

ence which shapes public opinion, and fashions our literature, and regulates our education, and controls legislation, and dominates diplomacy. No party would dare to antagonize Christian conviction. Men who defiantly read the Decalog out of politics, and who blaspheme the name of Christ, are remanded to political obscurity. And the rationalistic critic has no other alternative than to say that this faith is all a delusion, that it is not real. All history, past and present, becomes an insoluble riddle, a most stupendous absurdity. And a logic defective in historical insight pronounces sentence against itself.

3. The logic of the rationalistic critics is ethically defective. The intolerance of many who pride themselves upon their liberality is simply monumental. The pastor of the most prominent Unitarian church in the city of Brooklyn recently preached a sermon, in which he is reported to have claimed that the denomination to which he belongs is the only one in which the thinking is honest and the utterance fearless. One can only pity the man who does not hesitate to bring such an indictment against well-nigh universal Christendom. It is only too evident that his knowledge of men is strangely superficial. It should have occurred to him that, in Hamilton's phrase, "the logic of contradictions is one," that the inclusive truth is always the fusion of logical exclusives; that in science, in political economy, in philosophy, in theology, the doctrine which presents no unsolved problems is *prima facie* false. It is one thing to challenge orthodoxy to make good its logical consistency; it is quite another thing to charge its advocates with hypocrisy, or cowardice, or ethical falsehood. But it is just here where the rationalistic critics are universally defective. They claim to have a monopoly of ethical honesty. They do not treat the witnesses whom they cross-examine with common decency. They browbeat them after the manner of third-rate attorneys. Criticism is serious work, and should be seriously conducted. The critic may not assume that he is more honest than the men or the documents dissected by him. And this holds especially with such a collection of documents as make up the Christian Scriptures, in which every chapter and paragraph renders homage to the supremacy of truth and duty. Whatever the Bible may not be, it certainly is most intensely ethically honest. It may be possible to make out that the writers were not absolutely infallible in the details of their narration; but to charge them with deliberate forgery, and with wholesale invention, is an assumption which a sane mind must indignantly reject. When Baur conceded that the primitive Christians believed that Jesus Christ actually rose from the grave, he punctured his elaborate destructive criticism. It is no solution of the problem thus presented to say that they were morally indifferent, and mentally incompetent to examine the ground of their conviction. They suffered exile, imprisonment, and death, by the thousands, for their faith; and martyr fires are not beds of down that men and women make haste to lie down in them. Yet this is the