

of Geology will for a moment question. Though not *professedly* becoming the champion for Christianity—though rather declining such an attempt—Mr Dawson has accomplished so well the great end, which he denies us being the sole purpose of his work, that we cannot regard the admirable harmony displayed by *Archæia* as existing between the Bible and nature, as a more incidental thing; but rather impute the non-intervention statement of the author as resulting from his modesty. The reader, however, will have no fears in pronouncing a verdict—even should the author hesitate.

The work is of its *kind*, perfect—and actualizes the requirements of that class of readers who wished to see this subject dealt with by one combining the qualifications of a firm belief in Christianity, an extensive acquaintance with Hebrew literature, with a profound knowledge of the present state of the geological question. Such a want *Archæia* has supplied.

It is not possible to condense the geological controversy within very small compass—but it is here needful to advert to the subject by way of explanation, before proceeding to the analysis of the work before us. The Eternal Son of the Father from the deep eternity of his being, had spoken to man. He demanded a universal and unquestioning faith in his revelations. That faith the Infidel refused. On being interrogated as to his reasons—the reply was at hand—“The so-called divine teacher has committed himself hopelessly to statements made by Moses, with whose false cosmogony the science of the earth has made us acquainted. Moses and Jesus stand or fall together? The Christian confesses that the Great Teacher *has* committed himself to the Mosaic cosmogony—but asks—and has Moses committed himself to false statements? He puts the question fearfully and anxiously.

“Without question,” answers the scientific infidel. “The unequivocal testimony of the fossiliferous deposits nullifies the crude assertion of Moses that in six days God made the heavens and the earth.”

There exists no doubt that, perplexed by so sounding an assertion, the Christian was silenced, though not convinced—whilst a momentary semblance of triumph was enjoyed by the infidel. Then followed the discoveries of the Huttons and Cuviers—discoveries made irrespective of the controversy, but apparently inimical to the christian view of the question: myriads of shells, vegetable organisms—nay, whole animals were exhumed from the depths—and the infidel cried to the still more perplexed believer in Revelation—“is not this array of proof incontestable!” In such a dilemma Christian divines were called upon for an explanation. They could not refuse offering their different solutions—as the orthodox creed appeared for the time to depend upon the controversy. But how different their replies. Some repudiated the evidence of the collected *phenomena*—and asserted these to be unsubstantial and delusive. And we all remember the shout of wonder with which Chalmers's celebrated solution was received—*between the Berashith (beginning) and the creation of organisms many ages may have elapsed*. Then appeared Richard Watson's “Institutes”; admittedly great as a theologian and reasoner, even he staggered under this question, and for the first and last time, writes as if he were at sea without a compass below or a star above. He repudiated the various theories then existing, excepting those which were *pruned* down and *mude* to agree with the scriptural cosmogony, but which nevertheless were manifestly artificial and unnatural. Daubison's scheme he regarded as extravagant and impossible. “No system of Geology” quotes Watson from Granville Penn—“can be founded in true philosophy unless the principle of Newton be the *basis*, and the narrative of Moses, the *working plan*.” This was to actually reject the phenomena presented for examination, by asserting *a priori* “I know the received views of the Mosaic cosmogony to be correct”—a line of argument, which though it is said is employed by Father Cullen when dealing with Galileo's scheme, is utterly unworthy of a christian and philosopher. Why then did such great thinkers as Dr Chalmers resort to it? The answer is easy—simply because they had no *better* mode of discussion. We do not think Chalmers altogether ingenuous: he admitted so much of the assembled phenomena as formed the web and woof of his solution, and reflected the residue. In

this doing, he committed himself to the new school without extricating the christian view of the question from its obscurity. More cautious and logical, Mr Watson does *not* commit himself in any wise. He rather says—“I receive no geological theory as established—and I make no concessions in their favor. I regard the Mosaic narrative as literally and simply true—and I rather resort to the belief of the creation of fossils *in situ*, than admit the existence of pro-adamite organisms—if extending beyond the sixth day backward. I know nothing of the slow deposits of ages—and the geologist knows nothing of first formations. God who made the first man perfect, without the preceding stages of childhood and youth, may have created the world as it is—organisms and all—in six days. We know nothing of the laws of rock-making—who then can assert with confidence that laws *now* in operation acted during the six days of creation?—I wait for a reply.” The reply has since been given. He would be no friend of the Bible, who at this day, would deny the operation of agencies, which ascertainedly began at the dawn of the Permian day and still continue to influence our planet. *Logically* Mr Watson may be right—but his argument is *a priori*—God could have thus created. The geologist's argument is *a posteriori*—God *has* thus created. One thing may be said of the former—it was the best that divine ever gave. It conceded nothing: it defended all: but as might have been expected, it failed to satisfy any mind which had been equally impressed by the Mosaic writing and the unarranged phenomena of Geology.

In this condition do we find the science, when suddenly a new school of interpreters appears; and presents claims on the public attention of no mean order. Of this school, Hugh Miller and the Author of *Archæia* stand forth assuredly the proper representatives. It may be asked—why not name Lyall, or Agassiz, or Hitchcock. We reply because the two first lack the moral courage to attempt the elucidation of the reconciliation scheme, and are therefore *not* proper specimens of the class described and the last has not yet arrived at a fixed theory; but vibrates between the accommodation scheme of Chalmers and the system, hewn in outline by Miller, and rounded and elaborated by the Author of *Archæia*.

We said that it remained for us to show whether Mr Dawson, standing on the outermost circle of Miller's “Two Records,” had made *that* point the centre of another circle, which *last* embraced the skord of regions untraversed and unknown? We think he has not done this. A wonderful collector of facts and principles is Mr D.—a profound analyst—a patient and accurate thinker, when he has before his eye the assembled phenomena of which he treats—but a theorizer Mr Dawson is *not*. Whether he has declined advancing a theory, lest he should compromise his Geological reputation, or whether he is content with an existing system to which he is partially committed, does not appear. He follows Hugh Miller with a torch—and wherever the giant hand of the latter shattered a rock to pieces at a blow, and then proceeded onward to other discoveries, Mr D. has paused, and collecting the fragments has turned upon them the light of his investigations. But let it not be from hence inferred that Mr D. is but a satellite revolving in the light of a superior orb. On the contrary we should greatly err to regard him as a second rate geologist—or, in his own way, any wise inferior, even to Miller. In fact the latter could not have done Dawson's work. The knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures—the acuteness of a mind, deficient, indeed, in imagination, but presenting a mirror surface to facts, and powerful in analysis—the unwearied energies of a thinker whose enthusiasm for his study carries him, by *induction* as high as *imagination* ever soared—unite to constitute Mr Dawson that which Hugh Miller—“Scotland's greatest man, says Walter Scott,” though he be—could not have become, unless new-modelled and re-created. Greater in *strength* of intellect—vividness of imagination—and poetical intuitions—the author of the “Old Red Sandstone” certainly was—but we draw the comparison no further—suffice that we regard Mr Dawson as inferior to no living geologist.

In *Archæia* we find eighteen chapters, with an appendix—and which might have been expanded into eighteen chapters more, and the interest still retained. The first chapter is intro-