

evident. Assuming then that the Mosaic chronology points to a marvellous truth arrived at by primeval man, or received by him, as the Hindoos and Egyptians believed, as a gift from the Deity, the conclusion is most important, as throwing light on the early history of the whole human race. It is evident that the periods of the ancients pointing to 25920, had not, as has been supposed, a reference to astronomy, but to chronology based on the revolution of the fixed stars, and to a rule absolutely essential to the regulation of the primeval calendar of the Pleiades. The necessity for this rule forced itself upon my attention at a very early stage of these investigations, when I endeavoured to ascertain whether the festivals and calendars of the ancients were connected with the year of the Tux* or of the Pleiades, and whether they exhibited traces of the progression, which must have been shared in by them, if attached to a sidereal year.

At the time that the problem as to the great year indicated by the Mosaic narrative was worked out, referred to in the letter to the Bishop of Nova Scotia, Sir William Jones' works had been lent to him. They were subsequently obtained from him for the purpose of seeing whether the great month of 2160 years was not a period of the Hindoos. A period of that exact number of years was not found, but a far more conclusive corroboration was discovered, viz: a great year precisely similar in principle in every respect to that indicated by the Mosaic chronology. A kalpa or period makes a day of Brahma, 30 of which make a month of Brahma, and 12 of these months make a year of Brahma, an age of Brahma consisting of 100 of his years. As the period 25920 is so well known to the Hindoos, it is not improbable that the year of Brahma, like that indicated by the Mosaic chronology, originally referred to the revolution of the fixed stars, or rather to the progression of a year regulated by the fixed stars, around the seasons of the natural year, though subsequently magnified by the extravagance of Hindoo mythologists into an enormous era.

The seven periods or great days of creation of the Mosaic narrative, appear in the mythological chronology of the Hindoos, but are connected not with the creation but with the deluge. But a difficulty will suggest itself that the days of creation could not have referred to periods, because their "evening and morning" precludes this idea. This difficulty, though apparently such a stumbling block to many writers can easily be explained. Geology presents such difficulties in the way of their being simply seven days, or one of our weeks, that Hugh Miller has endeavoured to convert them into periods.

He appears to have thought the task one of a good deal of difficulty, as he felt himself "called upon to account for but three out of the six." The writer in the Essays and Reviews on the Mosaic Cosmogony, regarding it as exhibiting mistakes, will not allow the figurative view which that eminent geologist adopted as regards three at least of the days of creation. "While on the one hand this supposition admits all desirable latitude for mistakes and misrepresentations, Hugh Miller on the other hand, endeavours to show that a substantial agreement with the truth exists, and to give a sufficient reason for the mistakes." In opposition to this view the Essayist states: "It has been held," says Hugh Miller, "by accomplished philologists that the days of the Mosaic creation may be regarded, without doing violence to the Hebrew language, as successive periods of great extent." We do not

* This will be apparent by a reference to p. 56.