

**ANALYSIS OF DARWIN, HUXLEY  
AND LYELL, BEING A CRITICAL  
EXAMINATION OF THE VIEWS OF  
THESE AUTHORS IN REGARD TO THE  
ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649436569

Analysis of Darwin, Huxley and Lyell, Being a Critical Examination of the Views of These Authors in Regard to the Origin and Antiquity of Man by Henry A. DuBois

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**HENRY A. DUBOIS**

**ANALYSIS OF DARWIN, HUXLEY  
AND LYELL, BEING A CRITICAL  
EXAMINATION OF THE VIEWS OF  
THESE AUTHORS IN REGARD TO THE  
ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN**



*S. C. Marsh*

ANALYSIS  
OF  
DARWIN, HUXLEY AND LYELL:  
BRING A  
CRITICAL EXAMINATION  
OF THE  
VIEWS OF THESE AUTHORS  
IN REGARD TO  
THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

BY  
HENRY A. DuBOIS, M. D., LL. D.

---

REPUBLICATION FROM THE  
"AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW."

---

PRINTED BY  
TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE & TAYLOR.

.....  
1866.

→

Som.  
D853a

## P R E F A C E .

---

THE following answer to Darwin, Huxley and Lyell, was written at our request, to combat the pernicious scientific infidelity of these authors, and is published in the July (1865) and the two following Numbers of the AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW.

It is from the pen of the author of the "Critical Examination of 'Essays and Reviews,'" which was published in our July Number for 1861, and which has attracted much attention at home and abroad.

An urgent request, emanating from high authority, coinciding with our own opinion in regard to this former Essay, induced us to present it to the public in a separate form in order that it might more readily reach the popular mind. Its wide circulation among those who were not likely to see the Church Review,—and its republication in England, with eulogy, by so distinguished a scholar as the Dean of Carlisle, fully justified the expediency of the step.

Precisely the same reasons have induced us to detach the present contribution from the Church Review, and to issue it from our press in pamphlet form. We hope that this second Essay will be as successful in liberating the minds of the uninitiated from the dangerous sophistries of Science, falsely so called, as the former one was in refuting the pernicious infidelity of professed Christians.

The author is willing that his own name shall be affixed to its publication, as he seeks no exemption from scientific responsibility, by *anonymously* attacking the opinions of men justly celebrated for their scientific attainments.

It is a fact that cannot be denied, that many practical men of Science have an unreasonable prejudice against Revelation, which they manifest by an antagonism, more or less overt, to the statements of

the Bible. Whether this prejudice proceeds from ignorance of the subject, or from pride of reason, engendered by their pursuits, we will not pretend to decide; but it certainly exists. It is also a fact that the unlearned are generally inclined to give implicit credence to the bare opinion, on general subjects, of men distinguished in some particular branch of practical Science. Yet there is no class of men whose abstract speculations are to be received with more distrust, than those who are the most successful and diligent laborers in special fields of Science. It would seem that there is something in those habits of thought and in that structure of mind which best fits a man to accumulate the details of Science, which unfits him for generalization, as well as for abstract speculation. The imagination can scarcely conceive any absurdity in science or philosophy, greater than what has been seriously held as truth by men renowned in those pursuits; and if all the absurdities of speculative opinion entertained by such men were carefully collated, it would present a catalogue which should justly excite our astonishment and contempt.

We think that the three works reviewed in this Essay, will furnish apt illustrations of the truth of this remark.

N. S. RICHARDSON,  
EDITOR OF THE AM. Q. R. CHURCH REVIEW.

NEW YORK, 37 Bible House, }  
Jan. 9th, 1866. }



THE

## ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

---

### PART I.

### DARWIN'S ORIGIN OF SPECIES.

THREE works have been recently presented to the English and American public, emanating from authors of distinguished scientific attainments, and purporting to treat of subjects purely scientific, but which, whether designedly or not, are well calculated to sap the foundations of revealed truth.

The first of these works, published in 1860, is, "The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection," by Charles Darwin, M. A., Fellow of the Royal, Geological, and Linnæan Societies of England, and author of "Journal of Researches during H. M. S. Beagle's Voyage Round the World."

