principle determining the existence of and changes in historical quantities as with intrinsic necessity. Thus, e. g., the principle of the "survival of the fittest" is so far from accounting for the phenomena of history, that the principle itself is flatly contradicted and utterly exploded by a sober investigation of historical facts. That there are in nature numerous instances of a survival of the *unfittest*, is not only conceded by our evolutionists, but has been deliberately forged into an argument against teleology and divine providence! And, we ask, was it by the survival of the fittest that Julius Caesar, one of the grandest rulers of all ages, should succumb under the daggers of Brutus and Cassius; that Paul and Seneca should die by authority of their inferior, Nero; that Popery, rotten to the core and represented by men who would have brought on the ignominious collapse or extinction of every other dynasty in the days of the Roman pornocracy, should survive, while the illustrious house of Henry I sank away to ruin in the third and fourth generation; that John Hus should die at the stake and Jean Charlier de Gerson in timid monastic retirement, while Balthasar Cossa, by far their inferior in talents and learning, and every inch an infamous scoundrel, having for a time disgraced even the Roman see as John XXIII, ended his days as a Cardinal and Bishop of Tusculum and Dean of the Sacred College; that Girolamo Savonarola, one of the most remarkable and pure-minded leaders of his day and of all times, should be fought down and crushed in a struggle with men not one of whom was worthy of unloosing his shoe's latchet, among them Alexander VI, one of the most scandalous wretches of all history? Survival of the fittest! And what process of evolution resulted in the lives and deeds of such men as Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Constantine the Great, Luther, Napoleon I, and Bismarck? All these great makers of history were what they were far less in consequence and by the continuation of the course of previous events or developments, than

largely in spite of the past and in direct opposition to forces which had worked together in shaping the condition of things with which they had to deal. The Macedonian empire would never have sprung into being but for an Alexander, in whose mind the chief factors for its realization were united. The Rome which Julius Caesar left behind him was not that which he had found, only carried forward to a new stage of development, but the embodiment of ideas conceived in his mind, a quantity which under God the greatest Roman had *made* out of a quantity which he had found. The distinctive features of the Constantinian empire as compared with that of Diocletian, or of the tetrarchy of which he was the head, were not evolved from earlier political principles, but stood out in bold contrast and even in direct opposition to the very fundamentals of antique statesmanship, and so new in politics that even Constantine permitted them to slip away from his grasp long before the sunset of his life had come. Luther was not a more fully developed Hus or Savonarola, and the Reformation was not the more advanced stage or completion of a movement inaugurated by the Humanists, but a work of God the actuating spirit of which was as diametrically contrary to the rationalistic spirit which animated Erasmus and, in a measure, Zwingli and his abettors, as it was to antichristian Rome, which was in 1517 essentially what it had been in 1302, when Boniface VIII issued his bull *Unam sanctam* as a definition of the rights and powers of Popery. Napoleon did not carry onward but broke away from the tumult of French politics when he laid the greater part of western Europe at his feet, and the battle of Austerlitz and the rule of the hundred days were no more evolved from the French Revolution as by intrinsic necessity than the burning of Moscow and the Russian snows which turned to naught the campaign of 1812. And, finally, since we have mentioned Prince Bismarck, the German Empire of to-day was not evolved by internal necessity, but made, and made

in spite of itself by the Iron Chancellor as an instrument of God.

Turning from secular history to ecclesiastical history, we find as little room for evolution there. What has been termed the evolution of dogmas is from beginning to end an empty fiction. Christianity is not an evolutionary, but a revealed religion, and the doctrines or dogmas of this religion are revealed in the word of God, not only in rudiments or germs, but in all their parts. All that remains to be done is to gather under certain heads, in chapters and paragraphs, what the Spirit of God has laid down in his store house, and no one will call that a process of evolution. But we defy the world to point out one Christian dogma which is not in all its parts to be found in the holy Scriptures. Arius was excommunicated as a heretic by the church of Alexandria long before the Synod of Nicaea had raised its banner with the *ὁμοούσιος*, because the doctrine of Arius had been branded as a fundamental error in the books which were written, that we might believe that Jesus is the Son of God,¹⁾ that the Word was not only *with* God as a distinct Person, but also *was* God as of the one divine Essence.²⁾ No thetical dogmatic statement is entitled to a place in a system of Christian Dogmatics from the first paragraph in Bibliology to the last paragraph in Eschatology, unless it have its *sedes doctrinae* in the Scriptures. Nor have these doctrines found utterance in the Scriptures in or subsequent to a process of evolution; for holy men of God did not speak out thoughts and concepts evolved in their own or other men's minds, but *spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*,³⁾ things *which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man*,⁴⁾ *not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth*.⁵⁾

In like manner, though on different grounds, it must be said that even false doctrines and heresies have not origi-

1) John 20, 31.

