

ing? Are you not trampling upon, not the inspiration only, but the veracity of the Holy Scriptures? Are you not representing the God of truth, speaking through the medium of his inspired servants, as uttering that which is not true? Let it be freely admitted that it is no part of the design of God, in giving a revelation of his moral will, to communicate lessons of physical philosophy; yet this does not involve the admission that, when the instruments of revelation advert to physical causes and operations, they should not speak according to *the reality* of things. A well informed and correct speaker, when he is talking freely about common affairs, and when nothing is farther from his mind than to be teaching history or geography, yet will not so express himself as to imply ignorance of historical or geographical facts. Surely we cannot think less of the inspired writers. "If Moses professes by divine inspiration to give an account of the manner in which the world was framed, he must describe the facts as they occurred."\* This may seem an unanswerable objection; but will it stand before a fair examination? I think not; for two reasons.

1. It is impossible to deny that the Scripture does use language, even concerning the highest and most awful of objects, God and his perfections and operations, which we dare not say is *literally true*, or that it is according to the reality of the things spoken of. I entreat renewed attention to the evidence which I have adduced. Will any man deny, that the Scripture, in places innumerable, particularly in the earlier books, speaks of God as having the bodily form and members of a man, and the mental and imperfect affections of men? Or will any say that such descriptions and allusions are properly true; that they

\* The excellent and amiable man, the late Rev. Richard Watson, in his *Theological Institutes*; Vol. I. p. 273.