

irreverent naturalist ought surely to have remembered, that the sum total of all the animals cannot be different in its nature from the various sums of which it is an aggregate, — seeing that *no* summation ever differs in *quality* from the items summed up, which compose it, — and that, though it may amount in this case to man *the animal*, — to man, as he may be weighed, and measured, and subjected to the dissecting knife, — it cannot possibly amount to God. Is God merely a sum total of birds and beasts, reptiles and fishes ; — a mere Egyptian deity, composed of fantastic hieroglyphics derived from the forms of the brute creation ? The impieties of the transcendentalist may, however, serve to illustrate that mode of seizing on terms which, as the most sacred in the message of revelation, have been long coupled in the popular mind with saving truths, and forcibly compelling them to bear some visionary and illusive meaning, wholly foreign to that with which they were originally invested, which has become so remarkable a part of the policy of modern infidelity. Rationalism has learned to sacrifice to Deity with a certain measure of conformity to the required pattern ; but it is a conformity in appearance only, not in reality : the sacrifice always resembles that of Prometheus of old, who presented to Jupiter what, though it seemed to be an ox without blemish, was merely an ox-skin stuffed full of bones and garbage.

There is another very remarkable class of facts in geological history, which appear to fall as legitimately within the scope of argument founded on final causes, as those which bear on the appearance of man at his proper era. The period of the mammiferous quadrupeds seems, like the succeeding human period, to have been determined, as I have said, by the earth's fitness at the time as a place of habitation for creatures so