

a man to whom the world was indebted for some excellent contributions to science, Baron CUVIER, (of whose participation in this theory, however, the Doctor did not speak with certainty), also Professor JAMIESON, and since then the Earl of Ross and Mr. SILLIMAN. The position taken up by this class of expositors was, that the term day, as employed in the sacred narrative, was to be understood of an epoch of indeterminable length, leaving as much time for any operation as it might require. They went further, and supposed an exact correspondence between the several successive geological periods and the narrative of the six days' creation. It may be remarked concerning this theory,

1. That more accurate investigation has fully proved, that, however plausible it appears, no such correspondence actually exists. A discrepancy occurs in the details of the theory with the facts of geology. It supposes that vegetable formations were the first of organic remains, which is now quite exploded, and scarcely any are found now to adhere to this notion.

2. Admitting this wide acceptance of the term day, the principle of which is unquestionably just; e. g., a day of vengeance, day of life, day of mercy, etc., yet it will appear that the context invariably determines its figurative or literal application.

Regard must also be had to the sense in which the writer himself uses a particular word. The early part of the book of Genesis consists apparently of several distinct compositions, one closing with the 3rd verse chap. ii. And there is much probability that that the whole was not originally composed by Moses, but that a part was in the possession of AMRAM his father, as a family memorial. Such a view of the case, instead of weakening, rather confirms its credibility, as the reference LUKE makes to the testimony of "eye-witnesses" in no way detracts from the character of his narrative as a veracious and inspired record. And if between this and the statements of another writer an apparent discrepancy exists (in some instances from a different sense put upon the same word), their credibility is rather strengthened, as in the case of the witnesses in court who give substantially the same evidence without a verbal coincidence. Thus in the separate narrative before us, which commences with the 4th verse of chap. ii. (the term *generation* meaning a history), the word "day" is not, as in the former narrative, a simple noun, but a compound, in which a preposition answerable to *when*, is included; and refers to the whole period of the creation.

3. It is manifest on the face of the document, that it is to be taken in its ordinary sense. It is not a poem but a simple narrative, into which the introduction of a figurative phraseology would be in bad taste.

4. If there were no other argument against this "device," the fact that it requires such an unwarrantable extension of the power of figurative phraseology, such a monstrous hyperbole, would be sufficient to discredit it. To this may be added the difficulty presented by the peculiar character of the seventh day, which was set apart and consecrated to an especial service. There is, however, a clergyman (and I hope he is singular in his notion), who gravely suggests that the day or Sabbath is not finished. (A laugh.)

5. A more plausible theory, and one supported by many excellent and sensible men, geologists of the parlour and the study, not of the mountain and the field; viz., that, taking the Mosaic record of six natural days as the term of creation, all the phenomena of the earth's crust are resolvable into changes which have occurred between the creation and the deluge, together with the results of that catastrophe and subsequent accumulations of an alluvial character.

The period elapsing before the flood, has been variously calculated. The Hebrew Pentateuch gives it as 1656 years; the Septuagint, 2262; the archæology of JOSEPHUS, 3155. Taking the last as the rule, it would be found to fall immeasurably short of the requisite time for formations such as these.

1. It deserves to be noticed, that the geological facts for which these gentlemen endeavour to account, are not of their own discovery, but are supplied by the very men whose judgment of their causes is treated with contempt:—men whose profound knowledge of the auxiliary sciences of chemistry, natural history, mechanical forces, etc., eminently qualified them for that practical and personal attention to the subject, which they did not fail, at the sacrifice of personal ease, and often of advantage, to give;—men whose prepossessions were all in favour of hypotheses they are now compelled to reject. What are we to think of the logic which supposes them so mighty to do the greater and so feeble to do the less, that transfers all the power of induction to the hands of men incompetent to furnish the data? Or, that they were unwilling to own that which they knew—that a confederacy of men in distant parts of the world, who never saw each other, should be formed for violating the truth—that some of these should consist of ministers of the Gospel. Such a supposition involves an amount of deliberate baseness, of which the world will hardly furnish a parallel!

