

has never studied. A man, for instance, may be most distinguished in science, so that his word is law ; and yet, never having given his attention to theology, he is utterly unfit to judge of the bearings of scientific facts or theories upon religion. We listen with great respect to the opinions of an eminent divine upon those theological principles to which he has devoted so much thought and study. But if he undertakes to dogmatize upon matters of science, when his very language shows him quite ignorant of its principles, and swayed by prejudice, what claim can his opinions have to our reception or respect ?

The distinguished Scotch divine, who uses the following language respecting geology and geologists, no doubt supposed himself doing an important service to religion by his denunciations. "Geology," says he, "as sometimes conducted, is a monument of human presumption, which would be truly ridiculous were it not offensive by its impiety." "Thus puny mortals, [geologists,] with a spark of intellect and a moment for observation, during which they take a hasty glance of a few superficial appearances, dream themselves authorized to give the lie to Him who made and fashioned them, and every thing which they see." The same may be said of another eminent divine, who applies similar remarks to the whole of physical science. "The third fact," says he, "here revealed, [in Genesis,] is, that this world was created in six days. Here, again, the Scriptures are at issue with science. Modern geologists tell us that this is not possible ; and all we need reply to the bold assertion is, *with men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.*" "Natural science is confessedly progressive, and, therefore, comparatively crude. Geology is in its infancy." — *Spring.*

Now, whatever effect such language may have upon persons