

replies, now lose their potency, and we may suffer them to pass into the limbo of forgetfulness.

*If these things are so, then may I add, as another inference, that we gain from the whole subject a presumptive proof of the truth of revelation.*

If science had been discrepant to revelation in relation to the creation and character of man as much as it is now in agreement, it surely would have been seized upon as casting suspicion upon Christianity. Why, then, should not these remarkable coincidences strengthen our conviction of its truth? When the writer of Genesis placed man's creation on the last of the demiurgic days, who told him that when the earth's rocky archives should be deciphered man's registry would be found only near the close of the long roll? When he represented the work as eminently miraculous, who told him that the science of the nineteenth century would teach the same? And when he placed man at the head of creation on earth, who told him that psychology and ethics would make the same classification? Who told him? How natural the conclusion that it was the same infinite Instructor whose hand laid the foundations of the earth, filled it with life and beauty, and who therefore could not be mistaken in its history!

In view of this whole discussion, may I not add, in conclusion, that it furnishes an instructive example of the use that may be made of natural religion by the minister of the gospel?

Imperfectly as the subject has been presented, may I not presume that my hearers feel that the teachings of science, in relation to man's creation and character, do lend a strong confirmation of the biblical account, and that this united testimony throws much light upon several important principles