vision the *pattern* of those successive pre-Adamic creations, animal and vegetable, through which our world was fitted up as a place of human habitation. The *reason* why the drama of creation has been *optically* described *seems* to be, that it was in reality *visionally* revealed.

A further question still remains : *If* the revelation was by vision, that circumstance affords of itself a satisfactory reason why the description should be *optical* : and, on the other hand, since the description is decidedly *optical*, the presumption is of course strong that the revelation was by vision. But why, it may be asked, by vision? Can the presumption be yet further strengthened by showing that this visual mode or form was preferable to any other? Can there be a reason, in fine, assigned *for the reason*,—for that revelation by vision which accounts for the optical character of the description? The question is a difficult one; but I think there can. There seems to be a peculiar fitness in a revelation made by vision, for conveying an account of creation to various tribes, and peoples of various degrees of acquirement, and throughout a long course of ages in which the knowledge of the heavenly bodies or of the earth's history, *i. e.* the sciences of astronomy and geology, did not at first exist, but in which ultimately they came to be studied and known. We must recognise such a mode as equally fitted for the earlier and the more modern times,—for the ages anterior to the rise of science, and the ages posterior to its rise. The prophet, by describing what he had actually seen in language fitted to the ideas of his time, would shock no previously existing prejudice that had been founded on the apparent evidence of the senses ; he could as safely describe the moon as the second great light of creation, as he could the sun as its first great light, and both, too, as equally subordinate to the planet which we inhabit. On the other hand, an enlightened age, when it had come to discover this key to the description,