2) John 1, 1.

3) 2 Pet. 1, 21.

4) 1 Cor. 2, 9.

5) 1 Cor. 2, 13.

nated by evolution. The great heresy of the present generation, the denial of the inerrant truth of the word of God, is as old as and even a little older than the history of human error, having been uttered in Paradise when the Serpent, *which deceiveth the whole world,*¹⁾ said unto our first mother, *Yea, hath God said?*²⁾ and, *Ye shall not surely die.*³⁾ No representative of Higher Criticism has gone beyond that. The Arian heresy was as full-fledged in the mind of Arius when he had framed his rationalistic syllogism in Alexandria as it was at any later period, and when he retained such terms as "the Son of God," he was as far from their scriptural sense as Servede was when amid the smoke and flames of the pyre he cried: "*Jesus Christ, thou Son of the living God, have mercy upon me!*" Pelagianism is to-day what it was in 412; or if there be any statement of modern Pelagians going beyond the tenets condemned at Carthage in the trial of Coelestius, we should like to see it. The dogma of papal infallibility was as firmly asserted, though not so clearly stated nor so generally accepted, in 422 as it was in 1870.

Proceeding from doctrine to practice and institutions, we find that here, too, the genesis of things has not by any means been a process or series of processes of evolution. The sacraments were instituted as to all their essentials by Christ himself, to be and to remain for all times what they were made by their Ordainer.⁴⁾ The ministerial office was not developed according to laws operating in the church or to considerations of expediency, but instituted with all its powers and functions by the Head of the church, and is to-day what it was in the days of the Apostles.⁵⁾ Church discipline was enjoined by Christ⁶⁾ and practised from the

1) Rev. 12, 9.

2) Gen. 3, 1.

3) Gen. 3, 4.

4) Matt. 28, 19. 20. 1 Cor. 11, 23—26.

5) Matt. 28, 18—20. Luke 9, 1—10. Mark 16, 15. John 20, 21—23; 21, 15—17. Acts 20, 28. 1 Cor. 12, 28. 29. Eph. 4, 11.

6) Matt. 18, 15—18.

earliest times of the Christian church.¹⁾ Preaching is as old as the church; it was practised on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, and what we find in many books as "the evolution of preaching" is dissipated by the light of real history as a fog by the sun. Christian benevolence was exercised in the church and by the churches from the beginning.²⁾ From the beginning, the churches cooperated in dealing with affairs in which they were jointly concerned.³⁾ Missionary endeavors were from the earliest times considered the task and duty of the church, and of the local congregations.⁴⁾ The earliest church had deacons, and even deaconesses.⁵⁾ The acts of public worship were in apostolic times substantially what they are now: preaching the word,⁶⁾ administering the sacraments,⁷⁾ prayer,⁸⁾ singing,⁹⁾ and almsgiving.¹⁰⁾ Or what more have we to-day? Even the independence of the church from the state, which we enjoy in this country, is not the result of evolution; the church of apostolic times was not in any sense a state church, but managed its own affairs without any concurrence of the body politic;¹¹⁾ and even if the idea of evolution, which is generally taken to be the development from primitive to higher forms, should be made to cover also the gradual development to primitive forms, which, probably, no evolutionist will claim or concede, our separation of church and state could not even in this latter sense be credited to evolution,

1) 1 Cor. 5, 11—13. 2 Cor. 2, 10. 2 Thess. 3, 14. 15.

2) Acts 2, 42. 44. 45; 4, 34—37; 11, 27—30. 1 Cor. 16, 1 ff. 2 Cor. 8, 1 ff. 9 ff. al.

3) Acts 15.

4) Acts 11, 22—26; 13, 1—3; 14, 26—28.

5) Acts 6, 1—6. 1 Tim. 3, 8—13. Rom. 16, 1.

6) Acts 2, 42; 5, 42; 6, 4.

7) Acts 2, 41. 46. 1 Cor. 11, 20—29.

8) Acts 1, 14. 24; 2, 42; 4, 24; 12, 12; 13, 3. 1 Cor. 11, 4. 5; 14, 14 ff.

