

critics, I might well confess myself guilty, and conclude that my zeal to sustain a favorite theory had blinded my judgment. But in fact, these views, both of Genesis and of Peter, have been advocated by the early fathers of the church, and by a large number of the ablest modern interpreters and divines. As to the meaning of Peter, Dr. Griffin says, that the view above referred to "has been the more common opinion of the Christian fathers, of the divines of the reformation, and of the critics and annotators who have since flourished." I must disclaim, therefore, both the honor and the odium of these views, and say, that if I am wrong in their advocacy, it is because I have been led astray by such men as Augustine, Theodoret, Justin Martyr, Origen, Luther, the elder Rosenmüller, Tholuck, Dathe, Pye Smith, Patrick, Chalmers, Knapp, and Griffin.

Finally, it ought to be a position admitted by the philosopher and the theologian, that the facts and principles of science, brought before an unsophisticated mind, are favorable to piety. A contrary impression prevails extensively; just because not a few scientific men, in spite of science, and not through its influence, have been sceptics. Their hearts were wrong when they began the study; and then, according to a general law of human nature, the purest truth became only a means of increasing their perversity. But had their hearts been right at first, that same truth would have nourished and strengthened their faith and love. Why should it not be so? For what is true science but an exhibition of God's plans and operations? And will any one maintain that a survey of what God has planned and is executing should have an unfavorable moral effect upon an unperverted and unprejudiced mind? If it does, it must be through the influence of extraneous causes, such as pride, prejudice, bad education, or bad hab-