

(and whether this may be rightly done is a question only of criticism and not of philosophy)—and secondly, by endeavouring to shew, that, under this new interpretation of its words, the narrative of Moses may be supposed to comprehend, and to describe in order, the successive epochs of Geology. It is to be feared that truth may, in this way, receive a double injury; and I am certain that the argument, just alluded to, has been unsuccessful. The impossibility of the task was however (as I know by my own experience) a lesson hard to learn: but it is not likely again to be attempted by any good Geologist. The only way to escape from all difficulties pressing on the question of cosmogony has been already pointed out. We must consider the old strata of the earth as monuments of a date long anterior to the existence of man, and to the times contemplated in the moral records of his creation. In this view there is no collision between physical and moral truth. The Bible is left to rest on its appropriate evidences, and its interpretation is committed to the learning and good sense of the critic and the commentator: while Geology is allowed to stand on its own basis, and the philosopher to follow the investigations of physical truth, wherever they may lead him, without any dread of evil consequences; and with the sure conviction that natural science, when pursued with a right spirit, will foster the reasoning powers, and teach us knowledge fitted, at once, to impress the imagination, to bear on the business of life, and to give us exalted views of the universal presence and unceasing power of God.

The subjects discussed in this note are of great importance; and I am anxious to take away any