

This position continued to be taken by some as late as thirty years ago, and is found, for example, in the English edition of Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary, published in 1869. But the great majority early felt that this was not satisfactory. The length of time required to explain the geological changes might be undetermined, and perhaps undeterminable, but it was at least certain that a much longer period must be allowed than the few thousand years which have elapsed since man's appearance on the earth, plus six days. Man's appearance in nature occurs, not near the beginning, but at the very close of the geological ages.

2. The second method proposed was to insert a long period of time as left unmentioned between the first and second verses of the first chapter of Genesis, that is, between the original creation of the heavens with the earth and the state of chaos out of which the existing condition of things was brought into form. This period was left unmentioned as having no human interest, but during it the animals and plants now found in the rocks flourished and passed away. It was at length closed by a great catastrophe, which reduced everything on the earth to chaos, when a new order of things was introduced in connection with man, all brought about in six days as described in Genesis. This is the view substantially expounded by the distinguished Dr. Chalmers and widely held among his contemporaries.

Though I came across this view a few days ago in an anonymous pamphlet dated 1891, this in turn must be declared unsatisfactory, and is now almost entirely discarded. It allows, indeed, all the time necessary, however long a period may be called for by geology, but it lies open to other objections. It ignores the fact that the existing species of animals and plants are all very much older than man geologically. It supposes a universal convulsion of the earth's surface at a point of time immediately before man's appearance, for which there is abso-