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Chapter IV

THE TRADITIONALISTS' RESPONSE

The massive campaign against the critical approach to the Bible as it dawned on the British public in the work of Colenso and the essayists had largely subsided by the end of the 1860's. Another wave of popular material however swept the market two decades later in response to the spread of critical views on both an academic and popular level. Particularly disquieting was the publication in 1889 of Lux Mundi, a presentation of the Gospel in terms of the new movements in secular thought which allowed that the Bible was not an infallible record of exact historical truth. A sense of militant urgency characterized the material as the new thinking on the Bible came to be accepted by the leading teachers and clergymen of the day. David McIntyre, minister of Finnieston Church and principal of Glasgow Bible Training Institute, compared the higher criticism to the Arian controversy which claimed to have a monopoly on the support of scholars and churchmen. He quoted with dismay Farrar's assertion that, "I cannot name a single student or professor of any eminence in Great Britain who does not accept...the main conclusions of the German school of critics." Even more distressing was the fact that
these "retailers of German crudities" continued to profess the same faith as the ordinary devout believer:

It was a comparatively easy matter to deal with the sceptics of last century, because they kept their legitimate position outside all Christian profession. But when we find men holding the same sceptical views regarding the Old Testament Scripture, and yet abiding within the Church, entitled, so long as they are there, to all the privileges of it, the difficulties of contending with this hydra-headed foe are immensely increased.2

Another significant factor in generating this sense of urgency was the fact that biblical criticism was no longer contained within the walls of universities and divinity halls, but was penetrating the general literature and periodicals of the day.3 One author warned that an immense amount of literature was being produced daily to prepare the public to receive this new teaching.4 Alfred Cave, a notable opponent of the higher criticism cautioned those who believed that critical discussions were only esoteric in nature: "Be not deceived. What is done in these questions in the school, will reappear in the pulpit; what is won by the expert will ere long pass to the populace."5 Roderic O'Conor, in The Ethics of Moderate Criticism, wrote of a canon in one of the English cathedrals who freely admitted that the Church had been mistaken in many of her views about the Scriptures, and that he was purposing to unfold in his preaching some of the critical theories. Similarly the author regretted the fact that a layman believed it a good thing to teach the Bible in this new light to children, as it was impossible for educated persons to receive the
the present Scriptural instruction. Bishop Ellicott, in a note praising the work of a local clergyman defending the Bible, warned that the critical conclusions had been so popularized and so continually entered into the familiar publications of the day that every fresh argument for the faith should be heartily welcomed.

The material which this chapter examines proposed in a variety of ways to combat the spread of critical views at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. Strident in tone and repetitive in argument, most of the publications sought to refute the popular critical works by appealing to the common sense and ordinary intelligence of the Christian, and to the authority of Jesus and the Apostles. The bulk of the material involved pamphlets or books of some type, though the controversy raged in the conservative religious periodicals as well. Often individual clergymen and laymen felt called to speak out against the tide of public and scholarly opinion, although deliberate publishing campaigns were also launched. "Rationalism, neology and the wild surmises of biblical higher criticism" were countered by the Religious Tract Society in a series of "Present Day Tracts" begun in 1881. The S.P.C.K. appointed in 1870 a fourth Anti-Infidel Committee (which became the Christian Evidence Committee) to deal with the "pernicious and blasphemous" publications being circulated. Infidelity, said a special report, was alarmingly prevalent among the better educated as well as
the working classes, especially "scientific" infidelity. Many of the tracts printed earlier in the century to combat atheism and infidelity, such as Butler's *Analogy* and Paley's *Horae Paulinae*, were reprinted in the light of the new situation. £1,000 was also provided to remunerate the authors of new works. 9

A significant number of those authors who attempted to prevent the popular inculcation of criticism adopted a stance clearly in contrast to that of the opponents of skepticism in the 1830's and 1840's or even that of the opponents of Colenso and the authors of *Essays and Reviews*. The strict views of verbal inspiration popular among churchmen had been modified to some extent, at least among the educated. This modification did not mean that the Bible was accepted as errant in matters of salvation or even in matters of history and science. What was altered was the attitude adopted towards criticism of the Bible in general, and towards the way in which certain books and ideas originated.

