

ground; and that if I have been so fortunate as to carry the intelligent reader with me thus far, I may chance to lose him now."

You have *now*, Dr., no more cause for alarm than you had when you first announced your anti-Scriptural and absurd theory. You have been, all along, not merely on dangerous ground, but on that of the nature of *quicksand*, and every intelligent reader has clearly seen your utterly frail and untenable position.

The Dr. next makes the following rather offensive assertions:—

"There are, as yet, but few even of educated men whose range of study has included any thing that is practical or useful, either in Hebrew literature or geological science."

Did the Dr. really comprehend the true meaning of what he has here written? It must be presumed that by "Hebrew literature" is meant the Old Testament Scriptures, for there cannot be said to be any Hebrew literature *now*, but what is contained in those divine oracles. Are there, then, "but few, even of educated men,"—either ministers or laymen—whose studies, in these Scriptures, "have included any thing that is practical or useful"? This defect is really the meaning of his offensive assertion. As to the kind of geological science in which the Dr. is such an ardent enthusiast, all usefully educated and sensible men, and all Scriptural Christians, consider that such merely speculative geology serves no practical or useful purpose, and when, as in this work of the Dr., it comes in conflict with the plain truths of divine revelation, they not only neglect, but *reject* it, with deserved contempt.

The Dr. still proceeds, in an excited or offensive strain, as follows:—

"That slipshod christianity, which contents itself with supposing that conclusions which are false in nature may be true in theology, is mere superstition, or professional priestcraft, and has nothing in common with the Bible."

There is no real contradiction or inconsistency between nature and true theology. It is only those who are *slipshod*, both in *theology* and a knowledge of *nature*, who think they see such an opposition, and as to validity of proof, give their crude and *slipshod* geology the preference. The following is the next passage for remark:—

"The geologist, fully aware of the substantial nature of the foundations of the science of the earth, regards it as little less than absurd to find parallels to its principles in an ancient theological work. Still there are possible meeting points of things so dissimilar as Bible lore and geological explorations."