

revelation, and he cannot sit still and see that cause suffer which he loves so well. He denounces the new discovery, therefore, and gives no doubtful intimation that its advocates are sceptics, trusting to his reputation as a theologian to enforce his opinion upon the public. Some, whose organ of veneration is large, swallow the *ex-cathedra* judgment with no wry faces. Others, more discerning, see through the ruse, and sigh over human weakness. Scientific men look upon the whole with silent contempt, nor deign to attempt an answer to dogmatism and personal abuse.

Sometimes, however, a scene equally absurd is witnessed on the other side. A scientific man, desirous of extending his discoveries into the domain of religion, ventures upon interpretations of Scripture, or statements of doctrine, that show him quite ignorant of both. The practised theologian points out the fallacy of his reasoning so clearly as to wound his pride. But, instead of generously confessing his error, he resorts to charges of bigotry, narrow-mindedness, and ignorance of science, and dogmatically maintains that science is to be followed, whatever becomes of revelation. He shows towards it and its defenders the same bitter, bigoted spirit which he censures in his opponents. Their arguments he cannot answer, because he has never studied hermeneutics or theology. And so he wraps himself up in the cloak of self-conceited wisdom, and substitutes contempt for logic. Men talk much of the *odium theologicum*, as if it were the quintessence of gall. But really, the *odium scientificum* is often a much more concentrated mixture. The most illiberal of all bigots are those who fancy themselves the very pinks of liberality; and pride never assumes such lofty airs as when it curls the lip of the self-satisfied philosopher who is destitute of Christian humility.