

ter were distinguishing features in all the men of note, and especially in those whose names were most famous. We do not believe that science nourishes the pride of intellect. The great things with which, for the most part, it is conversant, and the illimitable field of investigation, with its thousands of great mysteries over which it expatiates, tend rather to humble than to exalt a man in his own estimation. Who can feel proud or big when he looks upon the stars and considers their magnitudes; or when he investigates into the causes and courses of storms and whirlwinds; or when he measures the ages of the earth by the multitude and thickness of its concentric rings; or when he surveys the infinite variety of form and life in the fauna and flora of the world; or when he beholds with the microscope the ultimate atoms and exquisite tissues of which material things are formed,—who can make acquaintance with these things and lift up his head and boast? The spirit of a little child is that which characterises the true man of science. In literature it is often very different. Here we find vain boasters and haughty exaltees. In science men have to do with God's works, and in *their* presence they feel their own littleness; but in literature the subjects are chiefly human thoughts, feelings, imaginations, aims, and destinies; hence there is some temptation for the *litterateur* to exalt himself. He looks with acute, discriminating eye upon the errors, the faults, the foibles, the follies of others, while he is unconscious of the like in himself. What wonder, therefore, if he should be disposed to think of himself more highly than he ought. We thus claim for the pursuits of science an influence more genial than that which pertains to literature.

But shall we say that science is religious? By no means. That it is irreligious we deny; to say so would be treason against the Creator. If it is not religious, it may be asked, can it be anything else than irreligious on the principle that what is not for is against? There is, we reply, an analogous principle to this under which science may be brought, viz: "that which is not against is for." Science has no direct religious tendency, this we fearlessly say. We hold it all folly to talk about "nature leading up to nature's God." Nature never led any one to God who had not known God before, and by other means. Nature displays God to those who have seen his face before; but nature of itself never gave a man, in the proper sense of the word, a *revelation* of Jehovah. Creation is only in a subordinate sense a revelation of the Creator; *it is passive*—it says nothing of its origin; of itself it conveys to the observer no certain knowledge of its Creator. At most it can but tell that some intelligent cause brought it into being, but who or what he is, it can tell nothing. Of mighty power and supremacy it may give an idea, but, in point of fact, to the perverted human mind it never has given any true conceptions of Deity. Science, we therefore say, is not religious; that is, it does not tell of "What man is to believe concerning God, or of what duty God requires of man." No man has been made a devout worshipper of God by the pursuits of science. A man may be most scientific and yet be without the knowledge or the fear of God. We might mention some who although illustrious in science, had yet no faith in the being of a God and gave no homage to His Majesty.