2. There is no difficult task to perform. One of this class takes up an alluring book—perhaps LYELL'S Principles of Geology; from this he selects a number of facts, which strike him as most extraordinary and deserving reprobation; which, not having patience carefully to examine in conjunction with all the arguments and details by which they are supported, he runs no small risk of

failing to understand. By omitting a considerable portion, he vitiates the whole body of evidence, and comes out with the discovery of a prodigious discrepancy, not suspecting that it arises from the fragmental character of his investigations. He favours the world with it! And he is surprised and grieved to find that geologists do not adopt it. And this is the true history of many a book on Geology. It is with reluctance and pain that I mention names. GRANVILLE PENN makes no scruple of dealing with Scripture in the most arbitrary manner to support a favourite hypothesis, relative to the ancient strata being the deposits of antediluvian seas. He rejects the topography of the Garden of Eden, and treats it as an interpolation. Mr. FAIRHOLM exercises great ability, and is well versed in more recent natural history, but is unacquainted with the facts of geology. Mr. KIRBY, in his Bridgewater Treatise, has wandered out of his field, and presented his readers with some of the wildest speculations that ever entered the brain of man. He, however, generously relieves our feelings by acknowledging that he does not understand geology!

FAIRHOLM, in an extremely sarcastic and dogmatical tone, supports his theories from certain views expressed by Dr. BUCKLAND, in his *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, which he afterwards wholly retracts. Yet Mr. FAIRHOLM publishes his sentiments, as though they were identical with those which he still maintains, taking no notice whatever of his retraction!

Here the Rev. Dr. read an extract from "Historical and Geological Deluges Compared," by Professor HITCHCOCK, of Amherst College, whom he designated not only as a deep student, but as an eminent practical geologist and a man of genuine piety, confirmatory of his own opinions of the treatises of GRANVILLE PENN, Mr. FAIRHOLM, Mr. KIRBY, etc.

The Rev. gentleman then adverted to a publication of the Rev. Prebendary GIBBORNE, on whose temper and ability he pronounced a high eulogium, but whom he designated as very imperfectly acquainted with his subject, etc. The inconsequent reasoning into which this excellent man had unwittingly fallen, is exposed with severe sarcasm, by one of his own brethren, Professor POWELL, who remarks, that "this is not an age in which the dignitaries of the Church should array themselves in hostility to science." Not deterred, however, by this warning, the Dean of CORK, in a few loose pages, in which his almost incredible ignorance of the most obvious facts keeps pace only with his want of common courtesy, boasts of overturning the positions of Dr. BUCKLAND. It is much to be wished that Dr. BUCKLAND would refute the whole *genus*. SHARON TURNER, in the first part of his excellent book, entitled "Sacred History of the World," has some remarks on geology, which, arising from that pleasant, easy, parlour study, to which reference has been made, cannot conduct to safe conclusions. Dr. YOUNG, of Whitby, Mr. RYE, and an anonymous writer who subscribes himself BIBLICUS, must all be classed in the general description already given. Disagreeing as they do in many particulars, they agree in giving garbled statements of the opinions of geologists, in suppressing important portions of their testimony, and in overlooking the equity of argument: not all, however, to an equal extent, and often with the accompaniment of upright intention.

A great contrast to these is furnished in "LYELL'S Principles," which, without pronouncing it faultless, he might affirm to be distinguished by fairness and perspicuity. It is to be regretted he takes so slight a notice of the bearings of his statements on the records of Scripture: he thereby lays himself open to severe animadversions. Some of these speculators affirm that the strata of gneiss and mica schist were formed in *one day!* The testimony of Dr. McCULLOCH (whose treatise on the Divine Attributes is a rich philosophical and theological treasure), remarks, that the formation of these and some other strata must have been an inconceivably slow process.

The Rev. Dr. concluded his lecture with an interesting extract from the present number of the *Christian Observer*, which describes these opponents as a class of people on whom evidence makes no impression. The geologist asks to be heard, and is denied—he is put down, while the infidel stands by and witnesses the proceedings of this Protestant inquisition.

From Dewey's Travels.

