

are yet not well enough understood to reason from, and demand long and patient investigation. Or make the most unfavorable supposition, viz., that the preponderance of evidence favors the idea of a diversity of origin. Is it quite certain that we must give up the Bible, or its more important doctrines? Would the discrepancy appear so great as it did when the Copernican system was first announced? Shame on us, that we feel so fearful in respect to God's Word, and those eternal truths that form the groundwork of the scheme of salvation! Right is it that we should address ourselves manfully to every argument that bears upon revelation; but how unwise, when it is wholly unnecessary, to take ground which we may be compelled with a bad grace to relinquish!

In conclusion, let me recapitulate the principles, which, as I have endeavored to show, should be the common creed, and regulate the intercourse and feelings of the theologian and philosopher.

They should start with the principle that theology is entitled to higher respect, as a standard of appeal, than any branch of knowledge not strictly demonstrative.

It should also be admitted that, as a means of moral reformation and a regulator of human affairs, philosophy has little comparative power.

They can agree, also, in the position, that entire harmony will be the final result of all researches in philosophy and religion.

To the scientific man should be granted the freest and the fullest liberty of investigation.

The language of science and of Scripture, as well as of popular religious literature, requires different, or at least modified, principles of interpretation.

Revelation has not anticipated scientific discovery.