

But if he discover proofs, and those too, generally admitted by well instructed geologists, of both the stupendous events named above, or of a succession and diversity of such events, sufficient, on the whole, to mark the entire earth, by their appropriate effects; if then he finds a history of high antiquity, and generally revered wherever it is known, describing such a state of things as the condition of the planet reveals, what rule of science or of philosophy can debar him from bringing the two into comparison, for mutual illustration, as is always done in the case of other antiquities. Why should any one object to his applying the terms of the history, as he understands them, and then measuring the phenomena by them, and them by the phenomena. If they agree, surely, it is reasonable that conviction should receive augmented strength in his mind. Should they, however, disagree, the phenomena, if correctly observed and correctly reported, will still be true, and the credit of the history will, of course, be impaired. Should, moreover, the genuineness or authenticity of the history be disproved, from other sources than the phenomena, the latter will still remain in all the obstinacy of fact, which history may indeed illustrate, but cannot, on the contrary, disprove. If the history, on the other hand, be confirmed by the natural phenomena, it has then received the greatest confirmation possible, and may well exult in so powerful an ally.

Should it, in the case of the pentateuch, be proved even, that there was never any such person as Moses, or that the books that pass under his name were written by others, or that they are compilations of ancient and vague traditions, or even of reputed or real fables, this would not, in the least, affect the system of geological truth that has been erected by an ample course of investigation and induction. But, as long as the Mosaic history is admitted to be both *genuine* and *true*, any geologist who receives the history in that character, may, with strict historical and philosophical propriety, illustrate the history by geology, and compare geology with the history.

This he will do merely on the ground of historical and geological coincidence, and without drawing for the support of his scientific views upon any portion of his moral feeling, towards a work which, as an individual, he may revere as a communication from his Maker for purposes far more important than the establishment of physical truth.

To personal imputations on his motives, his science or his skill, or on those of eminent philosophers with whom he has the honor to think and to act, while he leaves the case, with the grand inquest of the learned, the candid and the wise, he will reply in no other manner than by ex-