

the highest service in the end. God himself must wish us to know the truth, or He would not be true.

Let it not be supposed, therefore, in anything I shall say this evening, that I object to the criticism of the Bible or depreciate its value. Fair criticism is always legitimate. It is a condition of all progress in knowledge, as well as of assurance of results. But criticism itself may run mad. It may be imposed upon by its own ingenuity. It may degenerate into the shaping of facts to theories rather than a shaping of theories by facts. It may be ruled by preconceptions while avowedly applying the inductive method. It may make the whole arena of its labors much like a gymnasium given up to new and curious feats. It is to a criticism which is subjective, fantastic, and ruled by false principles that I object, not to a criticism which is objective, sober and reverent.

At the outset, the propriety, if not the right of anyone but an expert to deal with the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament has been challenged. Did I think this challenge well founded I should not have ventured to comply with the request of the Chancellor and Faculty to discuss some phase of this live and serious subject this evening. It is true, I have been following the course of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament for quite a number of years with deep interest. For some time I have read as widely as I could in its literature. At the same time I make no claim to be a specialist in this line of study. I do not believe, however, that I am, therefore, compelled to receive with silent submission and dumb assent all that the higher critics *par excellence* may give, or rather, leave us. A Ruskin, and many who are not Ruskins, can judge of

works ( beef, all original we have features beyond not many details. to an in be at th if there perhaps selves a is surely special problem of Glas speciali may fol upon th We s to put c to the historic New T their ta jected t searchin apostoli