

science—they have nothing to do with science. The Bible is not a scientific book, its object is not to depict scientific truth, and therefore we cannot expect to find it teaching science; nevertheless, God is the Author of it, as He is the Author of all truth, and therefore I willingly concede that it is inconceivable that God should fill the Bible with scientific lies, because its object is not the teaching of scientific truth. It claims to be the Word of God. There is but one way in which it can be true scientifically, and yet not anticipate scientific discovery, that we may form in our own mind. If there be terms which can be selected from human speech that are so elastic and flexible as that without disclosing scientific facts in advance, they may accommodate themselves to scientific facts when discovered, it would seem that that is the best thing that could be done by the writers of the Bible in the matter of expression touching science. It is the very thing that has been done. You open at the first chapter of Genesis, and what do you find in the very first chapter? You find the word firmament. Now, the ancients believed that the concave above us was a solid concave of metal, and that the stars were fixed in that concave, and that it revolved in diurnal rotation around the earth. That word "firmament" finds its way into the Bible, because it was the closest word to express, in the minds of the translators, the Hebrew word "rakya," but the Hebrew word means simply "*expanse*;" had Moses been Ormsby, McKnight, Mitchell, or one of your grandest astronomers in the British Empire, like Rosse or Herschell, he could not have chosen a word that would more accurately express the exact fact, then unknown to men, that there is simply an *expanse* of space between the stars and the earth.

Well, I know it is said that Moses and geology are hopelessly at war! What does geology teach? As far as it teaches anything it teaches a wild watery waste, then the arising of the continents above the surface of the water, the appearance of the sun and moon in the heavens, after the moisture fog and mist had been dispersed on the third creative day; then the growth of enormous vegetation, in its three forms of plant, herb and tree; then the creation of animals, from lower types up to man. Just exactly *that order* does Moses follow in the six creative days, and his is the only ancient book that touches on cosmogony that does not teach nonsense. If I take the old East Indian books what is the system of cosmogony I find there? I will give it to you, as nearly as I can:

"Ages upon ages ago this earth began to be. It was made in seven stories of flat triangular plains resting upon the heads of elephants with their tails turned out! And the elephants were supported upon a great tortoise, and the tortoise rested upon the coil of a great snake, and the snake rested upon—nobody knows what!" That is Indian cosmogony. Compare it with Moses' sublime account of creation. Will you tell me who it was that so guided Moses that he should not use a single term anywhere in his account of the six days of the creation that should not be accordant with the discoveries of modern science? Comparative anatomy has shewn within the last two hundred years, that the order of creation was from a lower type to a higher. It began with the fish, the proportion of whose brain to the spinal cord (which is accepted as the standard) is two to one. Then came the reptiles, two and a-half to one; then the birds, three to one; then mammals, four to one, and then followed man with thirty-three to one as his ratio. Absolutely Moses' order! Who taught Moses comparative anatomy? Who can account for the mistakes that Moses—didn't make?