Gavin Carlyle, for example, an adamant opponent of the higher criticism, made the point that "healthy" criticism had rendered a great service in making many parts of the Bible lively and interesting. 10 The legitimate or "healthy" criticism of which many of the traditionalists approved involved a process by which an interpreter of the Scriptures passed independent judgment, using the best means at his disposal, on the text, dates and genuineness of the biblical record. 11 The sole object of the critic was to achieve the truest and best understanding
of the Bible, a goal not incompatible with fervent and devout faith. The missionary writer George Rouse acknowledged for example that he had received much help from the textual critics. O’Conor concluded that biblical criticism was acceptable if it was "an intelligent, yet humble and reverent examination of the structure of God’s Word and a careful and scholarly endeavour to get the best reading of its text and general meaning; it is possible, lawful and deeply instructive".

The traditionalists we are concerned with also accepted some specific modifications with regards to the Old Testament. Some for example were willing to claim that revelation was progressive. Thomas Hodgkin told his readers that the less rigid views on the Bible could lighten the burdens of faith caused by the cruelty and immorality of the Old Testament. One could clearly see an upward movement from the low morality of Genesis to the prophets. Conservative scholars also cautioned that, "It would be unwise to meet with a decisive negative the asserted combination of different documents traceable in the books of the Pentateuch." John Kennedy, a vocal defender of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch claimed that this fact did not imply that Moses made no use of earlier documents, especially in the composition of Genesis. Nor did the Mosaic authorship preclude certain minor additions or changes in the sacred text, either by the lawgiver himself or by Ezra. The historical books, admitted Bishop Charles Ellicott, bore
plain and unmistakable marks of the work having passed through the hands not only of early compilers but of later editors and revisers as well. There were, in short, difficulties encountered in the conventional view of the Old Testament. As indicated in most of the popular works however the objections against the critical view were of a more fundamental nature than those which had been urged against the traditional. The latter rested more on problems of detail; the former on problems of general principle.

The Layman vs the Expert

The refutation of higher critical principles as conducted by the orthodox involved two major thrusts: certainty that when the canons of common sense and reasonableness were brought to bear on the conclusions of the critics, the latter would be found wanting; and faith that Jesus provided in his teaching a court of appeal which ruled finally and unequivocally against the new views on biblical authorship. We are concerned below primarily with this first thrust and its ramifications. In one sense the entire popular debate so far as orthodoxy is concerned may be considered as a controversy in which the layman, equipped with a degree of intelligence but more importantly with common sense and a breadth of vision, takes on the scholar who, while an expert in the field of linguistics, cannot "see the forest for the trees" and is therefore led to the most preposterous conclusions.
Indeed the "layman vs expert" theme is explicit in numerous publications and implicit in the way in which specific arguments are selected and developed. It was certain to appeal to many believers who needed the assurance that the scholars had not spoken the last word on the sacred book. As Bishop Ellicott claimed, in reference to an essay competition which he had sponsored, it was essential that common sense as well as the literary investigations of the experts in Hebrew scholarship be heard in such a discussion.22

What irritated most traditionalists was the tendency on the part of the critics to assume an exclusive right to dictate to ordinary readers what they could and could not believe about the Bible. The critical question was one in which "the man of letters and the believer have each much to say, and which will never be settled by the critics alone".23 The traditionalists almost without exception therefore attempted to examine the results of criticism from the point of view of ordinary intelligence and experience. Blomfield, for example, wished to bring the Hebraist and critic S.R. Driver "out of the clouds of Hebrew scholarship and into the world of ordinary intelligence and non-experts where common sense reigns supreme".24 Edward Wensley wrote that criticism was termed "higher", "because of the high learning and eminent skill of its advocates, who with undisguised contempt, pity the credulity of orthodox believers".25 O'Conor appealed to the laity as a power which could save the faith from lasting injury:
Let them consider what the Bible has been to man. Let them examine the critical literature of the day, and ask themselves, what does biblical criticism propose to leave to them? Then let them decide for themselves whether they will accept the new teaching or not. Again I remind them—they are a power!  

