

fails to favor us with its definition. His nearest approach is to make indirect reference to myths as the "primitive ideas of primitive men." If the early narratives of Genesis then are only the "ideas" of men he thereby implicitly denies that they are a Divine revelation of facts. Finding several myths floating about in the limited intellectual world of the ancients on the subject of the creation of the world, the creation of man, the fall of man, the deluge, etc., the myth which happened to be current among the Hebrews was selected by God, not to teach the facts of the alleged events (for it contained no such record) but to teach certain religious lessons which Mr. Jackson alleges may be deduced from these myths. Why God espoused the Hebrew myth, while rejecting others, is not stated, though the impression is left that thereby He used good discrimination. We dwell thus at length on this phase of the discussion so that there may be no confusion as to what Mr. Jackson really means to teach.

The myth theory is the crux of this controversy; and of all possible explanations of these early chapters the mythical interpretation is the most degrading to the general tenor of Scripture. Dr. Driver (whom Mr. Jackson evidently admires) is one of the most advanced critics of England. Referring to the patriarchal record he thinks there are "reasonable grounds for concluding that the narratives are in substance historical." (Quoted by Dr. Orr in Prob. of Old Test., p. 59.) Mr. Jackson, fails, however, to leave us even this small crumb of comfort.

He says: "To some minds, however, it will seem a thing incredible that God should make use of myths