

one resting on a basis of verifiable facts, the other on the unsupported and unsupportable assumptions of the modern scholar. The one is the method of archaeology, the other of the so-called 'higher criticism.' Between the two the scientifically trained mind can have no hesitation in choosing.

The value, indeed, of the method of the 'higher criticism' can be easily tested. We may know the tree by its fruits, and nowhere is this truer than in the domain of science. There is a very simple test which can be applied to the pretensions of the 'higher critic.' More than once I have challenged the advocates of the 'critical method' to meet it, but the challenge has never been accepted.

In both England and France books have been published of late years which we know to have been the joint work of more than one writer. The novels of Besant and Rice and of Erckmann and Chatrian are familiar instances in point. They are written in languages which are both living, which embrace vast literatures, and with which we believe ourselves to be thoroughly acquainted. And yet there is no Englishman who would undertake to say where

*The cases are not parallel. The moralists wrote together, and occasionally La Fontaine for himself. The Scripture documents of the one book were written within a hundred, & years apart.*