9) Col. 3, 19. Eph. 5, 18. 19.

10) Acts 2, 42; 4, 34; 5, 11. 1 Cor. 16, 2.

11) Acts 1, 14 ff.; 2, 1 ff.; 4, 31 ff.; 5, 1 ff.; 5, 33—42; 6, 1 ff.; 13, 1 ff.; 15, 1 ff. Gal. 6, 6. 1 Cor. 9, 4—14.

since the constitutional history of our country shows no such process whereby the independence of church and state had been brought about as by evolutionary necessity, but clearly points to wise statesmanship on the part of a few leading men and to various compromises between conflicting interests as the human causes which have demonstrated to the world the feasibility of "a free church in a free state."¹⁾

While we, thus, deny the historicity of evolution in history, especially in ecclesiastical history, we do not deny three things which have often been misconceived as or misconstrued into evolution: the relation of cause and effect between historical phenomena, the increase of historical quantities, and the degeneration and gradual decay of historical organisms or institutions.

It is unquestionably true that Judaism exercised a certain influence on pagan Rome. But who would say that pagan Rome was evolved from or represented a higher type of Judaism? The two were and remained heterogeneous quantities, and the one was never and in no sense devolved into the other, though both were mutually related by the relation of cause and effect. The repristination of paganism by Julian was very markedly tinged by Christian influences. But Julian himself would have scouted the idea of having his rites and sacrifices at Antioch set down as a higher type of Christianity. The influence of both Judaism and Christianity on Mohanmedanism and Mormonism is unmistakable. But let an evolutionist ask the Sultan and he will tell him whether the Islam be Christianity in a higher form, and ask the Christians of the United States how Brigham Young strikes them as a St. Paul of a higher order. There are undoubtedly relations of cause and effect between the French Revolution and the German Empire. But who would be willing to make himself ridiculous by averring that the work of Bismarck and Moltke was merely the work

1) See also THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. I, pp. 436—447.

of Robespierre and Marat in a more advanced stage of development? Luther in his day thrust the assertion into the face of the Romanists that they no longer ventured to preach as they had preached before he had raised his voice, and from the council of Trent to the present day the Roman church shows very distinct traces of protestant influence. But what protestant would consider Leo XIII of sound mind, or would be judged sane by Leo XIII, for defining Romanism of to-day as a more highly developed type of Lutheranism? Such nonsense would be hooted down even by many who believe in Darwin's *Origin of species* and *Descent of man*. The influences of ancient Egyptian and Babylonian civilization, of Athenian culture, of Roman politics, of mediaeval society as organized and confused and shackled down in church and state—are still alive and active at the present time. To mention but a few instances. No English lexicon would be what it is but for those influences. Our schoolboys speak of *mummies* and our girls and women wear garments antique in form and *peplum* by name. The old Tombs prison in New York was built after ancient Egyptian models. The German *Kaiser's* title was handed down from the zenith of Roman history, and stands out in the headlines of our American dailies; while it serves as a watchword and stimulus of German patriotism. Much of the statuary exhibited in the show windows and pedestaled in many parlors in St. Louis bears witness at the same time to antique genius and art and ancient vandalism. The causes which have made the texts in Dr. Walther's postils and Dr. Seiss' Lectures on the Gospels the same in choice and arrangement are not to be sought in an interdependence between Dr. Seiss and Dr. Walther, but can be distinctly traced back over Luther and Charlemagne to Jerome and Pope Damasus.

But all this is not evolution. The fact that customs and forms and notions and norms are in thousands of instances the *same* as those of by-gone ages to which they

can be traced by chains of cause and effect under the influence of will is certainly not due to evolution, a chief essential of which is *change*, and change not determined by will as a free agency, but due to causes working by absolute intrinsic necessity. The evolutionist's wife is apt to prove to his conviction, if not to his satisfaction, that wearing a peplum is not a matter of evolutionary necessity, but of her own obstinate will, which may very soon decide against the peplum and in favor of a costume never dreamt of in the days of Homer. Zwingli in his day, from January 1, 1519, on, and thousands of others after him to the present day, have proved that preaching on the texts of Jerome's *Comes* and of Charlemagne's *Homiliarium* was and is by no means enjoined by the rigid laws of evolution, and neither Dr. Luther nor Dr. Walther nor Dr. Seiss would by word or deed join issue with them.

