

in making known his will to mankind." This is true. On this point one sympathizes profoundly with Goldwin Smith, who holds that "inspiration can have no concord with myths—that when you admit the one you rule out the other." It seems abhorrent to the reverent Christian mind to base religious instruction on alleged events which never occurred. Such a conception is lowering to a proper respect for God. Of course when lessons are taught by means of parables, or the like, plainly stated or implied, no one thereby can possibly be misled.

### **The Call for a New Crusade.**

Mr. Jackson says: "It is hardly less than cruel to allow young men and women to grow up in the belief that those chapters are literal history, and afterwards to send them to a university." There may be here a play on the word "literal," but in other parts Mr. Jackson makes it plain that he denies the records to be historical in any form—that is, a representation of facts. He also says: "There are multitudes who have felt themselves driven silently and sadly to surrender the faith of their fathers because that faith has always been presented to them bound up with doctrine concerning man and the universe which they now know to be false."

Beliefs about the alleged facts of the murder of Abel, the translation of Enoch, the confusion of tongues or the preservation of Noah are not doctrines. The alleged facts upon which doctrines "concerning man and the universe" are usually based are that God created the heaven and earth and man, that man was tempted and fell into sin, and that thereby mankind