

against the *principle* of supporting the credibility of the sacred Scriptures on any unascertained interpretation of physical phenomena. Such a support appears to be imprudent, as well as unnecessary: unnecessary, because the moral evidence of the credibility of the Scriptures is of itself fully sufficient; imprudent, because we have the strong ground of antecedent analogy, not only in another but in this very branch of knowledge, for anticipating a period in the progress of science, when particular phenomena may be interpreted in a very different manner from that in which they are interpreted at present. Thus the explanation of the motions of our solar system, which is now admitted very generally, without any fear of weakening the authority of Scripture, was once as generally impugned on the principle of that very fear. Time was also, and indeed within the last century, when the shells and other organic remains, which are imbedded in the chalk and other solid strata, were considered to be the remains and proofs of the Mosaic deluge; and yet at the present day, without any fear of injuring the credibility of the Scriptures, they are admitted very generally to have been deposited anteriorly to the Mosaic deluge. And who will venture to say, in the infancy of a science like geology, that the same change of opinion may not happen with respect to the organic remains of the gravel beds and caverns.