

science, they regretted that the same discrimination and long study had not been given to the science of biblical interpretation before an exegesis of Genesis had been thrown out so confidently, which is contrary to the obvious sense and to the almost universal opinion of biblical writers. I speak not here of the truth or falsehood of the theory of this distinguished man, whose writings exhibit so much of the true spirit of religion, and who takes so noble a stand against the flippant scepticism of sciolists, but refer simply to this particular exegesis of Genesis.

“The advocates of identity of origin for all the several races of men, as springing from only one primitive pair,” says Professor Agassiz, “have no argument to urge in support of that position, but simply a vulgar prejudice, based on some few obscure passages of the Bible, which may after all be capable of a different interpretation.” “To suppose that all men originated from Adam and Eve, is to give to the Mosaic record a meaning that it was never intended to have.”

It is very probable that some may be ready to apply to me personally the exhortation, *Physician, heal thyself*. For some do regard me as having violated the rule which I am urging upon others, by advancing interpretations of Scripture which no sound biblical scholar can admit. On two points especially has this charge been made. I have advocated that exegesis of Genesis which permits the intercalation of a long and indefinite period between the beginning and the first demiurgic day; and, also, that exegesis of Peter, which makes him teach that this earth and its atmosphere, after being burned up and renovated, will become the new heavens and the new earth.

Now, were these interpretations original with myself, and now first proposed in opposition to the whole array of biblical