

both Mr. the argu-  
 ments that  
 ic days in  
 ly fanciful  
 of the case,  
 roof of this,  
 ns of these  
*Vestminster*  
 But if I  
 Mr. Miller's  
 fabric of a

s with the  
 ars as one  
 er, by his  
 beside the  
 being that  
 the world  
 ntroversy is  
 non-natural  
 ddressed to  
 given the  
 on language

e Book and  
 d in my pre  
 —that "if  
 d of time,"  
 must also be  
 ed *sequitur*  
 The retort  
 to me it ap-  
 r does not  
 the Crea-  
 an who had  
 for ought  
 going on

continually in other spheres; and indeed the recent discoveries in astronomy seem to render this very probable. The meaning, therefore, is evidently this,—that God having *ceased* from those great works in which for the last six days He had been engaged on our behalf man was required in token of his gratitude to God and for his own comfort, (how wondrously Divine benevolence ever combines the two!) to keep the Seventh Day holy. My argument in my last letter, with regard to the Fourth Commandment, consequently remains untouched.

Something, I can scarcely understand what, in favour of the writer's views is attempted to be based upon the fact that the Seventh Day is not defined by its "evening and morning," as are the rest. To me, the omission seems to strengthen the argument in favor of the literal character of the other six days; since they, being the days of creation, are thus carefully marked as natural days, in order to prevent their after perversion, as, for instance, is now done by our geologists, to a non-natural sense; while the Seventh Day being one of rest was not equally liable to misinterpretation. And besides, this last day of the primeval week might be left thus partially undefined as a beautiful symbol of that eternal rest which awaits the faithful. For there is a wondrous depth of loving kindness,—*though not of deception*!—in any of these typical allusions.

*Blackwood* is equally as pertinacious as Hugh Miller in attributing the distinct language of Moses concerning the six days, to his writing from the appearances of "a vision;" or even from a "succession of *hieroglyphs*, descending perhaps from high antiquity"!! rather than from positive revelation. Now all this is exceedingly foolish; first, because there is not the most remote hint of any such "vision," which there distinctly is in the case of St. John, whom the writer cites as an example; and less then is there any hint respecting "*hieroglyphs*;" while, on the other hand, there is more than an intimation, as I have stated before, that God spoke in