Of course, our reduction of historical phenomena to the relation of cause and effect will find little favor with evolutionists who put down the relation of cause to effect as "a mere assumption, and, indeed, rejected by exact science."¹⁾

The second process which has been misconstrued into evolution is that of the increase of historical quantities. The human race had its beginning, and, in the course of time, the family has multiplied and replenished the earth. The Jewish nation was a greater body in David's day than in the days of Moses. Rome grew from small beginnings to be the mistress of the civilized and a great part of the uncivilized world. New Testament Christianity had its birthday at Jerusalem and, in the course of years and centuries, has planted its banners in all lands. Popery was enthroned at Rome in Boniface I, and the records of its progress and of the increase of its power and of the territory subject to its sway fill volumes compared with which

1) Brinton, *ibid.*, p. 45.

the books of Mr. Darwin dwindle into insignificance. The Reformation was planted at Wittenberg, and before many years had passed it spread its branches far beyond the confines of Germany. All this, however, was anything but evolution. Man was in Paradise and in Mesopotamia as fully and truly man as at any subsequent period and in any country on the face of the earth. The Jews were in the same sense a Jewish people under Vespasian as they had been under Joshua, and a Jew is distinctly a Jew in New York to-day as he was under Claudius in Rome and under Ptolemy in Alexandria. The Christian church in Jerusalem and Antioch was no less a Christian church when Peter and Paul preached Christ, and him crucified, than is any Christian congregation anywhere in 1898. Gregory I was as really an antichristian Pope as Gregory VII and Pio Nono. And the Lutheran church at Wittenberg in 1530 was essentially what Holy Cross Lutheran church is at St. Louis, a church and Lutheran, no more, no less.

Here, then, we have again an essential difference between what really appears in history, and the fiction called evolution. If a process the beginning and the end of which exhibit the same thing, though, perhaps, in different forms or states, were to be called evolution, we would not seriously object. Thus the development of a human being from the embryo to the adult might, as far as the etymology of the word is concerned, be called evolution. But that is not the accepted *usus loquendi* of the word. We hold that the human embryo is as truly and distinctively human as the adult man or woman, and that the destruction of either is covered by the same fifth commandment of the decalogue, and it is this manner of development which has its analogies in history. But evolutionists in Biology claim for their hypothesis or theory that in it they have a key to solve the mystery of life in its innumerable varieties of forms; they dream of development, not from specific germs, but from a utopian neutral cell; they would account for the *origin* of

things, of vegetation, of vertebrates, of man. In the evolutionist world there was a time when man did not exist and a time when man had come into existence, and that by evolution. The supporters of this theory substitute evolution for creation. And it is evolution in this sense which has no analogy in history, except as another empty dream, e. g., the dream of the origin of religion by evolution in a previously non-religious world, or the origin of language by evolution in a race of mutes.¹⁾

A third historical category which must not be misconstrued into historical evolution is that of degeneration and gradual decay in historical organisms or institutions. Our scientists who bother themselves and others about the descent of man have favored with a keen interest the Bushmen of Australia and other types of savage humanity, with receding skulls, flat noses, thin legs, little or no clothing, and not much of morals or religion. The lower in the scale and the farther remote from the civilized Caucasian a newly discovered or investigated tribe or specimen, living or dead, would appear to be, the greater was the value set on the discovery, because the nearer science was supposed to have come to the missing link, the transition from brute to man. Of course, the missing link will never be discovered, because it never existed. There is no transition from brute to man, and never was. But if there were a species of beings which might be classed either with man or with brutes, a transitional species, even that would not necessarily represent a transition in the direction from brute to man. We do not say that a transition from man to brute is possible; for it is not; but we do say that the evolutionist who sees in Bushmen and other savages specimens of humanity representing the earlier stages of development, through

1) "According to them, man must have lived for a time in a state of mutism, his only means of communication consisting in gestures of the body, and in changes of countenance." Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*. Vol. I, p. 40.

