

ever distance, must follow in the same course, and the various points in debate must be freely and generally canvassed, till good information shall have set public solicitude at rest.

It will not be denied, I think, that Geology has been hitherto regarded with coldness and

third verse. . . . This is no new theory. It was held by Justin Martyr, Basil, Origen, Theodoret, and Augustine—men who came to such a conclusion without any bias, and who certainly were not driven to it by any geological difficulties.' (*Biblical Cyclopædia, Art. Creation.*) Professor Hitchcock, who has given great attention to the history of this subject, declares that he is not aware of any new theories of exegesis having been originated by geologists.—(*See Student's Cab. Lib., Vol. IV., p. 24.*) Certain it is, however, that the views indicated above were not current in this country till of late years; and that Dr. Chalmers had great merit in giving them distinctness, and even originality of exhibition, and in gaining attention and favour for them by his eloquent writings. In the highly interesting memoirs of him, by his son-in-law, the Rev. Dr. Hanna, it is said: 'The merit, I believe, belongs to Mr. Chalmers, of having been the first clergyman in this country who, yielding to the evidence in favour of a much higher antiquity being assigned to the earth than had previously been conceived, suggested the manner in which such a scientific faith could be harmonised with the Mosaic narrative, and who, even in the dreaded investigations of the geologist, discerned and indicated fresh "footprints of the Creator." So early as 1804 he had arrived at the conviction that "the writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe. If they fix anything at all, it is only the antiquity of the species."'—*Memoirs*, vol. i., p. 386.