add anything to them, or take anything from them, or change anything in them; for it is a principle received by every Jew from his birth that these writings are the revelation of God, to cling to them as such, and if occasion should require, cheerfully to die in their behalf." Philo's testimony is equally strong. Moreover, it was because of their adherence to Scripture that the Jews suffered under the persecution of Antiochus.

And when to the tradition of the Jewish nation, we add that of the Christian Church, of the Apostles and early Christians who dwelt in the glow of Pentecost, of the great fathers and students and scholars, who have from the beginning known and used the Scriptures; of the Catholic Councils, and of the interrupted and universal assent of nearly two Christian milleniums, I think that the position of the "Traditionalists" is well nigh impregnable, and there is small danger that we shall ever have to lower the banner that floats over our heads, emblazoned with the Vincentian motto:

"Semper, Ubique, et ab Omnibus."

But it seems to me that the question of the trustworthiness of Jcwish tradition is a more serious one for the Higher Critics than they would care to acknowledge. In reality, it places them on the horns of a huge dilemma. For if, on the one hand, they accept Jewish tradition concerning the Bible, their criticism is falsfied; but if, on the other hand, they reject it, they no longer have any Bible to criticize. For how does it happen that the Higher Critics can read their Hebrew Scriptures? Without a knowledge of the vowel sounds they could not do so. Yet we know that the vowels remained unwritten from the time of the composition of the several books until about the middle of the eighth century! How, then, was the vocalization of the Old Testamen, preserved? There is no other re-