their favor than because I fear that they will ultimately be of much injury to religion; especially so long as such works as Whewell's indications of the Creator are within the reach of the scholar.

The religious bearings of geology alone remain to be noticed. And no science, except perhaps astronomy, has excited so much alarm as this for its supposed irreligious tendencies. But so soon as theologians discovered that while the Mosaic chronology fixes the date of man's creation, it leaves the antiquity of the globe unsettled, and, therefore, a fit subject for philosophical examination, they began to see that this science might be made to shed much light upon religion. Indeed, it already excels every other science in the importance of its religious applications; and notwithstanding the noble beginnings by Dr. Buckland, Dr. J. Pye Smith, Dr. Chalmers, and others, the work of development is but just begun. Would that my time and the reader's patience might permit us to take a leisurely survey of this interesting field. But a glance must suffice.

To say nothing of the illustrations of the meaning of revealed truth derived from this science,—of collision between them there is certainly none,—it furnishes us, in the first place, with a new argument for the existence of a Deity. This argument rests upon three leading facts of the science independent of one another; so that we may doubt or deny one or two of them, and yet not reject the argument. The first is, that there was a period when no animals or plants existed on the globe, and, therefore, an epoch when they were created; which must have required a Being of infinite perfections. The second is, that there have been on the globe several nearly entire extinctions and renewals of organic life, each of which demands the agency of such a