

who have given no attention to science, what but a bad influence can it have upon the naturalist, who sees, on the very pages from which I have quoted, the most decisive evidence that the writers do not understand the subject? not from want of ability, but because other studies have engaged their attention. Suppose that, in reading a commentary on Job, the writer had inadvertently disclosed the fact, that he knew nothing of the Hebrew grammar, nor even of the Hebrew alphabet. From that moment his criticisms, however much of talent they might discover, would be regarded with indifference, if not with pity or contempt, by the Christian and the scholar.

It would be easy to quote examples of an analogous character from the philosophers. I might refer to the extraordinary and even ridiculous exegetical principles adopted by the physico-theologists of the last century to prove their favorite dogma, that the principles of physical science are all to be found in the Bible, as given by Catcott in his work on the Deluge, and by Hutchinson in his twelve volumes entitled "Moses's Principia." But more appropriately may I refer to a writer of our own times, eminent enough in science to be selected to write one of the Bridgewater Treatises. In his interpretation of the phrase "windows of heaven," in Genesis, Mr. Kirby makes it mean "cracks and volcanic vents *in the earth*, through which water and air rushed inwardly and outwardly with such violence as to tear the crust to pieces."

I quote another example from a naturalist and philosopher still more eminent, not because it has the dreamy character of that just given, but because I know how the following passage has struck some of the most distinguished and liberal Hebrew and biblical scholars in our land. While they sat gladly at the feet of this author in all matters of physical