

the position of Mr. Gladstone vastly strengthened, by a recognition of more critical methods of Biblical study, we think that Professor Drummond's method of using the modern criticism loses sight entirely of some fundamental truths which the grand old man of faith and antiquated theology sees with magnificent distinctness.

Professor Drummond's interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis finds in it, viewed from the side of science, nothing more than a myth. He maintains, indeed, that this myth teaches divine truth of religion in a poetic form suited to the world's infancy. But while poetically true it is, as science, utterly without value. Of course, with such an interpretation Mr. Huxley can have no quarrel. But in spite of our respect for Mr. Huxley's science and Professor Drummond's modern theology, we cannot but think that Mr. Gladstone's faith has apprehended more truth than either of the others.

In the present triangular form of the discussion two grave questions are started with regard to that most remarkable ancient document presented to us in Genesis i. 1 ; ii. 3.

*First*,—Does the author of this document at all deal with the natural facts of cosmogony ?

*Second*,—If so, has he reached any abiding basis of great general truths ?

We are disposed with Mr. Gladstone, in opposition to the two great professors, to maintain the affirmative of both these questions.

We waive for the present the question of the age of the document, and of the history of its appearance in its present place and form. All admit that in its present form it is not later than the time of Ezra, and that certain fundamental outlines of it were known to Zoroaster, to the Etruscans, and to the Babylonians before the time of Moses. We readily acknowledge with Professor Drummond that the document in every form in which we meet it is essentially the product of the religious spirit. We will with him lay aside all theories of vision and other mechanical means by which it is supposed to