

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute

OR

Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXI

1939



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY

THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, W.C.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

832ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 22ND, 1939, AT
5.0 P.M.

R. E. D. CLARK, ESQ., M.A., PH.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Lieut.-Col. L. Merson Davies (late R.A.), M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.R.A.I., F.G.S., to read his paper entitled "Man in the Image of God."

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion in which the following took part: The Rev. W. B. Monahan, Mr. H. S. Shelton, Mr. George Brewer, Mr. E. J. G. Titterington, and the Rev. E. Rose.

MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

BY LT.-COL. L. M. DAVIES (late R.A.), M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.E.,
F.R.A.I., F.G.S.

" Il résulte de cet exposé que la théorie de l'évolution est impossible. Au fond, malgré les apparences, personne n'y croit plus."*—Prof. P. Lemoine, *Encyclopédie Française*, vol. V, 1938, p. 5·82–8.

WHEN Charles Darwin first published his ideas in *The Origin of Species*, he thought it advisable, in view of general opinion at the time (1859), to say nothing about the highest species of all—Man. Twelve years later (1871), the increasing popularity of his doctrines encouraged him to pursue the subject to its logical conclusion, and he produced his next most famous work, *The Descent of Man*, in which he claimed to prove that man is descended from a hairy quadruped with pointed ears and a tail. He did not give the animal a name.

Controversy raged over the subject for some considerable time. It divided both the Christian world and the non-Christian one.

* " It follows from this exposition that the theory of evolution is impossible. At bottom, in spite of appearances, nobody believes in it any longer." Quoted in the *C.R. Soc. Géol. France* for April 4th, 1938, and not disputed by any French geologist, it shows how freely evolution is criticised in France to-day.

Thus, although the Christian Church was much more conservative in its views than it is now, it could even then produce its Henry Drummond, who tried to take the sting out of Darwinism by talking of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and the "Ascent of Man" instead of his "Descent." Such verbal play, however, merely served as a spiritual anæsthetic. It did not remove, but actually emphasised, the basic fact that belief in the Fall was undermined; and so by implication was belief in the necessity for the Incarnation, Atonement, and Physical Resurrection of our Lord.

On the other hand, the evolutionary edifice did not stand very firmly. Its builders have never agreed as to the essentials for its structure. What some have treated as fundamental, others have thrown out as worthless. And many a naturalist who had little bias in favour of Scripture has ridiculed evolution belief as contrary to facts, and most of the arguments in its support as obviously absurd. As instances, one might quote A. de Quatrefages and H. Fabre. To judge from the former's writings, he had no belief in Bible Inspiration; but as a responsible scientist, objecting to assumptions and special-pleading being substituted for rigorous proofs, his opposition to Darwin was just as definite as that of Darwin's old teacher, the famous geologist Adam Sedgwick (founder of the Sedgwick Museum at Cambridge), who told Darwin that he laughed till his sides ached when reading parts of the latter's *Origin of Species*.^{*} Fabre was equally critical of Darwinian logic; and it seems that the French Academy of Science kept its doors closed to Darwin on the grounds that the two works on which his fame principally rested were not scientific treatises, but mainly the products of imagination.

Nor has the situation changed materially since that generation passed away. Certainly the Christian Church, as a whole, has now decided to take evolution for granted—with the inevitable result that her emphasis on Sin, Judgment, and man's need for Atonement has faded into the background, while a Social Gospel has tended to replace the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Such changes necessarily follow when man is regarded as a risen creature instead of a fallen one. But the scientific case for belief in evolution is still quite as patently unsound as it was when

^{*} Letter dated December 24th, 1859. See *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, 1888, vol. II, pp. 247-248.

Darwin propounded his 800 lesser "may-be's" to prove the final "may-be" of evolution—as Owen (who founded the Natural History Museum at South Kensington) sarcastically remarked.* And to-day, just as eighty years ago, evolution is treated much more sceptically in France than in Britain. To most French scientists, evolution theory is only an instrument for research, not a result of research; and they question its validity with a freedom which is apt to shock its devotees on this side of the Channel.

When we take a broad view of the subject, we find that the evolutionist stands on his firmest ground while claiming that man's physical frame is essentially part of the animal kingdom. That claim must be allowed. All the bones in man's body are matched by corresponding bones in the great apes. All his physical properties and processes are similar to theirs. He fits into place, in any systematic classification of living creatures, as being an animal of a particular known phylum, of a particular class within that phylum, of one of the recognised orders of that class, and as clearly located among the known families of that order.

To the evolutionist it seems unthinkable that any being so hedged in among other animals should not be genetically related to those others. But it is when he tries to identify man's actual ancestors that the evolutionist's embarrassment begins, and one finds that he has reached the end of his legitimate tether. Like Darwin, he has to conjure unknown forms to his assistance.

As I remarked in a previous paper (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. LVIII, 1926, pp. 229–230, fn.), it is much easier to fill gaps in nature than to construct series by filling the gaps. Intermediate forms have an uncomfortable habit of showing their own specialisations. So we can seldom offer even a possible genetic sequence of forms; and (as I showed in the same paper) we could never prove that the most seemingly perfect series was actually genetic. † The evolutionist always walks by faith, not sight.

The difficulty of constructing a possible genetic series is well seen in the case of man, for each group of forms among the

* *North British Review* for July, 1867, p. 313.

