

believe that there is any ground for this doctrine." "Every such phrase explains itself, and not only philology but common sense disclaims the notion that where 'day' is spoken of in terms like those in the first chapters of *Genesis*, and described as consisting of an evening and morning, it can be understood to be a *seculum*." Let us see, however, whether common sense necessarily leads to such a conclusion. Should we not at least glance at the traditions of the Hindoos and other nations of antiquity, as to the creation and the deluge, in seeking to interpret the phraseology of the Mosaic narrative, to which they bear such a striking resemblance, that Sir William Jones pronounces the Hindoo and Hebrew accounts of the creation and of the deluge to be almost identical? If science proves that "the evening and the morning" of the days of creation cannot have had the usual meaning attached to those words by us, but must have been connected with periods, let us see whether common sense leaves us no alternative but to adopt a literal interpretation, which, if accepted, presents the Mosaic narrative to us as a tissue of mistakes. In interpreting any ancient literary production of remote antiquity, critics generally make use of the light which contemporary works shed upon it; and this is especially the case as respects the meaning of words. Even in Shakespeare's works there are many expressions that are now altogether obsolete, and that would be unintelligible but for the aid which contemporary literature supplies to us.

Let us turn from the Mosaic narrative to a work attributed by the Hindoos to Menu, the Noah of India, and let us see whether, in the remote eras when Moses and Menu wrote their histories of the Creation and of the Deluge, the words "the evening and the morning" might not have been applied to periods as well as to days. "The sun," we are told, "causes the division of day and night, which are of two sorts, those of men, and those of the gods; the day for the labour of all creatures in their several employments; the night for their slumber. A month is a day and night of the Patriarchs; and it is divided into two parts; the bright half is their day for laborious exertions; the dark half their night for sleep. A year is a day and night of the gods; and it is also divided into two halves; the day is when the sun moves towards the north; the night when he moves towards the south." We are next told that a thousand divine ages make a day of Brahma; his night has also the same duration."

The evidence, therefore, of a narrative similar to the Mosaic cosmogony, bears out fully the view of Hugh Miller, that "the evening and the morning" of the days of creation referred to periods.

The system adopted in ages of primitive antiquity for the regulation of time, by which there was a gradual development of the year into the great year, and of night and day into "the evening and the morning" of periods or great days, is peculiarly interesting.

As the primitive year began with the rising of the stars in Taurus in the evening on the Halloweve, or "Mother Night" of the year, each succeeding day began at sunset. The same peculiarity is evinced in the seven great days of creation, which did not consist of morning and evening—but of "the evening and the morning."

The day of the Mosaic cosmogony is of a more primitive type than that of Hindoo chronology. The former commencing with the evening, while the latter is of a more modern character, and begins with the morning. The Hindoos hold that "the Twelve Nights are an image of the year." The German peasantry, inher-