

clouds beyond. Nor could physiology represent the bones to be the seat of pain, or psychology refer intellectual operations to the region of the kidneys. Neither could systematic theology in one place represent God as having repented that he had made man, and in another exhibit him as without variableness or shadow of turning. But all this can the Bible do in perfect consistency with its infallible inspiration, because it was the language of common life; and common sense can interpret it, so that every suspicion of self-contradiction shall vanish. Indeed, had its language been strictly scientific, it might have formed a good text book in philosophy, but it would have been a poor guide to salvation. Yet the attempt to force the language of the Bible into the strait jacket of science has been prolific of mistakes and errors.

Another principle, which maintains that the Bible has anticipated some scientific discoveries, should be settled and form a part of this mutual creed. - In my view it should be settled in the negative. For if we admit that one modern discovery can be found in the Bible, how can we vindicate that book in those numerous cases where it speaks of natural phenomena in accordance with the monstrously absurd notions which prevailed among those to whom it was originally addressed? If it describes the science of the nineteenth century in one instance, why not in all? But admit that it was foreign to the object of revelation to teach science, and we can see why its descriptions of natural things accord with optical, but not physical, truth; and, then, there is no difficulty in enucleating the true meaning of the sacred writers. Interpreted by such a principle, we should not conclude that Job meant to reveal the Copernican system because he speaks of the earth as hanging upon nothing; especially as in another place he refers to the pillars on which the earth rests.