† Dr. W. D. Lang, Keeper of Geology at the British Museum (Nat. Hist.), insists that "it is impossible to prove a true lineage, and extremely improbable that we can ever produce anything but an approximation to one." (*Proc. Geol. Assoc.*, vol. XII, 1930, p. 178.) All fossil genealogies, without exception, are unproved and unprovable.

primates—the order to which man belongs—is aberrant with respect to its neighbours in the taxonomic list. Thus, the anthropoid apes, who stand nearest to man on that list, are much too specialised to link him to the monkeys who stand lower down. This is shown in many ways. Like man, the anthropoids have no tail, but possess a coccyx, sometimes referred to as a “hidden tail.” Actually, the coccyx has nothing to do with a tail, all its functions being internal right to the tip of its last segment, to which the *sphincter ani* muscle is attached. But in any case, the ape’s coccyx is smaller than man’s; so if it is the relic of anything larger, it is easier to regard the apes as man’s descendants than as his ancestors. Similarly the hand of a man, with its large thumb, is more primitive in pattern than the typical manus of the ape, which is specialised as a grasping hook, with the thumb reduced to relative insignificance. The foot of a man and the foot of an ape contain similar elements, but they are specialised in opposite directions; and it is the human foot which emphasises the primitive disposition of the plantar surface, the foot of the apes representing an entirely aberrant specialisation. It is significant that this ape specialisation is never seen in any stage of the development of the human foot, and it is inconceivable that man’s ancestors could ever have possessed the ape structure. Much more evidence could be quoted to the same effect, and H. F. Osborn has well declared that the anthropoid apes are “totally disconnected from the human family from its earliest infancy.” (*Evol. & Religion in Education*, 1926, p. 136.)

When we turn to the monkeys, who stand lower in the list, we find them equally specialised out of series. Man, like the lowest primates (lemurs, etc.), has considerable sense of smell. In his skull, as in theirs, the ethmoid bone is large, and directly connected with the sphenoid bone. But monkeys have practically no sense of smell, and in their skulls the ethmoid bone is very reduced in size and completely surrounded by the frontal bones. It is clear that man’s ancestors never travelled by that route.

Nor do the characters of primitive human races approximate them to the apes, as evolution doctrine requires. The thick lips and woolly hair of the negro point directly away from the thin lips and straight hair of the ape; and if the prognathism of the negro recalls the muzzle of the lower primates, the essentially

human poise of the negro's head (balanced on top of the spinal column, instead of being slung downwards from it as in the apes) is secured by an increase in the essentially human protrusion of the occiput. Thus, if the negro's skull looks less human than ours in front, it looks more human behind; the net result being an equally human relationship to the spine. Indeed, the essential humanity of primitive peoples is often very striking. The most perfect picture of human grace of carriage, poise and motion that I myself ever saw, was exhibited by a string of almost naked Masai warriors going out on patrol.

Similar anomalies meet us when we examine the remains of fossil men of apparently degraded types. Neanderthal man had large supra-orbital ridges; but his palate and teeth were ultra-human, and his brain was larger than that of most men of to-day. Nor did he antedate the modern type of man, whose remains have been found in much earlier deposits.

It was after examining one of the best preserved Neanderthal skeletons that the eminent anthropologist, Prof. Marcelin Boule, concluded that man can have "been derived neither from the Anthropoid stem, nor from any other known group, but from a very ancient Primate stock that separated from the main line even before the giving off of the Lemuroids." ("L'Homme fossile de la Chapelle-aux-Saints," *Ann. de Paléontologie*, 1912.) Now the earliest known fossil primates are lemuroids, so this "very ancient" stock is purely imaginary; and since man admittedly comes from *no known* group, we see that the whole genealogy of man is a figment of the brain from start to finish.

How true to facts the Bible is! It clearly indicates this very situation. For Scripture nowhere denies "Man's Place in Nature," as claimed by Huxley. On the contrary, Solomon declares without hesitation that, as to his visible parts, man is simply an animal (Eccl. iii, 18-21). Physically and physiologically "the sons of men . . . themselves are beasts" and "a man hath no preeminence above a beast." Solomon actually prayed God to make men realise this fact.

And yet Scripture never admits man's derivation from other creatures. It draws the line just where we find it drawn in nature. I often ask those who profess to see evolution in Genesis how they square the origin of Eve with descent, and they never reply. The reason is obvious. Reconciliation is impossible. Hugh Capron admitted this, and while pleading for belief in the evolu-

tion of man, allowed of special creation for woman!* But Adam's origin is also incompatible with evolution, since Scripture indicates that he had nostrils before he had life (Gen. ii, 7).† All naturally-born men, as embryos, possess life before their nostrils develop; and their earliest (invertebrate and lower vertebrate) supposed ancestors, on the evolution theory, must also have possessed life long before the first creatures with nostrils appeared. Thus, by saying that Adam's life entered via his *nostrils*, Scripture very neatly denies his evolution.

In short, the Bible insists that man was specially created; but it nowhere implies that he was created upon special principles—so far, at least, as his physical frame is concerned. He is indeed the chief of the beasts, but—as to his visible parts—he is none the less one of them.

What, then, we may well ask, constitutes man's distinction from the rest of the animal world? For Scripture everywhere implies the existence of this distinction, even Solomon indicating a difference between the invisible elements of man and other creatures. In order to understand the Bible view of man's nature, let us begin with the account of his introduction, for it is found to be most significant.

In Gen. i, 26, we find a solemn conference recorded, the first of its kind in Scripture, of God with God, in the words: "Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness." Note the wording of this passage, for the nouns are in the singular, while the pronouns are in the plural. Surely, this plurality, which is to be typified in unity, seems distinctly to imply something very like the doctrine of the Three-in-One God Who is revealed to us in the New Testament, and in Whose image man must exist if Scripture be true? It is not normal, in the Old Testament, for the Godhead to use plural pronouns with reference to Himself; and as Skinner says regarding this verse: "The difficulty of the first person plural has always been felt." (*Crit. and Exeget. Comm. on Gen.*, p. 30.) The appearance of plural

* *The Conflict of Truth*, 9th ed., p. 288.

