

On the other hand, not a few scientific men, although professing respect for the Bible, and faith in it, yet feel as if its statements should have no weight, even upon any matter of fact which comes under the cognizance of philosophy. Science, it is thought, has its own appropriate evidences, which must be admitted, whatever else goes against it. The Bible was not given to teach science, and therefore it was never intended to be authoritative in such matters.

Now, if these two classes of men were to lay it down as a settled principle that all science and all religion are certain ultimately to harmonize throughout, it would remove this mutual jealousy and distrust; nor would the parties be disposed to stand aloof from each other, and to treat one another as enemies. If they are ultimately to be entirely one, then they are essentially so now, and all discrepancy is apparent only. Therefore should the philosopher and the theologian feel as if they were brothers, whose business it is, in mutual good will, to elucidate and bring into harmony different portions of the same eternal truth.

Another article of this mutual creed should be, that scientific men may have the freest and the fullest liberty of investigation. They have not always had it. "We remember," says Melville, "how, in darker days, ecclesiastics set themselves against philosophers, who were investigating the motions of the heavenly bodies, apprehensive that the new theories were at variance with the Bible, and therefore resolved to denounce them as heresies, and stop their spread by persecution." Open persecution is unpopular now; but I fear that a remnant of the same feelings still lingers in some minds. They will not say directly to the scientific man, "Abstain from your researches, for they seem to threaten injury to religion," but their fears of some disastrous influence make