

my Reviewer in the British Critic, also, “ has always
“ doubted the expediency of connecting the speculations
“ of Science with the truths of Revealed Religion.”
This curious principle, here conveyed in the form of a
doubt, is one of the most extraordinary doctrines that
could have been proposed to the intelligence of the existing
generation of Christians; it is, therefore, of the utmost
importance that it should be stripped of its character of
a doubt, and that it should be rigorously examined in its
tangible character of a *positive proposition*. It will then
stand thus:—“ it is imprudent and inexpedient to en-
“ deavour to connect the *discoveries* of natural science in
“ *Geology*, with the *statements* of the Sacred Narrative
“ relative to the *formation and changes of the Earth*.”
Now, besides the unreasonableness immediately manifest
on the face of this proposition, provided we admit that
Narrative to be *authentic and sacred*, and do not mistrust
its communications; every clear-sighted intellect that will
only take the pains to look steadily upon it, and to trace
it to its inevitable issue, must perceive; that, if it be ren-
dered absolute and universal, and without any considera-
tion of *what those discoveries in natural science may have*
brought to light, it may eventually terminate in this pre-
posterous and absurd conclusion:—that “ it is *imprudent*
“ *and inexpedient* to investigate the *most direct and imme-*
“ *diate proofs*, that the God of Nature and the God of
“ Scripture are *One and the Same*.” To trace that
unity and identity, is the sole object in seeking the *con-*
nexion; and therefore, to inculcate, *unconditionally*, the
imprudence and inexpediency of seeking it, is, in effect, to
endeavour to frustrate or obstruct the *most direct discern-*
ment of that unity and identity.