† Capron saw this difficulty. His attempt (*ibid.*, p. 282) to dismiss it was ridiculous. Because evidence that a child never breathed is legally taken to prove that it was born dead, Capron argued that a child is not alive until it breathes! On the contrary, it could not breathe unless *previously* alive; and unless alive from the first, it would never develop a single stage beyond the initial cell. Good men commit strange mistakes when trying to square Scripture with what Darwin himself called "the devil's gospel." (Letter to Huxley dated August 8th, 1860; vide *Life and Letters*, vol. III, p. 331.)

pronouns here is indeed very striking, and their connection with the origin of man seems clearly to imply man's distinctive resemblances to the *several Persons* of the Trinity.

Let us remember that the Old Testament offers other indications of the Trinity; for it not only refers to Jehovah Himself, but also to the Spirit of Jehovah, and to the Angel (or Messenger) of Jehovah—"Malak Yahweh." This Messenger both speaks and requires worship as Jehovah, which other angels do not (Ex. iii, 2-6; Josh. v, 13-vi, 5; cf. Dan. ix, 21; Rev. xix, 10; etc.). That the Godhead includes an Anointed Son is also indicated in the Old Testament, as I have shown elsewhere (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. LXV, 1929, pp. 216-217); and since the New Testament calls the Son the "Word" of God, a title which would well suit the Messenger, it seems reasonable to identify the Messenger with the Son.

In any case, the New Testament shows that the God of the Bible is a Trinity comprising the Father or Creator, the Son or Word through Whom He created all things, and the Spirit by Whom He created them. (That the Son was the medium of creation we find in John i, 3; Heb. i, 2-3; etc. Yet the Spirit seems to have been the immediate agent in creation, *vide* Gen. i, 2; Ps. civ, 30; etc.) It is in the image of these three Persons, then, that man is declared by Scripture to have been created; he *as contrasted with other creatures* should show peculiar resemblance to the Father or Creator, the Son or Word, and the Holy Spirit. In other words, it seems that man should be distinguished by his intelligent creative powers, his powers of speech, and his spiritual powers.

This induction from the account of man's creation, in the light of what we are told about God Himself, appears to be not only legitimate (if not inevitable), but also consistent with the rest of Scripture, being confirmed by repeated implications found in both Old Testament and New. Thus, the *understanding* of man is represented as distinguishing him from other creatures (Ps. xxxii, 9), just as divine "Wisdom" characterised Jehovah of old (Prov. viii, 22-30); and the loss of his human understanding reduced even Nebuchadnezzar to the condition of the beasts of the field (Dan. iv, 16, 25, 32-36). Turn, also, to the story of Balaam's ass (Num. xxii, 22-33): it is often ridiculed, but do scoffers at what the ancient writer says appreciate what he *omits* to say? For the ass is represented as seeing the Angel of the

Lord, and as being terrified by what she saw ; yet, even after power of speech is (miraculously) given to her, she seems unable to describe the cause of her fears. By no term conveying a theological or spiritual concept does the ass "appreciate" the situation or explain why she cannot proceed. Something terrible is before her very eyes, but she cannot describe it. She can only plead her own past obedience to show that she is not acting wantonly now. Why is this ? If the story was an invention, why did the writer refrain from making the ass utilise the dramatic opportunity which offered itself when power of speech was given to her ? Why did he attribute strangely indirect questions to her, instead of an impassioned description of what she saw ? Surely, the reticence of the writer bears witness both to the truth of his account and to the consistency of Scripture ; for the story indicates that even if one human characteristic—that of true speech—be given to a brute, it only serves to reveal the absence of another human characteristic—spiritual comprehension.* No human being, however degraded, would have failed to refer to the vision itself by using some term implying a supernatural concept. Whether he called it an angel, god, ghost or dæmon, he would inevitably have found means of indicating that he was opposed by a supernatural being. But that, apparently, was just what the ass could not do *even when speech was given to her.*

Space is limited, so I will only offer one more illustration, and turn to Rev. xiii. We there find what appears to be a dreadful parody of the Christian Godhead. A great red "Dragon," who is identified with the serpent of Eden (ch. xii, 3, 9), seems to represent the first person of a terrible Satanic trinity. This Dragon gives his power, seat and authority to a "Beast," just as our Heavenly Father gives His power to the Son (Matt. xxviii, 18 ; Luke xxii, 69 ; etc.) ; and the Beast also corresponds to the Son by rising from the dead (Rev. xiii, 3 ; xvii, 8-11), and by being the spokesman or "word" of the false trinity (xiii, 5-6). He is also the warrior personality of that trinity (verse 4), just as our Lord is the Warrior Personality of the Holy Trinity (Rev.

* The only other beast that Scripture represents as speaking is the serpent in Eden, whose words show full spiritual comprehension. But the speaker there is Satan, who is identified with the serpent. Whether the Devil took the shape of a serpent, or entered into one and used it as a medium, the words are clearly his, not those of the beast. In the case of Balaam's ass, the animal speaks for itself, and the different *quality* of its speech is most marked.

xix, 11-21 ; cf. Josh. v, 14-15). The third person of the Satanic trinity is a " False Prophet " (Rev. xiii, 11-17) who makes all men worship the Beast, whose deadly wound was healed, just as the Holy Spirit (sometimes called the " Spirit of *Prophecy*"--cf. Rev. xix, 10 ; 2 Pet. i, 21 ; Luke xxiv, 25-27 ; etc.) leads us to worship the Risen Christ (John xv. 26 ; xvi, 7-14 ; 1 Cor. xii, 3 ; etc.).

