

I now come to a question which is intimately connected with the preceding, and yet distinct from it, I mean the geological theory of the great antiquity of the earth ; which is held by many who are as much opposed to evolution as I am. I have read what scientific men have to say about the heavenly bodies having been thrown off one after another from a mass of hot vapor, travelling through space, and then allowed to cool ; and I have also read of those marvellous achievements of some of our Indian predecessors which Longfellow describes in " Hiawatha," and I attach as much importance to the latter as to the former, not doubting for one moment but that the solidity of the foundation is the same in both cases.

I accept the account of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis in its obvious or literal sense, which is supported by the references to the work of creation in other parts of Scripture, notably in the second commandment : " Six days thou shalt labor and do all thy work *for* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth." Here, then, we have the certain testimony that the six days of creation were such as men had to work, and which came between two Sabbath days. There are some who take the six days of creation thus, but who, nevertheless, think that what is stated in the first verse of the Scripture narrative may have happened ages before " God said let there be light." But this is merely an accommodation of things to suit the geologists, not what they suppose to be the natural meaning of the passage, and even this is at variance with the statement in Exodus which I have quoted. As to the allegorical or parabolic interpretation, no one supposes it to be other than strained and unnatural—a drastic method of escaping from what appears to be a difficulty. And who is to expound the parable? Are we to accept such interpretations as that given of the garden of