

them jealous of the man, and fearful that his scientific conclusions may lead himself and others astray ; and hence they withdraw their confidence from him, and thus take the most effectual way to alienate and make a sensitive mind sceptical. But how narrow are such views ! and how idle the fear of collision between science and revelation ! How much more noble and truly Christian are the sentiments of Dr. Pye Smith ! “ Only let the investigation be sufficient, and the induction honest ; let observation take its farthest flight ; let experiment penetrate into all the recesses of nature ; let the veil of ages be lifted up from all that has hitherto been unknown, if such a course were possible — religion need not fear ; Christianity is secure, and true science will always pay homage to the divine Creator and Sovereign, *of whom, and through whom, and to whom, are all things, and unto whom be glory forever.*”

The difference in the character of the language of science and that frequently employed in religion suggests a fifth article of the supposed platform. Different principles of interpretation, to some extent, are demanded in the two departments. True science employs terms that are precise, definite, literal, with scarcely more than one meaning, and adapted only to cultivated minds. Religion, especially the Bible, makes use of language that is indefinite, loose, and multiform in signification, often highly figurative, and adapted, not only to the popular mind, but to men in an early and rude state of society. Science, for instance, could not, as the Bible can and does, represent the work of creation in one chapter as occupying six days, and in the next chapter as completed in one day. It could not, like the Bible, speak of the sun's rising and setting, and of the earth's immobility. Meteorology could not describe the concave above our heads as a solid expanse, having windows or openings for the rain to pass from the