

*the earth.* And in regard to the date of man's creation, compared with the advent of Christ, as well as of many intervening events, particularly the antediluvian, it has long been known that there is room for a diversity of opinion, amounting to some thousands of years, according as we follow the Hebrew, the Samaritan, or the Septuagint text; so that when I speak of a presumption from my subject in favor of the Mosaic chronology, I mean, in favor of its general accuracy. Whichever system of biblical chronology we follow, the creation of man and existing animals was comparatively recent; and science teaches the same lesson, although geological periods cannot be reckoned definitely by years.

Perhaps it may be thought that a coincidence so general, between the scientific and revealed records, is of small importance. But I judge otherwise. For undesigned coincidences are among the best of collateral proofs of the truth of Scripture; and in this case, the coincidence is as exact as the nature of the case will admit. Had there been discrepancy on this subject, how eagerly would it have been seized upon to throw discredit upon biblical chronology! This is a point against which scepticism aims its deadliest shafts. It is pleasant, therefore, to find our confidence in the accuracy of Scripture history strengthened by the record which we find instamped upon the rocks.

*My second inference enters a protest against those materialistic views, widely prevalent at the present day, which sink men, or at least some varieties of men, almost to the level of the brutes.*

It is not strange, perhaps, that such views should be adopted, when we look at some of the prevailing systems of anthropology. It is first assumed that the size and shape of the cranium determine the intellectual and moral character;