William Ritchie drew attention to the fact that men of practical ability had little or no sympathy with modern biblical criticism, and presented an impressive array of names to support his argument. Both prominent statesmen Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield took the side of the orthodox; the private letters of Prince Bismarck showed sympathy with biblical literalism and Lord Selbourne argued for the genuineness of Daniel.  

Gladstone, it was claimed elsewhere, represented the opinion of the cultivated and intellectual outsider who, while not qualified to search and test for evidence, was better equipped "to apply the conclusion to the general position, to estimate its effect, and to sum up the whole result".  

The peculiar advantages possessed by laymen considering the critical approach was made the central theme of the popular and widely circulated books of Sir Robert Anderson. Anderson, an ardent and strict evangelical, held the esteemed position of assistant commissioner of police in London. In his book on *The Bible and Modern Criticism* especially, he emphasized his belief that while the critics as witnesses could present believers with certain information about the biblical record, they could not act as judges on the veracity of the same
material. Ordinary believers were however becoming dependent upon the opinions of the critical scholars in matters which were once left to personal study and observation, and it was this tendency which Anderson sought to curb:

In his History of the Criminal Law Sir James Fitzjames Stephens places on record the matured judgment of the Judicial Bench that no kind of evidence needs more the test of cross-examination than that of experts. In no other sphere save that of religious controversy would sensible people accept the dicta of experts until they had been thus tested; and yet the history of the Higher Criticism movement gives abundant proof that no class of expert is more untrustworthy than the critic.

This reputation for untrustworthiness was due primarily to the fact that in the eyes of the layman, the critics formulated their theories on the basis of purely subjective criteria and not upon objective factual evidence. One traditionalist spoke of the "trained subjectivity of the modern critic". The subjectivity of the critics appeared to manifest itself in several ways: it led to a priori assumptions regarding the supernatural and it involved the operations of an inner consciousness in deciding on matters of linguistic variation and historical credibility. Such processes offended the traditionalists' sense of what was a reasonable approach to the Scriptures as well as what was the proper and legitimate role of criticism. It appeared to them that the Bible was being removed from the people by the implication that the truth of the Scriptures could only be ascertained via scientific method and acquaintance with ancient literature. The critics threatened all that had been gained by the
Reformation:

To divide the Bible into false and true, with whatever motive, has one necessary result. Whether that guide be Pope or 'scholar', he will take the Bible from mankind. The effect of papal usurpation in that respect, is written on the face of history. Can the usurpation of the scholar do better for us than that of the Pope? 32

Wolves in Sheep's Clothing

In numerous popular publications the English critics were accused of bringing to the biblical material certain a priori philosophic positions which radically influenced their conclusions. Most traditionalists immediately traced these subjective notions to the German scholarship of the day, admitted to be in many critical works the major source of information and inspiration. It was impossible to see for example how Driver could have written his Introduction without the material appearing in Wellhausen's Prolegomena. 33 Similarly Ewald and Kuenen were cited as having inspired a great many British scholars and clergymen. The problem was of course that these later German critics were out of the same mold as Baur and Strauss, and would have been called Deists in the eighteenth century. 34 D.K. Paton explicitly compared them to the rationalistic writers Voltaire, Paine and Bolingbroke, for they all agreed that the standpoint of critical inquiry into the Old and New Testaments must be naturalistic. 35 In an article on "Forgotten Higher Critics" it was pointed out that Wellhausen was "Tom Paine
translated into German" and that many of the results of modern criticism could be found in Voltaire's famous dictionary; the latter, had he lived in 1894, might have been made a professor of divinity at Oxford. \[36\] Wellhausen, like those rationalists who had gone before him, accepted the existence of a Supreme Being but could see no evidence of special revelation nor any difference between Christianity and the other major religions of the world. \[37\] More significantly, the interference of the divine in the natural world was was regarded as impossible.

