

refer to what was advanced in Lect. V. upon the distribution of Drift, he will perhaps see reason to conclude that this operation cannot be assigned to an epoch later than what I venture to call the *Adamic Creation*; but, as it was of different ages, much of it must, in all probability, have preceded that date.

Let me entreat a thoughtful person to meditate on the succession, which we have thus rapidly and imperfectly reviewed.— Let him represent to himself a series of earthy materials, for the most part dried and consolidated into hard rock, proved by the plainest evidence of the senses to have been sediments from mixture in water; carrying in their texture and accompaniments the equally manifest proofs of quiet, gradual, and slow deposition; altered at different and long distant times, by forces urging from below, often and perhaps usually of very slow and gradual action, but frequently by the intrusion of melted rock driven up with tremendous violence; and that the united thickness of the whole cannot be less than five miles, but certainly, in extensive ranges, approaching to the double of that estimate. Let him ask, in each case, *whence* were those earthy materials derived? He will find, that they have been worn away from the surfaces of antecedent and now underlying rocks and dry land. Let him then reflect upon the time requisite for this repetition of operations so prodigious, producing a series of many terms, requiring intervals of both repose and action, to which it is difficult for the imagination to soar. And let him consider, whether he can conceive the possibility of those results having been effected, in less periods of duration than such as bid defiance to our poor chronology.

But, still it may be asked, Can you give no sensible idea whatever, to assist our conceptions? Is there nothing in nature that may serve as a standard of approximation? Is this vague language of magnitude and duration all that you can afford? Why then may we not compress the whole succession of stratifications, into a space of six or seven thousand years? At least you are bound to demonstrate that the lower numbers are inapplicable; that the position of the ordinary chronology is undoubtedly too short. Is there no plain fact that may measure some defined part of the series; and set at rest this part of the question, the negation of short time?

I will derive an answer from an assiduous, sagacious, and eminently qualified observer; a most extensive labourer in the field of practical Geology; and a zealous friend of revealed religion.

“ Let us contemplate *Time* as it relates to the CREATOR, not to ourselves: and we shall be no longer alarmed at that which the history of the earth demands.—Every stratum of rock is the work of time, often of far more than we choose to contemplate; while, from