

with what he, and others of his class, call *science*; and especially when the divine revelation interferes with their speculative and absurd theories. True christians do not need the adjunct or assistance of natural science, to convince them of the truth of that narrative of creation, and of every other part of scripture revelation. The greatest lights of heathenism Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Socrates, Cicero, and hosts of others far advanced in various branches of natural science, "never by their wisdom and searching found out God," his works and ways.

The Dr. heads his—"Chapter 1.—The Mystery of Origins and its Solutions."

"The things that are seen are temporal."—Paul.

He commences with the following passages:—

"Have we, or can we have any certain solution of those two great questions. Whence are all things? and Whither do all things tend? * * * It would seem that to-day men are as much in uncertainty on these subjects as at any previous time. * * * Christians have been accustomed to rest on the cosmogony and prophecy of the Bible, but we are now frankly told, on all hands, that these are valueless; and that even ministers of religion, more or less, sacrifice their sincerity in making them the basis of their teachings."

The uncertainties here intimated by the Dr. so far from being general, as he says, are only resting with a small fraction of society, who are either infidels as to the whole of divine revelation, or like the Dr. himself, are speculative theorists, yet claiming to be scientists and philosophers. With the innumerable myriads of Israel, during the 3,327 years since they received the divine records of creation, through the medium of Moses; and during the 1,800 years that christian nations have had the same Scriptures, there has been no such uncertainty as the Dr. has mentioned. He is equally at fault in saying that we are frankly told "on all hands" that "the cosmogony and prophecy of the Bible are valueless." Only that same fraction of audacious infidels and presumptuous theorists are the persons who say it. The remark as to ministers of religion is a slanderous insult, but only what might be expected from that proud and mischievous class. The next passages deserving remark are as follows:—

"No apology is needed for a thorough and careful enquiry into those foundations of religious belief, which rest on the idea of a revelation of origins and destinies made to man from without, and on which we may build the superstructure of a rational religion