

Daily Newspapers instinctively feel that that style of answer is quite inapplicable and in all probability—if anything is to be learned from history—radically unjust to the individual scholar. It appears to them to be in its way a repetition of the well known advice telegraphed to the defendant's lawyer,—“we have no case, abuse the plaintiff,” and they at once range themselves on the side of the plaintiff; with this melancholy difference, however, that while they praise him for his liberality, sympathise with and admire him, they at the same time adopt the summary of his views given by the other side. And no wonder. Patience and some knowledge of the facts are required in order to understand his position, whereas no study is required in order to accept the account of it given by opponents. Just as thousands who sympathised with Giordano Bruno, Copernicus, Galileo and their successors in such fields as geology, anthropology, natural selection and evolution, found it much easier to accept the rough and ready declarations of theologians that the views of those men contradicted Scripture, than to understand the truths themselves that were being painfully groped after or the true relation of those truths to the revelation of God in the written Word and therefore believed the declarations and became infidels out and out, so to-day, there are hundreds of thousands who sympathise with Robertson Smith or Dr. Briggs and admire their scholarship, intellectual fearlessness and love of truth, yet have no time to examine their position and see that it gives a truer insight into the Bible than they had before. In these circumstances, the natural course for them is to accept the statements that the traditionalists make with the utmost confidence that according to it the books of Deuteronomy and Daniel, for instance, must be forgeries. They decide that Doctors of Divinity must know better than they the true bearings of this higher criticism on the sacred books and that it cannot be unreasonable to take such men at their word. The average youth puts the matter to himself somewhat as follows:—“On the one hand every eminent oriental scholar and unbiassed investigator who is at all in sympathy with the undoubted principles of modern criticism—with perhaps a single exception here and there that proves the rule—declares that Deuteronomy was not written by Moses, but by a Prophet in the reign of the young King Josiah and that the Book of Daniel was not written in the sixth but in the second Century B. C. On such matters, I accept the decision of experts as final. But on the other hand ministers and elders assure me that the Books then are forgeries and as that is a point on which