which the more highly developed species had long since passed on the way from the primitive state of man to their present state, makes a great, fundamental mistake, the same mistake which one would make in supposing that the pale and decrepit inmates of a city hospital or a country poor-house represented the lower stage of development from which the strong and healthy men and women in the surrounding country had been evolved. Our evolutionists are in very much the same plight with Mark Twain and his friend, who, having slept all day, rushed from the hotel in scanty clothing, climbed the observatory and to the amusement of the guests loudly admired what they took to be the famous Rigi sunrise, while in fact they were vociferating and gesticulating at the setting sun. But while our tourists had soon found out their mistake, our evolutionists have not; which does not make it any less a mistake. St. Paul has drawn a vivid picture of the degenerating influence of sin upon the nations under the righteous wrath of God,¹⁾ and the course which the Greek nation and the Roman world have run from their pristine vigor exhibited in the days of Thermopylae and Cannae down to the state of *marasmus senilis* pictured by Juvenal, a state of rottenness which even the transfusion of German blood into the putrid veins of that degenerate and decaying race could not remedy, is a fearful corroboration of the apostle's testimony. What terrible work sin and the unrestrained sway of the passions may make even in a lifetime is continually being demonstrated in the innumerable wrecks which on their downward course totter through years of miserable existence into a libertine's or drunkard's grave. Sin is a destructive principle not only in individuals, but also in communities. Go to the slums of our great cities and note the ravages of sin; and go to the boulevards of the same cities and mark the ravages of sin! And that in a nation which is permeated by influences which act as powerful preservatives, both

1) Rom. 1, 18—32.

directly and indirectly, chief of which is the Christian religion in the pulpit, the press, Christian schools, missionary endeavors, and the lives of the Christian people, the salt and light of the world.¹⁾ Think what sin is making out of so many in spite of these influences, and what it will be likely to make of a people remote from such preservatives, and then say whether even the most degenerate savage, loaded down with the accumulated effects of the wellnigh unbridled sway of sin through many generations, should be a marvel to a thinking mind. St. Paul deplorably confesses that sin dwelled in him and deceived him, prompting him to do what he would not, and preventing him from doing what he would.²⁾ And of all Christians he asserts that the flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that they cannot do the things that they would.³⁾ This being the condition even of the best of men, it is not difficult to comprehend that, wherever the struggle of the spirit against the flesh has been in a measure neglected and the flesh has been allowed to gain headway in its evil propensities, deterioration has set in. Thus there was a time when the churches in Galatia had exposed themselves to the reproach: "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth."⁴⁾ And if this process of deterioration is not stayed, the leavening of the whole lump will follow.⁵⁾ What has become of the churches in Asia, the church of Ephesus, which had early "left its first love,"⁶⁾ the church of the Laodiceans, who, after the first glow of spiritual life had turned lukewarm,⁷⁾ and of other apostolic churches? What of the church of Rome, whose faith was at a time spoken of throughout the whole world?⁸⁾ We know that the time came when a bishop of Rome, Liberius, who had denied the orthodox Nicene faith, was on his return to the city welcomed with open arms by the greater part of his congregation. And even prior to that, the

1) Matt. 5, 13. 14. Eph. 5, 8—13.

3) Gal. 5, 17.

6) Rev. 2, 4.

4) Gal. 5, 7.

7) Rev. 3, 16.

2) Rom. 7, 8—25.

5) Gal. 5, 9.

8) Rom. 1, 8.

Roman church had so far degenerated in Christian life, that a former defaulter, who was, besides, contaminated with unitarian error, was possible on the episcopal throne.¹⁾ What the Roman church was in the days of Jerome, we learn from his *epistola ad Eustochium*.²⁾ And as years and centuries rolled on, Rome became the greatest gate of hell on earth, a veritable Sodom with the papal court as its focus; the seat of Antichrist, the Scarlet Woman drunken with the blood of the saints. The early churches of England and Germany were planted and prospered under the quickening sunshine of the gospel; but in the course of time they degenerated and fell a prey to papal treachery. The church of the Reformation degenerated under rationalizing influences through Philippism and Syncretism and Pietism into rankest Rationalism. Lutheranism in America degenerated from the orthodoxy of Berkenmeyer and the Pietism of Mühlenberg to the heterodoxy of Quitman and the unconfessional and anticonfessional General-Synodism of 1820.

But that all this is not evolution, but the very reverse, not sunrise, but sunset, ought to be clear to every one not an incorrigible evolutionist who, like a monomaniac, sees evolution everywhere. But such is evolutionism in history and everywhere. It is itself a symptom of degeneration, of the decay of true science which must terminate in an utter perversion of scientific methods and lead to the very reverse of the legitimate results of scientific research. Instead of leading to the discovery and establishment of truth, it leads into a maze of error and falsehood, and places its votaries in a line with those of whom the Apostle has said that they *became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.*³⁾ A. G.

1) Callist, a. D. 217—222.

2) Hieronym. ep. 22.

3) Rom. 1, 21. 22.