Whatever the full meaning of this remarkable passage may be, its intention to represent a sacrilegious counterfeit of the Bible Godhead seems unmistakable. Nor is the parody limited to offering counterparts of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity ; it also offers a counterpart of the creation of man made in the image of the Holy Trinity. For an image is made of the second person of the false trinity, and the third person of that trinity endows this image with life (Rev. xiii, 14-15). What is more, the nature of the life given to this parody man—made in the image of the parody trinity—is equally significant ; for it is not merely vegetative life, or even simply conscious life, but life which exhibits the three distinctive characteristics of man exactly as we have inferred them from other Scriptures, since this parody man both *speaks* and *causes* all who refuse to *worship* it to be put to death. So here again, while details of physical form are ignored, we find particular emphasis laid upon powers of articulate *speech*, powers of intelligent *causation*, and sense of spiritual *worship*.

This cannot be accidental. Though not explicitly stated in so many words, the picture of man in the image of God being forced to worship his own parody in the image of a false trinity is too detailed either to be mistaken or due to coincidence. It is also consistent that those who give this worship are represented as committing an unforgivable offence (Rev. xvi, 2 ; xix, 20), for it obviously reflects upon God Himself when His image bows to the image of another. (This is probably why all image worship is so strictly forbidden in Scripture. Man himself is the supreme image. Ex. xx, 4-5 prohibits the worship of graven images even of the true God. Such worship places man's handiwork before God's. Being what Scripture indicates—an image of God *by* God—man, despite his fallen condition, must worship God direct.)

From the nature, then, of the Holy Trinity in Whose image man was made, from the deficiencies of the brute creation as

compared with man, and from the very qualities of man's parody, Scripture makes it clear that man's peculiar characteristics are to be found in his intelligent *creative* powers, his powers of reasoned *speech*, and his *spiritual* powers.

These are rather remarkable facts, for if we turn to see how they correspond with the data of science, we find them confirmed in a very striking fashion. However little a scientist may know or care about Scripture, however eager he may even be to discredit it, he is compelled to bear witness to its truth here. Whenever we find definitely shaped tools,* traces of communications, or symbols of worship, they are at once referred to man, and man alone.

Perhaps the most significant feature about this is that the evidence is so decisive, even though purely circumstantial. For the actual remains of a creature may arouse doubts as to its status. The Java calvarium is large; the Heidelberg jaw has no chin. Yet even if we see nothing of the makers themselves, such objects as a prepared flint instrument, or dots and scratches suggesting an early code, or lumps of battered clay so associated with the bones of an animal as to imply the mystic rites of primitive hunters, are at once regarded as indicating the existence of men. The ascendancy of *circumstantial* evidence, in this connection, is very noticeable. The bones of the men themselves could not testify more clearly than their works do, as to their human status; and their humanity is always evinced along the three main lines of their *reasoned creative* powers,† their powers of improvising *communication*, and their strange energies (often intrinsically worthless) which testify their *belief in the supernatural*.

Let us then sum up:

- 1.—(a) According to Scripture, man was produced by special creation; and

* The significance of a shaped tool lies in the fact that it implies an involved mental process which is essentially human. An elephant will tear off the branch of a tree to use it as a club; an ape will throw stones, or even use a stick as a lever; but the instrument is used as it stands. Man alone seems capable of shaping an instrument; *i.e.*, putting work of one kind into it, with a view to using it for work of another kind.

† Among the creative works, of course, one reckons not only tools, but all other evidences of culture such as clothes, pottery, musical instruments, etc. Articulate speech, however, suggests a different basic principle; and so does evidence of religious (or superstitious, if degraded) concepts and rites.

- (b) Science shows that his form is not derivable from any other. Nevertheless
- 2.—(a) Scripture asserts man's essential identity, physical and physiological, with the beasts; and
- (b) Science can find no physical difference *in kind* between men and beasts. Yet
- 3.—(a) Scripture teaches that man alone is formed in the image of the Triune God—Creator, Word and Spirit—and repeatedly emphasises man's uniqueness in possessing Reason, Speech and Spiritual attributes; and
- (b) Science recognises the presence of man, even more certainly than by his bones, by his *works* evidencing those same three characters, which are uniquely human.

Thus the concordance between Scripture and science is both intricate and complete; and the question arises as to how this is to be explained. The whole history of other accounts of man's origin shows that the Bible account stands by itself. Man, by the light of nature, either tries to emphasise his *physical* distinction from the beasts, claiming differences in kind which cannot be shown to exist, or he goes to the opposite extreme and claims a genetic affinity with them which also cannot be shown to exist. It is strange that Scripture should have steered a middle course between these two most common errors! The mythologies and pagan theologies of man also show how far he has been from spontaneously conceiving of a Trinity like that of the Bible, or of himself as being formed in the image of such a Trinity. Lower creatures are frequently made to speak, etc., in ancient mythologies, without any suggestion of supernatural intervention being required to make them do so; no attempt is made to emphasise man's singularity in the respects recognised by the Bible and modern science.

Remember, too, that the Scriptural doctrine is integral to the completed Bible rather than explicit in any one part of it. The writer of the story of Balaam's ass makes no comments upon the ass's speech, although its limitations so exactly suit the implications of Gen. i, 26 in the light of the New Testament; nor does the writer of Rev. xiii comment upon the significance of the details given regarding man's parody. Since the Bible was written by many men, separated widely in time and circumstances, the way

in which their statements interlock, and finally by their union afford the most striking conformities to science, shows that there can only be one explanation of the whole. Nothing can account for the facts but the validity of the writers' own claim, that they wrote under the influence of one and the same Spirit; the Spirit of the God of Truth, Who knows the end from the beginning.