The higher criticism of the Bible was regarded by the traditionalists as having been nurtured in such a rationalistic atmosphere. Anderson told his readers that Eichhorn, in setting himself to win back the cultured classes of Germany, defiled legitimate criticism by eliminating from the Bible every element to which the rationalists took exception. \[38\] This of course meant the elimination of narratives which contained miraculous occurrences as well as the elimination of the miraculous fulfilment of prophecy. "The Higher Criticism," claimed Anderson, "was promptly captured by this sceptical propaganda, and it has never shaken off its sinister influence." \[39\] Thus the critics questioned the age and veracity of the material in the Pentateuch in order to rid themselves of the many instances of divine intercourse with the ancient Israelites. They were forced for example to postulate a slow progression from barbarism since they could not accept supernatural revelation. \[40\] Likewise it was
claimed that, "The denial of the unity of the authorship of Isaiah originated in the denial of the supernatural." Blomfield went so far as to concede that, "Nor would the assignment of Isaiah xl-lxvi, to a pseudo-Isaiah be in itself a point of much importance, were it not clear that the bias which has influenced the rationalistic critics is the determination that Isaiah must not be allowed to have predicted anything which happened long after his own time." Carlyle concluded on this point that, "The presumption that all miracles are to be set aside without inquiry is an unintelligent assumption, having no basis in reason, or in science, or anywhere. It is dogmatism as when the Pope asserts his infallibility."

Many of the traditionalists were prepared to admit that the English critics shared neither the extravagances nor the gross irreverence displayed by many of the German scholars. The British critics in fact maintained a clear allegiance to the Christian faith, yet this was a point which, far from winning the conservatives approval, incurred their full wrath. Once again the standards of common intelligence were brought to bear upon the critical conclusions. The Deists and the rationalistic critics of Germany were at least willing to follow their discoveries to a logical conclusion, supposing that the discovery of fable and error in the Old Testament completely Shattered all belief in the New. All that one had to do was to look at T.K. Cheyne’s *Encyclopedia Biblica*, "l’enfant terrible" to the traditionalists, to see how far astray criticism
could lead. Here Christianity was reduced to a subjective superstition, a vague opinion supported only by nine dependable passages in the New Testament; the contributor, Schmiedel, blatantly denied the historicity of the miracles, the resurrection and the ascension, and denied that Jesus was God. Wellhausen however had at least resigned his theological chair, while his representatives in Britain lacked the clear-sightedness to do so. Anderson, after describing the bankruptcy of Harnack’s theology, summed up the situation thus:

This is the abyss into which Dr. Harnack’s teaching would engulf us. And the road which leads to it is the Higher Criticism. Not so, it may perhaps be said, with our English critics. But the explanation of this is simple. As a nation we are not as logical as the Germans, and most of our English critics still feel the power of truth which every free and fearless thinker recognises to be inconsistent with the principles and conclusions of the Higher Criticism.

What was most distressing to the traditionalists was the via media which the English critics claimed to hold. Clearly it was "betrayal with a kiss". Moderate criticism started on the premises of advanced German criticism and in some way best known to the critics contrived, at the other end, to square its final conclusions with those of the ordinary believer. This, the popular publications claimed, was impossible. For one thing, if the accounts of supernatural occurrences in the Old Testament were doubted, there was no reason not to doubt the supreme miracles of Incarnation and Resurrection. Stanley Leathes declared that, "The same critical spirit which rejects the Old Testament record on presumably critical
grounds of a slender and subjective character, will, in all consistency, be compelled before long to reject also the narrative of our Lord's miracles, and will find themselves unable to stop at that of His own Resurrection.  

Also, according to the critics, the Old Testament gave men a totally false view of the history of Israel and the dealings of God with his people. The Pentateuch, which set out the basis for the salvation history of the New Testament, was composed at a late date largely from "loose rubbish".  

