

which" geologists "now estimate sixty thousand, or six hundred thousand, to be necessary?"* The querist was evidently not aware of the want of analogy in his cases. We know that great mineralogical changes may be wrought in a very short time, by the chemical and electric forces which are in constant action: metallic compounds may be produced and veins formed, crystals made to shoot, and lamination or even stratification effected upon a small scale. Let us grant the extension of these effects as largely as can be desired, notwithstanding the insuperable objections which lie in our way: the concession will not benefit the argument. The question is not with regard to mineralogical deposits and formations, as such; but to the remains of once living beings inbedded in them. It is manifest that the worthy author possesses only crude and defective notions upon this subject. He is evidently not acquainted with the *characterism* which

* "I once showed to a reader of this cast a solid, lofty, inland rock, composed of one vast mass of shells, often very delicate and brittle, agglutinated with interstitial matter; and asked him whether he thought that these enormous depositions were attributable to the deluge, or were formed during its short duration; and also, whether the various successions of strata, ten miles thick, teeming with the remains of animals and vegetables, from the most complicated in the upper strata down to the most simple in the lower—all arranged in order; now a layer of salt water formation, then one above it of fresh, and then another of sea, and so on in succession,—had really been deposited thus in fifteen hundred years before the deluge. His reply was to the following effect.—'How do I know but that in those early days the powers of nature were so prolific, or rather that there was so constant a miracle, that this rock, which would require an enormous period to grow by ordinary accretion, might be generated in a day; each plant and animal going through all its stages of life and death in the fraction of a moment, if necessary to produce the effect?' But why should it be necessary? Or, what 'effect' did my friend mean, except the support of a popular interpretation? I almost believe, that if my friend had been pressed with an argument from Euclid, he would have replied, 'But how do we know that antediluvian circles or angles were like ours?'" A Scriptural Geologist; in the Christian Observer, April, 1839, p. 212.