studied, along with such authors as Chalmers, Harris, Whewell, Sedgwick, Isaac Taylor, and McCosh, who extend and illustrate analogous principles, the flippant and superficial sciolism of the day, that would metamorphose the Deity into natural law, would find little favor.

Nor are these religious applications of philosophy confined to the older and more mathematical sciences. Nay, those more recent, and dependent mainly upon experiment and observation, when rightly understood, are remarkably prolific of religious illustrations. Chemistry and physiology, for example, throw much light upon the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and vindicate it against objections otherwise unanswerable. The former science, also, points us to the true meaning of those scriptures that describe the destruction of the world by fire; showing us that it is change of form in the matter of the globe, but not its annihilation. Meteorology teaches us how to understand the language of Scripture respecting the firmament above us. And geology, especially, lends confirmation to the biblical history of man's creation as a comparatively recent event; it shows us how we should understand the scriptural cosmogony, points out a new argument for the divine existence, and lends such decisive corroboration to the revealed doctrines of special and miraculous providence, and divine benevolence, that these truths could not consistently be excluded from the creed of philosophy, though the testimony of the Bible were lost.

Surely, then, the interests of theology demand that the religious applications of science should not be overlooked; and, on the other hand, science should count it the highest honor to be able to throw even a ray of light upon God's written word.

I venture here to suggest another use to which science may