

precisely the same as that which has been deduced from geological considerations." We have been guilty of no improper mixing up of divine and human things. We have examined the meaning of the terms in the first chapter of Genesis, in consistency with the acknowledged rules of criticism, and only by the light contained within itself, or that thrown upon it by the other books, in the same language with which it is associated. The human science we have not extracted from any part of the Holy Scriptures; we have taken it simply as we find it in the works of eminent geologists. As the latter is not a *philosophia phantastica*, but a deeply interesting science, constructed by that method of careful observation and cautious induction, which Bacon was himself the first to recommend; so neither can the sense of the Scriptures present to us a *religio hæretica*. If our science, thus constructed, and our religion speak so obviously the same language, as we see they do on one important point, what else in the strictest application of Bacon's philosophy, can we deduce from the circumstance, but that both are certainly true?

It does not come under our present subject to discuss the historical and moral evidences of the divine revelation of the Scriptures; but both are so full, even to overflowing, and impose upon us so many insuperable difficulties, in the way of our being able to account for the quality and consistency of these remarkable books, excepting on the ground which has been all along assumed by themselves, that they are of more than human origin, that in estimating the accuracy of any part of the matters contained in them, the fastidiousness of human science appears to be carried to an unreasonable extent, not to take these evidences into calculation. In this country, where for a long period, we have had the scriptures in our hands as a popular book, they among us who have been the most eminent for human learning and science, and whose fame has been in every view the most unsullied, have been so convinced by the force of these evidences, that they have in general been the most strenuous defenders of revelation.

Will not human science, then, condescend to borrow some light to direct the steps of its own inquiries, from a record, the accuracy of which it has itself proved, and which is supported by other proofs of the highest order? Or,\* what should we say to the illustrator of the relics of Pompeii and Herculaneum, who should reject the light

---

\* The other part of this argument, we attempted to illustrate, in the first pages of the present discussion.—*Ed.*