

as little scientifically true as the parables of our Saviour or of Nathan the seer are historically so. Now, I cannot think that the anti-geologists are quite in the place in which they either ought or intend to be when engaged virtually in making common cause with either of these latter classes.*

Be this as it may, however, it may be not uninteresting, and perhaps not wholly unamusing, to examine what the claims really are of some of our later anti-geologists to be recognised as the legitimate and qualified censors of geologic fact or inference. It will be seen, that in the passage which I have quoted from Turretine, the theologian, in three of his five divisions, restricts himself to the theologic province, and that when in his own proper sphere even his errors are respectable; but that in the two concluding divisions he passes into the province of the natural philosopher, and that there his respectability ceases for the time, and he becomes eminently ridiculous. The anti-geologists,—men of considerably smaller calibre than the massive Swiss divine of the seventeenth century,—also enter into a field not their own. Passing from the theologic province, they obtrude into that of

* The very different terms which Mr Powell employs in characterizing the anti-geologists, from those which he makes use of in denouncing the men honestly bent on reconciling the enunciations of revelation with the findings of geologic science,—a class which included in the past divines such as Chalmers, Buckland, and Pye Smith, and comprises divines such as Hitchcock and the Archbishop of Canterbury now,—is worthy of being noted. In two sermons, "Christianity without Judaism," written by this clergyman of the Church of England, to show that all days of the week are alike, and the Christian Sabbath a mere blunder, I find the following passage:—"Some divines have consistently rejected all geology and all science as profane and carnal; and some even, when pretending to call themselves men of science, have stooped to the miserable policy of tampering with the truth, investing the real facts in false disguises, to cringe to the prejudices of the many, and to pervert science into a seeming accordance with popular prepossessions." I cannot believe that this will be regarded as justifiable language; it seems scarce worthy of a man of science; and will, I fear, only be accepted as good in evidence that the *odium theologicum* is not restricted to what is termed the orthodox side of the Church.