

Professor Smith is too profound a student not to know that the account of the Fall in Genesis, which was once regarded by theologians as literal history, is now regarded by Christian scholars as *religious allegory*, an allegory, like a parable, being a form of narrative employed by the sacred writers to illustrate and inculcate spiritual truth. This portion of Scripture is an allegorical or a parabolical representation of the beginning of moral evil in human nature. While Paul uses the familiar form of Genesis in introducing the doctrine of Atonement, and, in that sense, connects it with the fall of Adam, the Apostle really connects the doctrine with the entrance of sin as a moral fact into human nature. When the essayist suggests that "the first step towards a rational appreciation of the Old Testament is to break up the volume, separate the acts of Joshua or Jehu from the teachings of Jesus, and the different books of the Old Testament from each other," he must certainly know that what he so sagaciously proposes is just what Christian teachers are doing and just what they have been doing for a great many years. Modern scholars do not put all the books of the Bible on the same level, or attach to all parts of it the same importance.

The story of Balaam is a *traditional account* of an ancient angelic appearance, belonging to a time when the idea of animals talking to men was practically universal, and is to be interpreted in harmony with that fact. The account of the sun and moon standing still also belongs to a time when men had no strictly scientific conception either of the nature of a miracle or of the constitution of the universe, so that physical phenomena which would now be called extraordinary would then be considered miraculous. The citation from the Book of Jasher, to which Dr. Smith refers, is part of an ancient Hebrew poem, which must be interpreted as Oriental poetry. Hence, consistently with the character of the account, the best modern expositors regard the extraordinary phenomenon it describes as a prolongation of the daylight by the ordinary laws of atmospheric refraction.

It is not the Hebrew Scriptures regarded as a sacred literature, however, but these Scriptures regarded as a supernatural revelation, which renders them, in the estimation of the essayist, a millstone to Christianity. "The time has surely come," he says, "when as a supernatural revelation they should be frankly though reverently laid aside." These Scriptures are now acknowledged by all scholars to be the record of a revelation which was received during a long period of time by a large number of men, who spoke or wrote on religious subjects as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, but who made use of a great variety of materials, traditional, historical, and philosophical, according to the fullest knowledge they had and the soundest judgment they possessed. Though he rejects the Hebrew Scriptures as a revelation in the obsolete sense which no modern scholar holds, yet, toward the conclusion of his article, he grants that the Old Testament may, so far as it is good, be a manifestation of the Divine. "As a manifestation of the Divine," he says, "the Hebrew books, teaching righteousness and purity, may have their place in our love and admiration for ever." In making this admission, he allows substantially the very thing which Christian scholarship maintains. If these books are a manifestation of God, they must not only, in some sense, be an inspired literature, but also, in some degree, contain a divine revelation. It is this divine element in them which distinguishes them from all other ancient writings.

In their inner spiritual contents, the Hebrew Scriptures are an organic part of