

in an article which I translated for publication, maintained that the luxurious vegetation of the carboniferous era grew up in an atmosphere so dense with carbonic acid gas as to make the heavenly bodies invisible to a possible earthly beholder. Supposing the late Sir William Dawson's view to be the most natural one, that the creation was revealed to its historian by a series of panoramic pictures, what more likely than that the higher stages of large plant life, having absorbed the darkening gas, which they converted into coal, and having breathed forth pure oxygen, the beholder of the panorama should suddenly have revealed to his gaze the long previously existing sun, moon, and stars? Mr. Griffith-Jones says the Bible was never intended to teach science and history. The first in a sense is true, yet no ancient book is so much in harmony with true science; and I venture to assert, as a life-long student of history, that it is the most accurate history in the world, and infinitely the most valuable for matters of fact. The author believes in the Elohistie and Jehovistic fragments of the higher critics, and regards Genesis down to and including the lives of the patriarchs, as a collection of myths, which, like the parables of our Lord, were made the vehicles of spiritual truth. With such a view I have no sympathy whatever. So-called myth in ancient times is no myth at all, but corrupted tradition, and the Bible stories are singularly pure traditions. Plato and Varro resolved heathen mythology into myth, in order to apologize for the exceeding vileness of the characters of the gods, but Euhemerus, who had seen the graves of some of these gods, knew better. Hengist and Horsa, Arthur, Tarquin, Hercules, even William Tell, Cinderella, Quetzalcoatl, and the Shifty Lad, are no myths, but corrupted traditions of real life. Go back far enough in history and you will find them, but not in the lands in the history of which the so-called myths stand recorded. The original Hengist, for instance, never saw either Saxony or Britain, and he was not a Saxon. He ruled in Babylonia, later probably than the time of the patriarch Jacob, as King of Uruk or Warka, and his name on his monuments is Sin Gasit. He was a Celt of the Celts, for Sin Gasit is the