

terms with them. So long as they do not, their logic is scientifically defective.

The Bible invites the most searching criticism. No theory of inspiration is required for its study. Such a theory must be formulated upon the basis which the facts disclose, and must give a satisfactory account of such discrepancies as may be brought to light. But we have a right to demand fair treatment. And a criticism which insists upon reading the supernatural out of court, which treats history with scant courtesy, which indulges in charges of wholesale and deliberate fraud, and which canvasses only a part of the evidence bearing on the case, demands concessions which can not be granted. Its logic is philosophically, historically, ethically, and scientifically defective.

III.—SOME RECENT REVISIONS OF SCIENTIFIC JUDGMENT CONCERNING BIBLE STATEMENTS.

BY JESSE B. THOMAS, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION, NEWTON, MASS.

ONE notices, occasionally, a blunt statement from some theologian, echoing perhaps, consciously or unconsciously, an oracular utterance from some scientific tripod, that "all intelligent persons" have ceased to defend the scientific trustworthiness of the Bible. One fervid Hebraist has gone so far as to charge with "sacrilege" any man who shall henceforth attribute a scientific character to the early chapters of Genesis, or attempt to gage their value by a scientific test. Such language carries with it an air of self-confidence, not to say of superciliousness, that ill becomes the gravity and complexity of the question to which it refers. Does the theological affirmant really mean to assure us, that to hesitate in assenting to his own conclusion is *ipso facto* to register oneself outside the class of "intelligent persons"? And does the Hebrew specialist ask us to admit, as a new form of "sacrilege," the refusal to be foreclosed by his authority from the formation of an independent opinion in a realm in which he does not even pretend to be a specialist? The late Professor Dana, of Yale University, affirmed the first chapter of Genesis to be a true "epitome of creation in a few comprehensive annunciations;" and this from a purely scientific standpoint. Is he, together with Sir J. W. Dawson, Arnold Guyot, and the other masters in physical research, who emphatically agree with him, to be toploftically waved aside from the class of "intelligent persons," or branded as "sacrilegious" for the utterance of convictions forced upon him and them by the concurrent study of God's Word and God's World?

If it be explained that the Bible is denied to be "scientific" only in the sense that it does not use language technically accurate, but