

sumption which would fain prove the truth of Scripture by physical evidence, or the weakness that would found a system of natural philosophy on the inspired record." Nothing is more unwarrantable than attempts to identify theories in science with particular interpretations of the sacred text; and the caution of Lord Bacon, uttered a century and a half before geology even had a name, cannot be too often repeated. "Let no man," said he, "upon a weak conceit of sobriety, or an ill-applied moderation, think or maintain that a man can search too far, or be too well studied in the book of God's word, or the book of God's works—divinity or philosophy: but rather let men endeavour an endless progress or proficiency in both; only let them beware that they apply both to charity and not to arrogance—to use and not to ostentation; and again, *that they do not unwisely mingle or confound these learnings together.*" So deeply impressed have I been with the necessity of strictly obeying this admonition, that in all my written or oral discussions on geology I have, on this subject, invariably confined myself to a statement of the opinions of several eminent philosophers and divines, in the hope that the example of men, alike distinguished for their piety and learning, cultivating with ardour this fascinating department of natural science, and stating their conviction of its high importance and beneficial influence upon the mind, would be a sufficient and direct reply to the absurd