

one's own convictions. Nay, some have attempted to reconcile this creation by law, not merely with theism, but with a belief in revelation. This is the form in which this hypothesis has clothed itself in our own day. In such a dress it has ventured forth from the philosopher's study, where it has so long been isolated, and become incorporated with the fashionable literature of the day. And it has enough of plausibility about it to make it popular with men who have only a general, but not a minute acquaintance with science, and who, afraid to live without some religious system, are yet unwilling to adopt one that brings God near. This is not the place to discuss such views. We will only say, that true philosophy must reject this hypothesis; first, because the facts adduced to sustain it, when scrutinized, are too few; and secondly, because for every fact seemingly in its favor, a thousand testify against it. Accordingly, all the great living and recently deceased masters of physical science reject it. Does it appeal to anatomy and physiology? Cuvier, Owen, and Carpenter cry out against it. Does it evoke the aid of chemistry? Berzelius, Turner and Liebig see its shallowness. Does it call on zoölogy for aid? Agassiz and Ehrenberg can refute its claims. Does it search the archives of geology for support? Sedgwick, Miller, Lyell, and D'Orbigny can show how certainly they will fail there. Or, finally, does it appeal to botany? Hooker and Lindley, Torrey, and Gray, know that it will certainly glean nothing to sustain it on that flowery field. The fact is, it is only here and there that a second-rate naturalist will sympathize at all with such dreamy views.

But there is another, and perhaps a more plausible mode of evading the general argument for the miraculous introduction of organic life upon our globe. When we descend into the rocks a certain distance, say six or eight miles, we reach