

battle may be longer, because of the greater age of the books and the greater lack of other historical material. But just as history vindicated the genuineness of the New, so archæology is marvellously coming to the defence of the Old. The trend to-day seems to be strongly in the right direction, and we may abide the ultimate result with composure and hopefulness.

The second phase of the discussion, now at its height, affects the value of the Book and the authoritativeness of its teachings. Admitting the genuineness of the documents, many are now discussing their inspiration and interpretation. Again we encounter a variety of views. Some still seek to explain it all as a merely human book, and maintain that natural development explains everything. Others grudgingly admit a divine element, but strenuously insist on the human. How far does the former go? What is the value of the latter? Is there, after all, any means of determining the soundness of any doctrine other than our own consciousness and reason? Since the human element is there, and "to err is human," and since the boundary between the divine and the human element is undetermined, must we not after all sit in judgment on Scripture teachings even where they are unmistakably clear? Is even Christ infallible? If He is, still what about Paul and Peter and John? If their teachings are repugnant to reason are we not bound to reject them? And so it comes to pass that we have a *new phase of rationalism*, a serious phase; for not only does it claim the right to accept or reject the teachings of Scripture, but it strikes even at the authority of Christ himself. Under its influence, and in the face of Christ's great commission, a learned Professor in a great Christian University, dares to pronounce the enterprise of Christian missions folly and failure!

This brief sketch is sufficient to show what one of the most striking theological features of our age is. Let me conclude it with a sentence or two from Bishop Ellicott. He says: "The active principle in the genesis and development of the analytical view is disbelief in, or inability honestly to accept, the supernatural." "Nought will stay the course of modern biblical criticism when once inability to accept the supernatural has become a settled characteristic of the soul." "If it be obvious that certain theories about the Old Testament must ultimately conflict