

It may be asked at this point, "Is this freedom lawlessness?" Is there no control, no rule for mind? May it run riot and be rampant? Do we remove it from the region of Law and of Government? The reply is strongly negative. Such would not be freedom! Law, properly considered, is the defence and exposition of liberty. This is seen in a well ordered Government; for under such Government only is

such tribunal, and that its author, whether viewing the declarations of Holy Writ, or studying the principles of the Divine government, or considering the essential nature of the human mind, arrives at the conclusion that *no such tribunal can ever be lawfully established*. 3. That the hypothesis on this matter of the "*Melanges Religieux*" and its cited authorities is not established. The attempts, which have been sufficiently able and ingenious, have proved abortive. "So far was Galileo from persisting in an attempt to reconcile the Bible with Copernicus, that he regarded this as a matter altogether indifferent and indeed beside the real question. 'I am inclined to believe,' says he in his letter to the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, 'that the intention of the Sacred Scriptures is to give mankind the information necessary for their salvation, and which, surpassing all human knowledge, can by no other means be accredited than by the mouth of the Holy Spirit. But I do not hold it necessary to believe that the same God who has endowed us with senses, with speech, and with intellect, intended that we should neglect the use of these, and seek by other means for knowledge which they are sufficient to procure us; especially in a science like astronomy, of which so little notice is taken in the Scriptures, that none of the planets except the sun and moon, and once or twice only Venus, under the name of Lucifer, are so much as named there. This therefore being granted, I think that in the discussion of natural problems we ought not to begin at the authority of texts of Scripture, but at sensible experiments and necessary demonstrations; for from the Divine Word sacred Scripture and nature did both alike proceed; and I conceive that, concerning natural effects, that which either sensible experience sets before our eyes, or necessary demonstrations prove unto us, ought not upon any account to be called in question, much less condemned, upon the testimony of Scripture texts, which may under their words couch senses seemingly contrary thereto.'" This passage, which I quote from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, seems sufficient to set at rest the point before us. The man that could write these sentiments, would not allow himself to be drawn into the course, on the ground of which our opponents say that he was condemned. In another passage in one of his letters, he intimates that when under examination before the Inquisition, and attacked with texts of Scripture, he did venture to give a different version of one or two of them; but this appears to have been by the way, and not in accordance with his usual practice. He persisted in basing his views on "sensible experiments and necessary demonstrations." But although sentences in letters may be detached from their connection and severed so as to bolster up either hypothesis, one would think that *the sentence of the Inquisition itself must decide the question*. A translation of that sentence is given at length in the work from which I quote, and I cannot imagine anything more explicit than its condemnation on the ground of false theory concerning the earth and the sun. It is perfectly decisive as to the fallacy of the allegation, that "Galileo was not persecuted as a good astronomer, but only as a bad theologian." As the sentence is an interesting document, and as the matter continues to excite discussion in the French journals, I place it as a note at the end of the Lecture.