

a grand distinction between symbolic and therefore *dark* visions, and visions not symbolic nor dark. Visions addressed, as the word indicates, to the eye may be obviously of a two-fold character ;—they may be either darker than words, or a great deal clearer than words. The vision, for instance, of future monarchies which Daniel saw symbolized under the form of monstrous animals had to be explained in words ; the vision of Peter, which led to the general admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church, had also virtually to be explained in words : they were both visions of the dark class ; and revelation abounds in such. But there were also visions greatly clearer than words. Such, for instance, was the vision of the secret chamber of imagery, with its seventy men of the ancients of Israel given over to idolatry, which was seen by the prophet as he sat in his own house ; and the vision of the worshippers of the sun in the inner court of the temple, witnessed from what was *naturally* the same impossible point of view ; with the vision of the Jewish women in the western gate “weeping for Thammuz,” when, according to Milton’s noble version,

“ The love tale
 Infected Zion’s daughters with like heat,
 Whose wanton passions in the sacred porch,
 Ezekiel saw, when, by the vision led,
 His eye surveyed the dark idolatries
 Of alienated Judah.”

Here, then, were there visions of scenes actually taking place at the time, which, greatly clearer than any merely verbal description, substituted the seeing of the eye for the hearing of the ear. And visions of this latter kind were enjoyed, argues the writer of this ingenious treatise, by the prophet Moses.

One of the cases adduced may be best given in the author’s own words. “Moses,” he says, “received directions from God how to proceed in constructing the Tabernacle and