

ological doctrine. Scientific evidence is of such a nature as always to command the respect and the assent of the bulk of reasoning men. If this hypothesis is sustained by scientific evidence, it is the duty of the Christian world to embrace it and convert it to their own uses. To do otherwise is to earn the contempt of those who are really on the side of truth. If it is not sustained by scientific evidence, it behooves the Christian world to overthrow it from scientific data. Such data ought not to be monopolized by secular learning. Science belongs peculiarly to Christianity, and Christianity is in duty bound to assert her claim. If she can use science to overthrow a false and dangerous position, she is derelict to neglect the opportunity; and all her denunciation will not atone for the error.

But this hypothesis, whether it represent the true history of cosmical matter or not, has no tendency to remove the Deity from creation. This has been admitted by Whewell, Buchanan, and all others who have been crowded to a response. This objection is founded in short-sightedness and a failure to appreciate the case. The hypothesis simply assumes that the Creator has brought worlds into existence by the use of second causes, precisely as he brings a tree into existence. Does any one hesitate to admit that an oak has undergone a slow and regular "development"—or that the delta of the Mississippi is undergoing "development"—or that the cone of Vesuvius is undergoing "development?" If it appear to intellects of the loftiest and broadest grasp that the Creator has evolved the solar system according to a method, and by the use of natural laws, exactly as he evolves a tree from the germ in the seed, why do we charge atheism in the one case and not in the other? The only difference between the cases is that the one attributes to Deity a vaster scope of intelligence and power than the other—and in doing this it concedes to