Believers in Scripture have the strongest warrant for accepting its literal Inspiration by God; and man himself, even in his most degraded states, witnesses, by his own threefold distinctions from other creatures, to the appropriateness of the ancient statement that he was made in the image of the Triune God—Creator, Word and Spirit.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. R. E. D. CLARK) said: There are many things about this stimulating lecture which must have impressed us all, not least the manner of its delivery. Speaking for myself, I find that an attempt to read, word for word, anything that I have written reduces me to a state where words cease to have meaning! But with Col. Davies it is clearly otherwise. I am sure we shall long remember the vigour and charm of his delivery.

To turn to the substance of the lecture, Col. Davies has alluded to so many things, that it is hard for me to know where to begin. Let it be evolution!

I had better say at once that the orthodox evolutionist would not regard some of the lecturer's remarks as fair. No one to-day supposes that the apes and monkeys are missing links between man and beast, but only that both man and ape have been derived from the same unspecialised species. This makes much of what Col. Davies has said beside the point, for there is no reason why ancient intermediate forms should be alive to-day. However, I agree with Col. Davies that evolutionists work by faith and not by sight and I am sure that all the bad arguments used on one side of this controversy can be paralleled by an equal number on the other. Here, for instance, is the kind of argument which an eminent biologist seems to find convincing: "The smell cells in the nose... are definitely fishy and will only work if they are immersed in water; so we find in an out-of-the-way corner of the cavity of the nose, a special set of little glands, evolved when the vertebrates came on

to dry land, whose business it is to secrete a film of moisture over the smell cells—a tiny vestigial sea for them to work in" (Wells, Huxley and Wells, *The Science of Life*, p. 726). Now anyone with even an elementary knowledge of chemistry knows that reactions do not occur save in liquids—except at an incredibly small speed. The reason why the sense of smell is connected with liquid is chemical—there is no need to appeal to evolution!

To turn to more serious topics, I should like at this point to refer to two important papers which have a close bearing upon the evolutionary controversy. The first is that of A. S. Barnes (*American Anthropologist*, 1939, **41**, 99), who has made a very careful study of the eoliths or supposed simple flint instruments which are often supposed to have been made by a race of primitive peoples. It appears as a result of a careful statistical analysis of the shapes of the stones, with which I have no time to deal, that the eoliths are no longer to be regarded as the work of intelligence, but were produced by the action of natural forces. It is curious that this view of their origin should once again be accepted after so many years of controversy. Let us hope that popular books on evolution will no longer find cause to mention them.

Col. Davies has based much of his argument upon the so-called Dollo's Law—the law that in evolution species start off unspecialised and only become specialised in the course of time. As apes and men are not, in any case, descended the one from the other, I cannot agree with the lecturer's argument based upon this law. But the law has nevertheless a very important bearing on the evolutionary question. A paper on this subject had recently been published by J. Needham (*Biological Reviews*, 1938, **13**, 225), who has collected scores of instances of its workings from the whole realm of biology. He compares it to the law of entropy in physics—the law that disorder increases in every physical change. In the same way each biological organism starts off with an immense complexity—invisible perhaps, in anatomical structure, but present at least genetically. Then, if it finds itself in a constant environment, many of the complex potentialities become unnecessary and drop off as a result of mutation, as one generation succeeds another. Finally, there results a highly specialised form which is ideally adapted to a particular environment but is at once doomed to extinction if that environment

changes. As Luoff puts it: "The physiological evolution of organisms proceeds by a successive loss of functions. This loss of functions is irreversible."

It certainly looks as if, when its significance is appreciated, Dollo's law will undermine the basis of the confident faith in constructive evolution which is still so prevalent—the faith that real rises in complexity are possible in biological evolution.

But enough of this! Col. Davies has put forward an ingenious and interesting suggestion as to the meaning of the Biblical saying that God made man in his own image. Is his theory correct?

The word "image," if taken literally, would seem to refer to shape. But God is a spirit, and has a spirit shape? Frankly, I do not know. But if some of the materialisations recorded by psychical researchers are genuine, a spirit may well have shape without matter. Moreover, shape is certainly connected with mind and mind is not necessarily connected with matter—as seems to be shown by the apparitions of those in danger who are sometimes seen by their loved ones at great distances away. These are mysterious topics about which we know little, yet I think we should do well to ask whether the passage in question may not, just possibly, mean quite literally what it says—that man was made in the shape of God. But I say this with much hesitation, scarcely knowing what to think.

In his paper Col. Davies has not discussed this possibility at all, but he has suggested that the word "image" stands for behaviour and mental likeness and that this should be applied to all the Persons of the Trinity severally.

Without wishing to be destructive, I feel that we have so little knowledge of these relations of the Persons of the Trinity to one another that his interpretation is a little unconvincing. For instance, it would surely be easy to quote many passages from the Bible which suggest that the Son has creative faculty—indeed, is He not spoken of as Wisdom? This being so, why should the Fatherhood of God have its image or likeness in *our* intelligence, while the Sonship is seen in our speech? These are deep matters and I do not think we have nearly enough information to solve them with any certainty, though I hope Col. Davies may be able to answer the objection to which I have alluded.

