

appealed on behalf of rival systems, to the Mosaical account of the creation, and that we thus became involved in seeming contradictions, the ready answer is that Genesis is not self-contradictory, nor conveniently elastic, because the intention of the writer was not to teach us geology. Or if a Philologist were to appeal to the account of the confusion of tongues, or to the fact that Adam gave names to every living creature, in proof or disproof of the divine origin of language, we should at once extricate ourselves from apparent perplexity by saying that the object of Moses was not to teach philology. We should see clearly enough that these sciences must be wrought out independently, while we should be inclined to believe that theories about them are most likely to be truly scientific which best fit into, explain and harmonize the incidental statements of Scripture. Again, we may learn by careful enquiry, a good deal concerning the Government of the Roman Empire, in the days of Christ and his Apostles, out of the New Testament, but inasmuch as the writers had not the remotest intention of teaching their contemporaries or us, whether that government was Imperial, or Senatorial, or Republican, it would be preposterous for us to decide the point *on the authority of Inspiration*. Some mode of Government must indeed have existed, and all that we can know on the subject is, that the one most likely to be true, is that into which the incidental