

all His revelations to Moses, face to face, as a man with his friend. But this trifling with Holy Writ is further distressing, because we must after all return to the fact that the Divine Intelligence is responsible for the truthful accuracy of the narrative according to the common method of interpreting human language, whatever might be methods by which it was imparted to Moses, or,—the Book of Genesis is a fable!

Thus, let any unprejudiced person say, after reading the account of the fourth day's creation of the sun moon and stars, whether human language can convey any facts in clearer or plainer terms? Yet of this statement of the Book of Genesis, the article in question says: "This is optical not astronomical truth"! I fancy I can see the quiet sneer of the *Westminster* on reading such a defence of the holy literal truth of that volume. on the fact of whose unassailable truth all our dearest hopes depend. And this cavilling is certainly most uncalled for, as the account of the heavenly bodies is literally and "astronomically" correct, *Blackwood* to the contrary notwithstanding, when considered in their relations and influences upon our earth;—and this it was, of course, the legitimate object of the sacred historian to state.

But what, indeed, is there to prevent our supposing, if geology seems to demand it, that a planetary system or systems, had existed, and been destroyed, before the creation of the present solar system, described by Moses as taking place on the fourth day? or, might it not possibly be their re-organization from a state of chaos? These suppositions are surely more reverential, than to imagine that when God says He "*made two great lights,*" He only means that He *cleared away the mists and fogs* which hid them from sight! And yet this is what Mr. Miller and *Blackwood* would have us to believe.

The whole of these efforts to bend the Mosaic account to the *supposed* discoveries of geological science