Also, while the critics denied that long-term predictions were a part of the prophetic work, they admitted that the prophets of old did speak of the coming Messiah. D.K. Paton claimed of George Adam Smith,  

Can anyone account for the striking incongruity of such statements? Does the Professor want to appear to be keeping step with the advancing 'Higher Critic' cliques, and at the same time wish to be reckoned quite orthodox?  

He may have been able to reconcile this conflict within himself, but it was something ordinary Christian people could not grasp.  

The traditionalists also marvelled at the way in which the critics could continue to talk about an "inspired Bible" even though they maintained that some parts were clearly immoral and that others were fraudulent deceptions. Unbelief had assumed a new and strange form which a former generation of infidels would have disdained; these eager opponents of the Bible exalted inspiration as if it were a reality.  

No one with common
sense could see how such gross errors of history could be co-existent with the revelation of God, let alone be vehicles for that revelation. Further, such a view of inspiration based upon what "found" a man in the depths of his soul was allowing the human creature powers far beyond that which his fallen nature would permit. Indeed, in exegesis and interpretation, criticism constantly depended upon the "faculty of intuition" which had to supply the deficiency of the sources. The only outcome eventually could be the denial of faith and unbelief. Anderson could see no difference in the end between what the German scholars and what the moderate British critics offered:

The one set of writers hands me a purse of coins, with the assurance that most of them are genuine. The other set of writers hands me a purse of coins, with a warning that most of them are counterfeit. But as I am unable to distinguish between the base coins and the gold, honesty forbids my trading with any of them, and therefore all my seeming wealth is practically useless. In either case the Bible is like a lottery bag from which blanks and prizes must be drawn at random. If one section of the critics may be trusted, the prizes abound; if the other section be right, the blanks predominate, but in either case... faith is impossible, and therefore Christianity is destroyed.

Most puzzling of all for the ordinary Christian was the claim of the moderate critic that his faith rested on an authority independent of the Bible. O'Conor raised the question,

But where, may I ask, do they profess to get these other and independent premisses? I cannot conceive where, if it be not from Scripture - from some portion of God's revelation to mankind. And, if this be so, what is
the position of the critics? Are they not still depending on the same structure, which they have laboured hard to prove owns a bogus foundation?53 Another author warned that there was, simply, something most mysterious in the critical position which required explanation.54 The question of authority for faith as raised in the popular material had already provoked an inquiry into alternative grounds for faith in the theological world. The most accepted solution was some type of assent in the inner consciousness of the believer. To the ordinary Christian however the problem appeared to be exceedingly difficult and the alternatives dangerous. Not only did men such as Colenso teach that the Bible contains innumerable errors, but also that men must "look for the sign of God's Spirit speaking to them in the Bible, in that which their own hearts alone can be the judges", so that they could accept in Scripture only what their own dark and perverted minds think true.55 In his work on Bible Truth and Broad Church Error, Ritchie also claimed that the Christian faith required "a distinct and patent fact on which to rest that not philosophers alone can grasp by subtle thought, but which simple minds can embrace, in humble faith"; and yet who did not see that this hypothesis of religious consciousness, as the source of inspiration, "is the very opposite of clear and plain. What is it, how does it exist in the Christian heart, under what conditions does it operate, to produce the great results ascribed to it?"56 "To
abandon the written word as a ground of faith," declared one writer in The British Weekly, "is to hand ourselves over to mysticism and delusion. We shall require to have a pope, an apostolical succession, and perpetual miracles after all."57

Could the great events of the faith — salvation, resurrection and eternal life — still command allegiance if they depended solely on a man's inner powers of verification? Was there no objective evidence with which the skeptic could be confronted? Was the frail and changeable human to become the measure of all things of faith? What about those individuals who did not have the inner witness of the Spirit? Were they to go back to the discredited Word? The final outcome could be nothing but despair, as men learned that there was no such thing as absolute truth and right in the universe. R.C. Jenkins concluded that,

