

atmosphere of faith: we must not expect in this life to "know even as also we are known." And I repeat, in conclusion, the assertion, that scepticism NEVER PROVED one fact that was in opposition to the facts stated in the *Book of God*.

---

LETTER IV.

SIR,—I must once more trespass on your patience, as I wish to make a few remarks on the difficulties attending Mr. Hugh Miller's attempt to reconcile the Mosaic Creation week with the theories of modern geologists.

Mr. Miller takes the ground that as Revelation was no more intended to teach geology than astronomy, the opponents of his theories are to be placed in the same category with the unwise theological persecutors of Galileo, Columbus, &c. But in this he confounds things which are essentially different. The Bible *does not* undertake to instruct us in the mysteries of the Solar System: it merely speaks of the sun, moon, and stars, as Mr. Miller himself well remarks, just as the almanack does, in that common phraseology which represents their relations to us. But yet I much question, whether the Jewish and Christian world got their former notions of the earth being an extended plain, and so forth, from the Bible; its language by no means necessarily involving such errors; these ideas were rather derived, I imagine, from ancient secular philosophy, to which Biblical phraseology was unwittingly accommodated in the minds of its readers.

We readily grant, therefore, on the same principles, that, as the Sacred Volume is not a geological treatise, the organic history and conformation of our globe is a fair subject of scientific research and theory. But what revelation *professes to state as historic truth, must be understood according to the received language and ideas of the people to whom the revelation was made*, or it would cease to be reliable testimony; and thus becoming a mere vol-