

not escaped the errors of many other good men, with respect to the design of the Scriptures, and the proper method of interpreting them. It will be my duty, in future lectures, to show cause in reply to his views, upon the subject of the Deluge, and that of Biblical interpretation. At present I have only the pain of saying, that he follows in a style of assumption, less headstrong and vehement, but for that reason more touching to my mind and feelings, than that of another author, before referred to. He hesitates not to charge upon modern geologists, making no exceptions,—even designating them “our Bucklands, our Sedgwicks, and our Conybeares,”—that they are associating their efforts with those of infidels to invalidate the statements of Scripture,—impugning the sacred record,—and assailing the volume of the Great God. On the other hand, with equal boldness, he represents his own interpretations of Scripture as *unquestionable*; and so confident is he in the infallibility of his own deductions as to identify them with the Divine Veracity, and to think himself entitled to take for an analogy to his own reasonings, “Two and two may be five, more easily than the God of truth can be untrue.” He zealously affirms, but makes no attempt at proof, that it is exceedingly “offensive to the plain reader of the Scriptures,” —“not only contrary to the Scriptures but unphilosophical, to resort to such an idea as a series of creations on the same spot:” and he maintains that “our highest conception of creation” (evidently intending to imply that it is the proper conception) “is that of a world starting into being, perfect and complete, at the command of God: so perfect and complete that, from the lowest zoophyte to the highest species of living creature, not a single gap could be found into which another animal might be thrust.” He looks with evident complacency to the hypothesis