The authors of new and specious theories are generally fascinated with the immediate results of their conclusions as not to be able to foresee the new and insuperable difficulties that would arise at their inception. That these in the present case would be of the most remarkable kind no one who can realise the chaos which this bouleversement of the entire Christian system of Judaism, and of Christianity itself would produce, can fail to anticipate.58

Subjective Fancies of the Higher Criticism

Subjectivity characterized not only the way in which the critics decided on what could and could not be believed, but it also determined the evidence on which they
based their "assured results". A great deal was made of the fact that their evidence would not stand up in a court of justice, because it was the product of their own "inner consciousness" or "spiritual instinct". "They may well be a wonder of the world, and they may deserve a niche among the most ingenious writers of fiction in this or any age."59 Two of the most obvious ways in which this subjectivity manifested itself was in the imposition of an evolutionary pattern of development on the Old Testament, and in the use of the "internal" evidence of style and tone to prove their theories. More important, the traditionalists made much of their belief that the internal evidence of the critics was flatly contradicted by the objective facts of history and archaeology.

Singled out for particular denunciation was the documentary hypothesis developed by Wellhausen and popularized in the work of Driver and Robertson Smith. The Old Testament history as preached by the critics was based on the vivid imaginations rather than upon historical evidence.60 It was colored primarily by a particular evolutionary philosophy which forced scholarly men to come to the most absurd conclusions in the light of both common sense and Christian faith. On the basis of evolution it had been judged possible and desirable to break up the books of the Old Testament into fragments and to rearrange those fragments in such a way that the progress from barbarism to civilization would be accounted for.61 It was quite incredible to suppose that the middle or prophetic parts of the Scriptures were built before the foundation,
yet, "the scientific critic tells us it was virtually first set up in the middle. The foundation was 'adjusted' afterwards, and was composed largely of loose rubbish, and yet many scientific reasoners further tell us, they believe that the apex of this extraordinary structure bears up the great truth on which our salvation depends!"  

Furthermore the critics had the arrogance to give names and dates and limitations to these fragments, and to speak of the authors as if they had real, substantial existence. Blomfield reminded his readers that as distinct entities, these authors existed purely in the minds of the German scholars and their English followers; they had no atom of proof except that which could be called "internal evidence".  

William H.G. Thomas recognized that,

There may be some certain discernible marks and signs of difference in age and authorship. But that any critical microscope, in the nineteenth century, can be so exquisite and so powerful as to dissect the whole with perfect nicety, to decompose it and assign each separate paragraph to its special origin in three, four or five more independent documents,...this seems to me a task which no mastery of the Hebrew language, with all its hundred tongues...can achieve.

The "scrapmonger" Driver for example assigned without hesitation the first half of Genesis 21:1 to J, the second half to P; the first half of verse 2 to J and the second half as well as verses 3 to 5 to P; verses 6 to 31 and the first half of verse 32 to E; to JE the second half of 32 and 34, and to J, verse 33.

The use of internal evidence or evidence derived from an examination of the biblical books themselves was another
way in which the critics gave free reign to their personal prejudices, excluding the ordinary believer from the critical process. One of the most vocal cases against internal evidence was that made by the traditionalist John Kennedy. Kennedy pointed out that what one interpreter saw as a change in style or in theological emphasis was simply not enough proof that two or more authors were responsible for the material at hand. It was suggested for example that the differences in Hebrew to which the critics drew attention was probably due to provincialisms such as those occurring in various regions of England. Also, stylistic nuances and subtleties of tone were difficult to grasp in an ancient and alien language, and it was certainly unfair to make them the reason for postulating two or more authors of a book or passage. McIntyre pointed to Macaulay's review of the Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay as instructive on this point. Here Macaulay claims there was no doubt that Samuel Johnson revised Cecelia, yet Johnson denies that he ever saw the book before it was printed.