Now let us see how we stand. If we decide that the "image" is not literal and if we cannot accept the details of Col. Davies' rather complex scheme, is there yet any sense in which man was made in the image of God? Indeed there is. Man's creative faculties have undoubtedly been fashioned after those of God. We see again and again in the realm of nature that man can think God's thoughts after him—can understand His universe in some measure at least and often design his machines in ways which have been used by God in nature. This suggests, very strongly, that our own thinking powers are made after the likeness of those of God. But perhaps, as a result of this afternoon's lecture and discussion, we shall find out how much farther than this it is permissible to go.

Mr. H. S. SHELTON began by saying that he would not criticise the lecturer's theology, but would confine his remarks to the science. He wished, however, to protest against the mixing of the two. Col. Davies was a geologist of standing, and his opinions on scientific matters deserved a respectful hearing. He implied rather than said directly that he believed neither in organic evolution in general, nor in the descent of man from other forms of life in particular. In that opinion he was in a small minority among competent men of science. It was very unwise to introduce his opinions on this matter into the present paper, and so give the impression that the truths of Christianity were in any way bound up with whether or not man was descended from other forms of life.

Mr. Shelton went on to criticise Col. Davies' reasons for implying that man was specially created. If man and the apes were descended from a common ancestor, it was not to be expected that the apes would remain unchanged. This was an example of divergent evolution. The same remarks applied to other forms of life more distantly related. Professor Boule's opinion that man branched off from the Primate stock before the existence of the Lemuroids was his own, and was not generally accepted.

Nor was it reasonable to ask for a truly genetic series. The geologic record was very imperfect, and especially so with the primates, and it was to be expected that the best series would be only approximate. Those who asked for truly genetic series would do well to try to make one out for the dogs, and show exactly where the pekinese,

the greyhound, the mastiff and the spaniel branched off from the main stem. If it could not be done in a comparatively easy case such as this, it was not to be expected that it would be possible in more difficult cases.

Neither Pithecanthropus nor Neanderthal man could be the ancestor of Homo sapiens, as both were too late in the time scale; but forms such as this gave to those who held that man was a special creation the somewhat difficult task of saying which forms were men and which were apes. Neanderthal man was big brained, but was usually classed as a different species. Piltdown man, was somewhat nearer the Homo sapiens type, though both skull and jaw showed simian traits. Pekin man had a very small brain, but the skeletons were associated with implements, which unfortunately had not so far been correlated with the European series. Pithecanthropus had not up to the present been found associated with implements, but it had attained the upright stature, and its brain was nearly as human as that of Pekin man, and very little smaller. If man were a special creation, it was necessary to draw the line somewhere, and those who attempted to draw a hard-and-fast line were confronted with a problem that was by no means easy.

The Rev. ERNEST ROSE said: May I add to that which the Lecturer has suggested concerning the "resemblance" of man to the Tri-unity of the Godhead that—As the Father is the source of *Love* displayed toward the Eternal Son ("Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world," St. John xvii, 24) and as the Son is the Word or *Speech* of the Father ("No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath *declared* Him," St. John i, 18, or "told Him out") and as the Holy Spirit is the *mind* of Deity ("He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the *mind* of the Spirit," Rom. viii, 27, *cp.* also 1 Cor. ii, 11). So *Love* and *Speech* (as powers of communication and communion) and *Mind* (as power to know) these three in man may be the reflection of the true "Image of God" in which man was originally made.

The Rev. W. B. MONAHAN said: I used the concluding words of the paper for my text. Dr. Davies said: "Believers in Scripture

have the strongest warrant for accepting its literal inspiration by God.”

I agreed with nearly every word of the paper; and especially did I feel moved by the happy application of various Scriptures to the thesis of “Man in God’s Image.” Also I was much struck with the reverence shown by the Society for the Holy Scriptures.

After much mental tribulation I was obliged to abandon various theories of inspiration in favour of the literal, which does by no means exclude the various senses outlined by St. Thomas. I pin my faith to the statement that: “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” Therefore God is the Author of the Scriptures.

Deprecating the application to Scripture to dogma and to the Church any theory of a biological Evolution, I pleaded that Evolution in the sense of an unfolding could be applied to the Bible as well as to matters of faith and to the Church. Such Evolution requires an Evolver; but it first of all requires an Originator. There can be no Evolution without an Originator—the Creator.

The first chapter of Genesis supplies instances of some sort of Evolution, but not of Man’s evolution, and it gives instances of distinct and undeniable acts of creation.

Three jumps are indicated which could only be done by the Creator. Three epochal acts are the Creation of Matter, the Creation of Life, and the Creation of the Intellectual Soul of Man. I underlined, in full and delighted agreement, Dr. Davies’ statement that by saying that Adam’s life entered via his nostrils Scripture very neatly denies his evolution—showing that Adam had nostrils before he had life, contrary to the natural order.

Indicating that there is some sort of evolution by way of development which can be applied to the Bible, I quoted in full Butler’s Analogy II, iii, 21. No doubt it refers to growth in the consciousness and expression of Christian doctrine. Butler’s words are: “As it is owned that the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so if it ever comes to be understood it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at; by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty, and by particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world. Nor is it at all incredible that a book, which has been so

long in the possession of mankind, should contain many truths as yet undiscovered, for all the same phenomena, and the same faculties of investigation, from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made were equally in the possession of mankind several years before. And possibly it might be intended that events as they came to pass should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture."

There you have an evolution by way of explication, elucidation and understanding : and a reverent looking to events to unfold some hidden Scripture meanings.