The second, which was published in 1863, is entitled "Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature." Its author is Thomas H. Huxley, F. R. S., F. L. S., a distinguished London professor of Natural History, who had previously disseminated, by oral and published Lectures, views "On the Origin of Species," similar to those put forth by Mr. Darwin.

The third work, also recently published in this country, is from the able pen of the justly celebrated geologist, Sir Charles Lyell, and is entitled, "The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with remarks on theories of the Origin of Species by Variation." Although much the most voluminous, as well as the ablest of the three works, it would seem to be written for the express purpose of giving currency and authority to the other two.

These three works are very closely allied, not only by the doctrinal sympathies and intimate relations of their authors,

but also by the close relationship of the subjects of which they treat, and the common object proposed.

Mr. Darwin attempts to show, that all animals now in existence have been derived from the lowest and simplest forms of life, by *transmutation* of species acting through illimitable periods of time.

Mr. Huxley adopts this doctrine of transmutation, and thinks that he has proved that Man is the nearly allied if not immediate descendant of the Gorilla.

Sir Charles Lyell accepts, with approbation, slightly modified, these views of his friends, and undertakes to furnish them, from the records of Geology, all the time demanded by their speculations.

We propose to briefly review each of the above works, with a view to determine how much of scientific truth and philosophy each is entitled to claim. Preparatory to this task, we desire to give expression to some thoughts in regard to the nature and distinction of Species,—as this is the main subject of the first two works we intend to review.

The question of Species—its origin, nature, and limits,—has always been a most vexed subject of dispute, upon which naturalists are now divided, and will probably always differ in their views. We may observe the facts connected with its phenomena, note its distinctions, and speculate on its nature, but the laws which govern its Origin and Extinction are beyond the reach of Philosophy. Its *causation*, if not revealed, must ever remain hidden in the mind of the Creator—for Science holds no clue to guide her groping steps. Where Science ends, Faith begins.

Prof. J. D. Dana, in an Article as profound as it is original, which appeared in the November No., for 1857, of the "American Journal of Science and Arts," has established, in a conclusive manner, the existence of species as "essentially realities in nature." Reasoning from the general to the special, he shews that the true *type idea*, or notion of species, is not to be found in any one group, but in the *potential element* which lies at the basis of the existence of each individual of the group. He demonstrates that, in accordance with the universal law which governs all existence, and which pervades all na-

ture, this potential element must be a fixed and definite *unit*, capable of multiplication in the inorganic world, by combination of fixed equivalents, and in the organic world, by self-reproduction. Thus he proves that *permanency* is a necessary attribute of species, demanded by the harmony of the universal law of existence; and he also shews that *variation* from the normal type—whatever that may be—is demanded by the universal law of “mutual sympathy,” which determines all change of composition or decomposition, growth or decay. Hence he deduces, with great philosophical severity, the essential idea of a species, to be “a specific amount or condition of concentrated force, defined in the act or law of creation.”

This stringent formula is intended to embrace all the departments of nature; but while it expresses, with severe accuracy, the logical type idea of species, as a real existence, it by no means, as Prof. Dana admits, gives us a conception of the material *type* form. Though species is a reality, no type idea of it can be represented in any one material existence, nor be designated by any one example. Nor can we ascend, by induction, from a study of the individuals, to a correct conception of the type of the species,—inasmuch as “the variables,” as well as “the constants,” form an element of the type, and therefore the conception formed from the study of the individuals, is a conception only of its phases or modifications. Nevertheless, we may adopt this stringent formula as a safeguard against specious generalizations.

In applying it to the animal kingdom, we may construe it as meaning,—that specific degree and kind of vital organization necessary for the development of the individual under modifying circumstances, and which is defined by the act or law of its creation.

The above formula defines species in relation to its *essence*; but it is also desirable to consider it in relation to its manifestations of *form*, and to accompany the definition with some sure test, whereby to guide and correct our classification of individuals. Considered in this relation, we would define *Species* to be an *original organized form, specific in its kind and immutable in its fundamental characteristics, but capable of developing varieties under modifying circumstances. The in-*