

low opinion which the rationalistic critics have of the men who were the authors and compilers of the Christian Scriptures. They are supposed to have invented the entire sacrificial ritual of the Old Testament, claiming for it divine sanction, and manufacturing for it its ancient historical setting. I do not impugn the honesty of the critics, but I do protest against their method of treating the original documents and their writers by the assumption of their ethical dishonesty. Such a wholesale indictment recoils upon itself. Its audacity is only equaled by its absurdity. For surely, he who would command confidence in his own ethical integrity must not be wanting in cordial recognition of the mental honesty of those whose clear and explicit testimony he undertakes to review.

4. Finally, the logic of the rationalistic critics is scientifically defective. It does not examine impartially, and with equal exhaustiveness, all the sources from which information may be gained. It concentrates attention upon literary analysis, and upon verbal niceties. It revels in catalogs of words, in etymologies, and varieties of style, and fancied theological diversities. Its horizon is narrow and confined. It is inattentive to external evidence. Such a book as that by Sayce, of Oxford, on "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," a writer whose competence no man will question, is an admirable correction of purely literary criticism. He insists that Oriental archeology has something to contribute in the debate; and the lofty airs of those higher critics who have more faith in philological dissection than in antiquarian discovery provoke him to say that there are "popes in the higher criticism as well as in theology." Canon Driver evidently does not have it all his own way in the great and ancient English university. Professor Sayce shows that with the excavations of Dr. Schliemann a new era began for the study of antiquity, and that the result has been a widespread modification of critical results in the department of classical history. The spade has refuted the analyst. And at the close of his volume he declares that the evidence of Oriental archeology is on the whole "distinctly unfavorable to the pretensions of the higher criticism. The archeology of Genesis seems to show that the literary analysis of the book must be revised, and that the confidence with which one portion of a verse is assigned to one author and another portion of it to another is a confidence begotten of the study of modern critical literature, and not of the literature of the past. Such microscopic analysis is the result of short sight." If any one should expect Professor Sayce to assume the place of an apologist, and to range himself with the older school of commentators, he will be grievously disappointed. He writes simply as an archeologist, and in so doing shows that the narratives of the Old Testament are not romances and theological fairy-tales, but trustworthy historical accounts. The higher critics have been slow to admit the new and revolutionary evidence. But the stones are crying out, and the literary critics must come to