

that we find growing on *only* the land. It is contrary to all experience, and all testimony too, that the one passed into the other, and so I cannot believe it; but I do and must believe, instead, — for it is not contrary to experience, and much according to testimony, — that the Author of all created both land productions and sea productions at the ‘times before appointed,’ and ‘determined the bounds of their habitation.’ ‘By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God;’ and I find I can be a believer on God’s terms at a much less expense of credulity than an infidel on yours.”

But in this form at least it can be scarce necessary that the argument should be prolonged.

The geological phenomena, I repeat, even had the author of the “Vestiges” been consulted in their arrangement, and permitted to determine their sequence, would fail to furnish a single presumption in favor of the development hypothesis. Does the ditch-side of my illustration furnish it with a single favoring presumption? The arrangement and sequence of the various organisms are complete in both the zoological and phytological branch. The flag and reed succeed the fucoid; the fir and juniper succeed the flag and reed; and the hazel, birch, and oak succeed the fir and juniper. In like manner, and with equal regularity, zoophytes, the radiata, the articulata, mollusca, fishes, reptiles, birds, and mammals, are ranged, the superior in succession over the inferior classes, in the true ascending order; and yet we at once see that the evidence of the ditch-side, amounting in the aggregate to no more than this, that the remains of the higher lie over those of the lower organisms, gives not a shadow of support to the hypothesis that the lower produced the higher. For, according to the honest farmer, the fact that any one thing is