

weight. As the personal equation is of decisive force in the determination of all questions involving religion and morals, we ask, What do the authors and leaders of this criticism believe as to God, and Christ, and sin, and salvation? These authors and leaders are not slow to tell us that they do not believe in a God who has made any written revelation of Himself; or in Christ as anything more than a man. Of sin and salvation, they never say anything. One of these authors and leaders believed so little in God that he did not mention Him except as spoken about by others, and another of these chief authors proclaims himself a polytheist.

And who say that these are the great scholars and all the scholars of the world in the matter of the Bible? Only the men of their own party, who seldom read works written by opponents, and deny all scholarship to men who will not accept their premises and conclusions. Believers are called to stand and deliver up their faith in God, in Christ, in sin, in salvation, in God's revelation of Himself, on the authority of this band of fifty or sixty, led by unbelievers. That does seem rather pretentious and supercilious, seeing that if these fifty or sixty were swept away from their chairs thrice each year, their places could be readily supplied with just as good scholars from believing Christian ministers at home or in the mission field.

The line between "real scholars," "all the scholars," and "non-scholars," "no scholars," has been accurately drawn by an adherent of "all the scholars" in a critical journal: "We have no taste for evangelical criticism, and no confidence in an author's critical power whose principal argument . . . is derived from the authority of the New Testament." "There can be no argument between those who thus think, and historical critics of any school who do not accept their theological and critical postulates." All who bow to the supreme authority of God, of Christ, are thus waived off from an appreciation which they never sought and would not have if it were laid in their hand. They divide at Christ.

The only persons, then, who, according to this school, are real scholars, and competent to pass an opinion on their views, are men of their own band. Let us see, then, what two of the leaders of this criticism say of the whole method of criticism pursued by each other. Dillmann and Kuenen were men of real ability, of great learning, of unceasing labor. They were the leaders of the two wings of precisely the same general anti-Biblical criticism. By some sciolists in our land, Dillmann has been regarded as more orthodox than Kuenen; but his premises and conclusions are just as anti-Biblical as Kuenen's, and they just as effectually would sweep away all belief in the Bible as a revelation from God. There is no discount, therefore, to be placed against Dillmann because of Biblical or orthodox views. He criticizes* the whole method of Kuenen as false from

* "Numb. Deut. u. Josua," p. 597 f.