As instances of such an evolution explanatory of some revealed dogma or truth I instanced the dogma of the Blessed Trinity which, foreshadowed and implied in Scripture, yet was not defined until Nicea nearly 300 years after Pentecost. . . . Newman summed up the principle of evolution or development as applied to dogma in a very happy phrase to the effect that religious belief in " new relations and under new forms changes with them in order to remain the same." One of Newman's great merits was the substitution for the mechanical idea of a tradition deposited in written documents the organic notion of an ever-living tradition. . . . The same sort of evolution can be held of the growth of the Church. There are two notions of the Church which stand in some sort of antithesis to each other : one regards the Church as a sort of fixed and mechanical organisation, the other regards the Church as a living organism. A living organism has the power of growth and it is in accord with St. Paul's image of the Church as a human body in which there is a mingling of change and permanence. . . . It is with great diffidence that I submit these considerations to the Society : there is something less certain and satisfying about them than the substance of the admirable paper of Dr. Davies.

Nevertheless, I feel the wonder and the great mystery and the vast future of that Body of Christ for the building up of which He ascended on high that He might fill all things : for which He gave the Ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, " till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Mr. GEORGE BREWER said : The truth as revealed in Gen. i, 26, 27, that man was created in the image of God, and after His likeness, and in Psalm viii, 5, as " a little lower than the angels " completely disproves the theory that man has ascended by evolution to a position a little higher than the ape.

In 1 Cor. xv, 39, we are told that " All flesh is not the same flesh : but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds."

The similarity of structure of man and some of the lower animals shows, not that his physical form is derivable from the beasts, but the design and power of the same beneficent Creator.

As Col. Davies has pointed out, Scripture teaches that man alone is created in the Image of the Triune God—Creator, Word and Spirit—possessing reason, speech and spiritual attributes, and that Science recognises him more by these characteristics, which are lacking in the lower animals, than by his bones.

The Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, revealed in God's Word, is reflected in Man, by his nature, person and personality, as shown by Mr. Nathan Wood in his *Secret of the Universe*.

Man, with a body of space, matter and time, has also a mind reflecting in its finite capacity some of the infinite characteristics of the Triune Deity, as revealed in the Scriptures.

Thus the Omnipresence and Omniscience of God are reflected in the power of the human mind of transporting itself, either by memory or anticipation, to the ends of the earth, time and space affording no obstacle, the mind instinctively seeing, thinking and feeling, regardless of bodily presence, in the place of its imagination.

Then God's Omnipotence is reflected in the limited power of the human to overcome obstacles, sometimes achieving what would appear to be impossible, and turning hindrances into means of accomplishing desired ends.

The Holiness of God is also reflected in the conscience of man, who though sinful by nature is instinctively conscious of what is right and what is wrong, and realises the importance of regulating conduct accordingly.

Thus the Holy Scriptures and Science agree, leaving no room for the speculative theories of evolutionists.

Mr. E. J. G. TITTERINGTON said : I am sure none of us can have listened this afternoon to Col. Davies without a deep sensibility of the importance of the theme he has brought before us, and of the cogency of the arguments by which it has been supported. It is not a mere question of scientific hypothesis or speculation, but, as the lecturer has pointed out on page 171, is intimately and vitally connected with the fundamentals of the Christian faith—sin and judgment, the Fall and the Atonement. Is it too much to express a hope that at some future date this aspect of the subject may be followed further—either by the present lecturer or some other ?

One cannot fail, in reading the narrative of the earlier chapters of Genesis, to remark with what insistent emphasis attention is drawn to man's supremacy in the natural creation. May I mention three points in this connection :—

1. The use of the term **בָּרָא** (*bara*) in Gen. i, 27. This word only occurs, as has been pointed out at gatherings of this Institute on various past occasions, to mark a fresh advance or initial step of a new order, including the creation of matter (v. 1), of animal life (v. 21) and of man (v. 27) ; though curiously it is not used, where we might have expected it, in connection with vegetable life. The precise significance of this I must leave to Hebrew scholars to determine, for I am none ; but it is at least suggestive as seeming to imply that as distinct a new stage is reached in the creation of man as in that of the lower animals, or even of matter itself.

2. Secondly, there appears to me a deep significance in Gen. ii, 18-20 : "And the Lord God said, it is not good that the man should be alone : I will make him an help meet for him. And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air ; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them ; and whatsoever Adam called any living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field ; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." There are several points in this short passage inviting attention ; but we may note (*a*) the emphasis on the origin of the brute creation "out of the ground," (*b*) the observation and critical deduction implied in Adam's naming of the animals, and, most important, (*c*) the Creator's purpose in thus bringing the animals to Adam, in that he might realise that

here was to be found "not an help meet for him"—not one with whom he could have affinity.

3. In contradistinction to this, we have the passage in ch. iii, and ff. ("they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day," etc.) which suggests that there was habitual fellowship between man and his Creator; or even if this is not conceded, at least the possibility of such fellowship existing. In other words, whilst Adam's affinity was not with the lower creation, he had an affinity with the One Who created him. In a still fuller sense the Apostle writes of those who have believed in Christ, "truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ" (I John i, 3).

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am glad that the Chairman liked my manner of reading the paper, but wish that he had paid more attention to its contents. He says that I never discussed the possibility of man having been made in the "shape" of God. If by "shape" Dr. Clark means physical form, this was the very first possibility which I did discuss. I showed (page 174) that, as to his visible parts, Scripture calls man a "beast"; so physical resemblance is out of the question. I am glad that Dr. Clark finally realised that man's creative faculties are in the image of God; perhaps he will presently realise that man's powers of *speech* and *spiritual* powers are also in that image.

