

heretofore supposed to prove divine malevolence, or at least vindictive justice.

We have now taken a glance at the entire and vast circle of human learning. And is not every mind forced irresistibly to the conclusion, that every branch was originally linked by a golden chain to the throne of God, and that the noblest use to which they can be consecrated, and for which they were destined, is to illustrate his perfections and to display his glory? If so, let me conclude my too protracted remarks by a few inferences.

In the first place, what a monstrous perversion and misapprehension of learning it is, to consider it as hostile to religion.

It is not difficult to explain how a Christian, who is very ignorant, and who learns that literary men are often sceptical, should distrust the influence of learning upon religion; nor how a mere smatterer in science, himself sceptical, should flatter himself that his great learning made him so. But how strange that any talented and well-informed man, be he Christian or infidel, should not see that all science and a large part of literature are

“ But elder Scripture writ by God’s own hand ! ”

It must be the strongest prejudice, or the most decided hatred to religion, which can suppose that one work of the same infinitely perfect God should oppose another; for, in fact, learning and religion are only different shoots from the same parent stock; and if their fruit be of opposite qualities, it must be because man has grafted upon one or the other the apples of Sodom. To set learning against religion is as unnatural as to array brother against brother on the field of combat.

We see, secondly, that those engaged in directly promoting