JUSTICE IN TURKEY.—As M. Msara finished his explanation, we saw the Cadi on duty. He goes out in the morning without making known his intended route; takes his walk with suitable attendants, and stops at the first bazaar. He seats himself at random in one of the shops, and examines the weights, measures and merchandises. He lends an ear to all complaints, interrogates any merchant accused of infraction of law, and then, without court or jury, and especially without delay, pronounces judgment, applies the penalty, and goes on in quest of other delinquents. In these cases, however, the punishment is of a different character. Notwithstanding the identity of the crime, he cannot treat the offending merchant as a common thief, that would have a prejudicial effect on commerce. The penalty is graduated thus: the mildest, confiscation; the moderate, closing the shop; the severest, exposure. This last is inflicted in a singular manner.—The culprit is placed with his back against his

shop, and is compelled to raise himself on his toes until the weight to his whole body rests on them; his ear is then nailed to the door or shutter of his shop. This punishment lasts two, four, or six hours. It is true, the criminal may abridge its duration, whenever he chooses to let himself down; but the Turkish merchant is jealous of his reputation, and nothing but the last necessity would induce him to resemble a thief by the mutilation of his ears.

I stopped in front of one of these wretches, who had just been nailed up. I was disposed to compassionate his case, but Mohammed told me he was an *habitué*, and that if I would observe his ear closely, I should find it was like a cullender. This changed the current of my sympathies, and, as he was to remain some time longer, I ceased to regret his sufferings, and rejoiced in the opportunity of making a sketch. I drew forth crayons and paper, and begged the rest to continue their route with M. Msara, leaving Mohammed to assist me in any embarrassment. But Mayer would not quit me; so we three remained and the others proceeded on their way.

My picture was composed: the criminal nailed by his ear, was standing stiff and motionless on the extreme points of his great toes; and seated near him, on the sill of the door, was the guard charged with seeing the punishment duly executed, smoking a pipe. The quantity of tobacco in the pipe seemed to be graduated to the time that the punishment was to continue. Around these two personages was a demi-circle of idlers. We took our places at one side, and I commenced my task.

After a time, the culprit, finding he had nothing to expect from the crowd—among whom, perhaps, he recognized some of his customers—hazarded a word to the guard.

"Brother," said he, "one law of our holy Prophet is, that men should help one another."

The guard seemed to take no exception to this precept in the abstract, and continued quietly to smoke.

"Brother," resumed the patient, "did you not hear me?"

The guard made no other reply than a large puff of smoke that ascended to his neighbour's nose.

"Brother," still persisted the man, "one of us can aid the other, and do a thing acceptable to Mahomet."

The puffs of smoke succeeded each other with a regularity that extinguished the poor fellow's hopes.

"Brother," cried the despondent, with a do'orous voice, "put a stone under my heels, and I will give you a piastre."

No reply.

"Two piastres."

A pause.

"Three piastres."

Smoke.

"Four piastres."

"Ten piastres," said the guard quickly.

The ear and the purse of the man held a parley which was visible in the countenance. At length the pain conquered, and the ten piastres rolled to the feet of the guard, who counted them with great deliberation, put them in his purse, rested his pipe against the wall, and picking up a pebble about as large as the egg of a tom tit, placed it under the man's heels.

"Brother," said the culprit, "I feel nothing under my feet."

"A stone is there, however," answered the guard, resuming his seat and pipe, "but it is true, I selected it in reference to your price. Give me a tatar (five francs) and I will place a stone under you so appropriate to your necessities, that you shall sigh for it when you reach paradise."

The result may be anticipated, the guard had his money, and the merchant his stone. How the affair terminated thereafter I do not know. My drawing was completed in half an hour, and we proceeded on our walk.

YOUNG WIVES.—A writer in Queen Anne's day, speaking of young brides, says it is usual with young wives before they have been many weeks married, to assume a confident look and manner of talking; as if they intended to signify, in all companies, that they were no longer girls, and consequently, that their whole demeanour, before they got a husband, was all but a constraint upon their nature, whereas, I suppose, if the votes of wise men were gathered, a very great majority would be in favour of those ladies, who, after they were entered into that holy state, rather chose to double their portion of modesty and reservedness. Avoid the least degree of fondness for your husband before any witness whatever, even before your nearest relations, or the very maids of your chamber. This proceeding is so exceedingly odious and disgusting to all who have either good breeding or good sense, that they assign two every unamiable reasons for it; the one is gross hypocrisy, the other has too bad a name to be mentioned. Conceal your esteem and love in your own breast, and reserve your kind looks and language for private hours, which are so many in the four-and-twenty.

SOCIETY.—No one living thing in society can be independent. The world is like a watch-dog, which fawns on you or tears you to pieces.