

I do cherish much hope that, had Professor Powell more carefully and completely examined the case, he would have found this principle which indeed he definitely lays down, quite sufficient for obviating all the difficulty; without having recourse to admissions which cannot but be revolting to the calm judgment of any man; as well as to the enlightened piety of a reflecting Christian. We, equally with him, admit the folly of “constructing systems of philosophy out of the Bible,—of attempting to force its language into accordance with philosophical results,”—or of supposing that the senses or applications which, by some engineering of verbal criticism, we might maintain that the words could be made to bear, were actually in the understanding and intention of Moses, or of any other inspired writer;—or of “imagining that the delivery of the Judaical law was really *intended* to embrace the doctrines of Geology, and this too under the guise of expressions which, in their obvious sense, are directly contradictory to those doctrines;”—or, in a word, of “saying something plausible to satisfy prejudice, and avoid giving offence to popular belief.”* Some persons indeed have been, and are, who have held notions like these, and have pursued some such fallacious course as is here reprobated. We cannot shield them from the Reverend Professor’s censure. We repudiate all such devices. But it is not necessary for us to go into the opposite extreme, and affirm that the language of revelation, when stripped of the conventional forms of description which were necessary in that state of mind and habits which characterized the people and the age, is *irreconcilably* and *insuperably* contradictory to the truth of facts in nature. The rash and harsh language of Mr. Powell has betrayed him into great inconsistency with

* Expressions of Prof. Powell.