

ma gine that one such human mind was in existence?— It would appear a prodigy: but that many, that all who fall under the former part of my description (for I know not of one exception) should be thus mighty to do the greater thing, which every logician knows to be the gaining of true premises, yet so wretchedly feeble to perform the easiest part of all, the perceiving what conclusion is contained in those premises!—This does indeed surpass belief!—

But the other part of the alternative is that, the men so qualified, with the evidence on the case spread before their eyes, are unwilling to announce that conclusion which dispassionate bystanders see to be the right one, and which they themselves were quite aware of, yea, probably had before maintained; that they have been seduced into a confederacy,—though many of them never saw each other,—to violate conscience, honour, and truth, to support an opinion which they know *is not* the fair deduction from the facts by themselves elicited; an opinion which they themselves had once disapproved,\* which

\* “When I first heard of the conclusions of Geology, I thought them very unsafe, for they opposed my conscientious interpretation of the Scripture-narrative; and I concluded (as was right and just, for I knew Scripture to be infallible, and I had never considered any other interpretation) that geological science was an ‘aberration.’ But, upon further scrutiny, I found its main conclusions impregnable. I then considered whether my interpretation was of necessity the right one; and I found, as many Scriptural Geologists have shown, that the sacred text might, without any violence, be differently interpreted, and that thus the supposed difficulties vanished. I was not reckless of consequences,—very far from it: but I saw that there might be bad consequences in two opposite ways; and I fear that some well-meaning and truly pious writers *are exposing* Scripture to one of them.” Letter of a Scriptural Geologist, in the Christian Observer, August, 1839, p. 473.

On the question, Whether these phenomena can “be comprised within the short period usually assigned to them?” the Rev. Samuel Charles Wilks long ago observed: “Buckland, Sedgwick, Faber, Chalmers, Conybeare, and many other Christian geologists, strove long with themselves