Dr. Clark suggests that I never considered whether the Son has "creative faculty"; yet I gave specific references (page 176) showing that both Son and Spirit shared in creation. The Triune God cannot be absolutely divided. Both the Son and the Father are Spirit; both the Father and the Spirit communicate. (Remember how the Father gave the Words to the Son, and the Spirit recalled those Words to the disciples—John xvii, 8; xiv, 26; etc.) Nevertheless, the Trinity is revealed as Father, Word and Spirit.

As to evolution, the Chairman contradicts himself. In one breath he calls me "unfair" to orthodox evolutionists for ignoring their idea that men and apes had common origin in an "unspecialised species" (though I emphasised that idea, in its fullest form, by quoting Professor Boule!), and in the next breath he accuses myself

of supposing "that in evolution species start off unspecialised." He calls this depending upon "Dollo's law"; if so, orthodox evolutionists do it. For myself, I never even mentioned Dollo. I appealed to the elementary fact that—Dollo or no Dollo—specialised forms cannot be placed in genetic series *between* unspecialised ones. The Chairman himself admits that specialised forms do not become unspecialised but extinct.

Dr. Clark is not a palæontologist, and apparently does not realise that fossil primates fall into the same categories as living ones, or he could never so light-heartedly assert that: "No one to-day supposes that the apes and monkeys are missing (*sic*) links between man and beast" (I wonder what he calls "beast"?). If this were true, then everyone would agree with Professor Boule; but people like Mr. Shelton do not.

Dr. Clark shows a flash of good sense in criticising Wells; but the point hardly affects the general case for evolution. His reference to Needham simply repeats what Bateson and others said before (just as Breuil and others long ago proved the same facts about eoliths as Barnes proves to-day, and just as Herbert Spencer and others said the same thing as Dollo—who seems to have so impressed Dr. Clark). When the Chairman has studied the subject further, he will probably see more of the wood and less of individual trees.

Mr. H. S. Shelton (who couches his remarks in the third person) says that he will not criticise my "theology," but wishes to protest against my questioning evolution because this mixes "science" with theology. He obviously expects me, when considering "Man in the Image of God," to accept without question the theory which asserts that the first men appeared in the image of missing links. Had I done so, there would doubtless have been little difference between Mr. Shelton's theology and my own. Evolution automatically substitutes "New" theology for "Old."

Since, however, I demand actual proofs of evolution, Mr. Shelton calls me "unreasonable," explains that the evidence has been lost, and demands to be shown, in return, "truly genetic series" between various breeds of dogs. But why should I produce such series? Scripture does not require them. On the contrary, certain dogs may have been separately created, just as certain "lice" were (Ex. viii, 16-19). But if Mr. Shelton himself cannot produce truly

genetic series, even where creatures all belong to the same physiological species, what business has he to treat a connection between men and apes as proved? On his own showing, "it is not to be expected that it would be possible" to prove that connection.

Mr. Shelton still, however, falls back upon theory—and so long as he treats it as theory I have no objection. After admitting that all the known degraded types of fossil men appear too late to serve as ancestors of normal men, he refers to the difficulty of "drawing a hard-and-fast line" between possible fragments which might be referred either to men or to apes. This difficulty is fully recognised in my paper, which shows (page 179) that *circumstantial* evidence—indicating man's resemblance to the Trinity—is always more decisive than details of bodily form.

I am glad that the other speakers seem to appreciate this fact; but I note that the Rev. E. Rose suggests that man's capacity for love may indicate his resemblance to the Father, and his mind represent his resemblance to the Spirit. I believe, however, that this suggestion was an impromptu one, and I think Dr. Rose will realise on reflection that it would hardly agree with Scripture as a whole. Mind is not the same thing as spirit, even though the Spirit Himself has mind. The words of Balaam's ass show that she had *mental* processes, though she had no conception of *spirit*. And the love of the Son, Who gave His life for us, is stressed throughout the New Testament. What is more, we know that love is not a peculiar prerogative of man. A bird will sacrifice herself for her brood, and a dog will die for his master.

Indeed, I do not find, in Scripture, that moral qualities (all derived from love—Matt. xxii, 37-40) distinguish man from beast in the absolute way supposed by many Christian writers and some philosophic ones. Thus, the ox that gored a man had to be stoned (Ex. xxi, 28)—which clearly implies a moral judgment—and the Noachian Covenant (Gen. ix, 9-16), of which the rainbow and the Cherubim remind us (cf. Ez. i, 4-28; x, 1-22; Rev. iv, 2-8; etc.) was with bird, cattle and wild beast (Gen. ix, 10; symbolised by the eagle, ox and lion heads of the Cherubim) as well as with man.

I would therefore point out that, according to Gen. i, 26-28, man was specially created to *rule over nature*; so his peculiar resem-

blances to God would have more to do with his powers than his affections. And this *certainly accords with science*.

It seems that God gave special powers to certain of His creatures, who thereby peculiarly resemble Himself ; but His love is (I believe) intended to be broadcast throughout creation. The effects of such broadcasting are described in the prophecies of the Millennium (cf. Is. xi, 6-9). Hence Scripture nowhere indicates that morality affects status, *although it directly affects destiny*. The greatest of all angelic beings, the Devil, was still treated as superior even by the unfallen Archangel Michael (Jude 9). And there is no hint that the relative innocence of Balaam's ass reduced the gulf between her and her master ; though we read that it would have saved her from the death which all but overtook him then, and actually overtook him soon afterwards. The greater the resemblance to the powers of the Godhead, the greater the responsibilities, and the more drastic the consequences for good or evil.

The "second birth," which concerns our moral relationship to God, is quite distinct from the natural birth, which relates us to this world. Even though natural man has spiritual powers, he cannot know the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. ii, 14). So Balaam could recognise the Angel, and yet proceed to commit his final crime.