

how possible it is for man to feel a deep conviction of the natural depravity of his heart, at the time that he has sublime and philosophic views of those moral and intellectual capacities he derives from God.

In conclusion, I may briefly notice an hypothesis, put forth, perhaps, in the hope of reconciling conflicting notions*. It assumes that we have no knowledge of God or his attributes from the light of nature: but when this knowledge has been given by revelation, it presumes that we can *then begin* to reason from natural phenomena, and confirm the truths of religion *by almost irresistible arguments, which may be deduced from every object around us*. Now this hypothesis labours, if I mistake not, under three insuperable difficulties. It has to explain away some of the clearest passages in the New Testament—it has to fight for a most untenable position: namely, that the heathen world knew nothing of God, except what first came through a corrupted tradition—And, lastly, it puts man in a new logical condition unsupported by any rational analogy. The inductions of natural religion are of a positive nature, and must be either true or false. If they be false, they cannot confirm what is true—If they be irresistibly true, then must their truth

authorities; as that would have been but a vain and false affectation of research. But it would have been well to have fortified my feeble argument with some passages from the immortal works of Hall: and I cannot do better now, than refer the academic reader to them—especially to his two discourses entitled *Modern Infidelity considered*, and *Sentiments proper to the present Crisis*. In them both there is something of an academic cast; and for moral grandeur, for christian truth, and for sublimity, we may doubt whether they have their match in the sacred oratory of any age or country.

* See the *Boyle Lecture*, Vol. II. by the Lord Bishop of Durham.