

and sublime theology. This latter he did not learn in Egypt, for it was in the possession of his ancestors while they were yet inhabitants of Canaan.

Shall we, then, conjecture that Moses borrowed theology from the Hebrews on the one hand, and geological science from the Egyptians on the other, to compound out of them that brief, but unique and perfect system of both, which is presented to us in the first chapter of Genesis ; or, is it possible that we could adopt any conjecture more absurd, and this, too, in utter destitution of all proof that the Egyptians possessed any knowledge of geology in the sense in which we use the term ?

The result of our inquiry is, that the geology of Moses has come down to us out of a period of remote antiquity before the light of human science arose ; for, to suppose that it was borrowed from, or possessed by any other people than the remarkable race to which Moses himself belonged, involves us on all hands in the most inextricable difficulties and palpable absurdities.* Of that race, it has been long since justly remarked, that while in religion they were men, in human learning and science they were children ; and if we find in their records any perfect system of an extensive and difficult science, we know they have not obtained it by the regular processes of observation and induction, which, in the hands of European philosophers, have led to a high degree of perfection in many sciences.

Let us now, then, inquire into the true value and necessary result of Baron Cuvier's statement, " that the cosmogony of Moses assigns to the epochs of creation precisely the same order as that which has been deduced from geological consideration."

Before we proceed to that detail and comparison of particulars which are necessary in the due prosecution of the inquiry, we purpose to shew that a right understanding of the terms employed by Moses,

* We believe that the opinion of Calmet may be maintained by very extensive and highly satisfactory internal evidence, that Moses, in the book of Genesis, has transmitted to us the successive writings of the earlier Patriarchs, just as the Prophets, who succeeded him, have transmitted to us that book and his own writings. We believe, likewise, with Bishop Gleig, that the opinion generally entertained of the late invention of alphabetical writing, is no other than a vulgar error, and that such writing must have been practised before the flood of Noah.

Sir William Jones, when he hazarded the conjecture, or rather opinion, that the language of Noah is probably entirely lost, must have quite overlooked the internal evidences, that the original language of Genesis can be no other than the language of both Noah and Adam. But these questions are too important and extensive to be more than thus briefly alluded to in a note.