

give some sign of assurance, that the act of devotion was accepted; and that the stream of his goodness should now flow uninterruptedly to man, notwithstanding the abounding of sin which would anew take place. The entire transaction must have been of the most impressive character to the favoured family; and to us and all men, it is full of instruction. Yet observe the childlike simplicity and the boldly figurative language in which it is related. "Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings upon the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet odour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; although the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I smite any more every living thing as I have done."*

Such was the manner in which the earliest Scriptures depicted to men the perfections and the operations of the Infinite Being, his dominion and authority, his justice and his mercy. Was it not most touching and impressive? Was it not well adapted to the mental capacities and the susceptibility of strong affections, which characterized men in a state of rude simplicity? Would a style more chastised, more coldly correct, more philosophical, more theological, (if we please so to call it,) have been better fitted to answer the ends of religious instruction?—*Better* adapted?—would it have been adapted *at all*?—Let us elevate its beneficial effect the most that we reasonably can; still, it would have been cold, unattractive, and with difficulty comprehended. Try the experiment upon our peasantry, or even the best educated children of our own families. The style of a Moral Philosophy school would arouse no attention, would leave scarcely

* Gen. viii. 20, 21.