

ume of guess work, in respect of its interpretation, it would consequently be valueless as a record of Divine truth and mercy.

Whether the history of Creation as at present organized, was given to Moses in a vision, as Mr. Miller and others suppose, or by direct communication, is of little importance: its *literal* accuracy is the question; but yet from the distinct declaration of Jehovah to Aaron and Miriam concerning the honour He put upon Moses, when He said: "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently and not in dark speeches," I can come to no other conclusion, notwithstanding the special pleading in "The Testimony of the Rocks," than that the history of Creation was so given to him, immediately by God himself.

Now nothing can be more plain, simple, and didactic than the account given in the book of Genesis of the creation of the heavens, the earth, and its inhabitants, as *they at present exist*. And this account Jehovah solemnly repeated, writing it with his own finger upon the two tables of stone, amidst the awful solemnities of Mount Sinai. And here, let it be remembered, that "words are but signs of our ideas," and that consequently they cease to be true, when they cease correctly to represent those ideas. Now, what would the people of Israel understand; what, in fact, have all men understood, till warped by a floundering philosophy, from this week of six days, and its seventh of holy rest—but the universal week of Judaism, and of Christianity? Hence as Jehovah—the God of Truth—could not use language designing it to convey a deceptive sense to His hearers, I cannot avoid the conclusion that the Mosaic week of the Creation was a natural week.

Miller and his friends, suggest, however, that Moses spoke after the manner of the later prophets, who generally use natural periods to indicate long prophetic dates. But they ignore this all important difference, that the prophets were not writing history; and the people