

tical analysis and not with the theological interpretation of either Church or Synagogue that we have now to do, we are constrained to say that in this instance Dr. Dawson has not exhibited the same strictly scientific exegesis which has delighted and convinced us in other portions of his book. We readily admit, however, that this is the only instance wherein we observe that Dr. Dawson makes philology and religion coincide in a way which he almost immediately afterwards condemns (p. 74), when geology and religion are made, or rather forced to coincide by others. Writing of the Desolate Void, he finds that "truth" obliges him to throw aside—which we are very willing he should—"the convenient method of reconciliation sanctioned by Chalmers, Smith, Harris, King, Hitchcock and many other great or respectable names, and on which so many good men complacently rest," because a strict exegesis will not permit him, "suddenly to restrict" the term *arets* in the 2nd verse to a limited region, when in the first it must mean the whole world. "Is not this supposition," he asks, "contrary not only to sound principles of interpretation, but also to common sense; and would it not tend to render worthless the testimony of a writer to whose diction such inaccuracy must be ascribed. It is in truth to me beyond measure surprising that such a view could ever have obtained currency; and I fear it is to be attributed to a determination, at all hazards and with any amount of to make geology and religion coincide."

The next word noticed is *Yom*. No doubt, the prevalent view of this word has always been that it expresses the natural day, a period of four-and-twenty hours. The contrary opinion that in the case before us it means a long pretended period has, however, been held at a very early date by Jewish authorities. Nachmanides some seven centuries since asserts that "the days of the Creator are to be understood as of a thousand years each." This view is also maintained by R. Samuel d'Urbino in his "*Ohel Monged*," and by the most esteemed commentator, Abarbanel, as may be seen in his interesting remarks on Gen. ii., 4, where he says "it is verified by holy writ, accepted from the words of our sages in many places, and the ancient philosophers also believed in it." The thousand years here referred to may perhaps be taken to mean a long indefinite period, and so employed by Moses himself in Psalm xc., 4: "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it hath passed." Kimchi thus comments on this passage: "Our pious sages refer the expression in thy sight to God and not to the children of men just addressed, and they say that the *day of the Eternal is a thousand years*." Compared with this remark of Kimchi, we may cite the following passage quoted by Dr. Dawson on p. 124, from the Institutes of Menu: "*One thousand divine ages* (equal to more than four millions of human years *are a day of Brahma the Creator*." Beside the commentators just mentioned we find that Rashi (eleventh century) and Maimonides (twelfth century) whose dicta are in the present day more highly respected by Jews than those of their other writers; who are, in fact, the chief authorities of the Synagogue in matters of interpretation, both unite in asserting that all things were created *on the first yom* or day, but that their proper natures and due development were only afforded them during the other five *Yamim*. These references to some of the most esteemed authorities of the Hebrews will show that this people have by no