So if Macaulay in trying to distinguish two authors whose writings are in English, of recent date, and well-known to him in other works beside the one in question, failed, what is the likelihood that Cornhill had succeeded in his endeavour to distinguish twenty authors, whose writings are in Hebrew, of remote dates, and wholly contained in the work under review? 67

Kennedy dealt with two additional characteristics of critical methodology to emphasize his point. Quoting the English critic T. K. Cheyne's opinion that, "the peculiar expressions of the later prophecies are, on the whole,
not such as to necessitate a different linguistic stage from the historical Isaiah," Kennedy claimed that there was no linguistic necessity for the theory of a dual or plural authorship at all. He provided for his readers, in fact, quotations from Driver and Delitzsch as well, admitting that the a priori arguments on the basis of language for Second Isaiah were weak enough to be ignored. Cave informed his readers that even Kuenen and Wellhausen believed that evidence based on style and language were weak and uncertain, and that better ground for debate was the relevant historical evidence.

One of the most violent attacks on the philological investigations of the critics was conducted by Emil Reich, a free-lance writer and lecturer. Reich declared that the higher criticism was "bankrupt as a method of research and pernicious as a teaching of religious truth"; it was a "perversion of history and a desecration of Religion". The nineteenth century was plagued by the worship of the philologists who were permitted to hold an undisputed dictatorship on everything pertaining to antiquity. In the past their "ravings" had been confined to a demolition of the ancient classics; now however there was real cause for alarm, for the critics threatened the very foundation of the Christian faith. A valid interpretation of the biblical record, claimed Reich, involved not the study of words, but a study of the personality and motives behind those words. Reich gave several examples of the "philological jugglery" which had
452

duped the public:

Joshua...is the sun. For he is the son of Nun, and does not Nun being interpreted mean fish and does not the sun at the spring equinoctial issue of the constellation of Pices? What could be more conclusive? Besides, does it not amply explain why Joshua’s companion is Caleb? Now Caleb is Kaleb, and Kaleb is Kelb, and Kelb is a dog. So of course Caleb is clearly put for the dog-star Sirius.70

Reich went on to describe at great length how the history of ancient nations had to be constructed, not on the basis of a philological study, but on the basis of geography or geo-politics. The critics for example ignored the fact that as the Hebrews formed a border nation which was constantly threatened with imminent absorption at the hands of the huge empires around them, they developed an intellectual and spiritual resistance. Monotheism particularly offered them a staying force during times of national peril, a fact which was more in line with the traditional view of biblical history. The Hebrew personalities were also neglected by the critics, yet common sense could see that the success of their religion depended upon personalities. Once an event such as the Exodus was admitted, we were constrained to acknowledge an organizing personality behind the event. Tradition claimed it was Moses; Reich claimed that Christians had no reason to doubt this. Yet when the Bible was handled exclusively by men who were unacquainted with the realities of life and trained only for an abstract mode of thought, such enormous omissions inevitably occurred. Their cardinal sin above all was the belief that religious ideas were children of the intellect rather
than the offspring of concrete historical events:

They ignore that the aristocrats among ideas such as monotheism are the rainbow visible only after tempests, torrents of rain and wild storms. They think that ideas are those puny things that arise when one learned infirmity embraces the other in the form of a quotation.71

Numerous traditionalists also stressed that the internal evidence of language and style would be much more credible if all of the critics agreed on such evidence. The opposite however was true, and the conventional believer was encouraged to take heart. The evidence available only to those with "spiritual instinct" had created a "succession of nebulous theories which gather and disperse at the stroke of the magician's wand".72 Kennedy warned his readers of the existing chaos, saying, "It would be amusing, were it not painful, to observe how one after another of them, most learned, most painstaking, most conscientious, is most positively certain that his brother critic was altogether mistaken in supposing that this passage or that was not written by Isaiah."73 Another popularizer clearly and unhesitatingly linked the critical chaos with such internal evidence:

They (the critics) tell us that they can point out how much Moses wrote, or how much Isaiah wrote, or how much other people wrote, by an inner consciousness, a capacity which enables them to detect various styles and variety of treatment; and yet in spite of this inner consciousness they contradict each other, and we find almost as many schools of critics as there are separate critics...The fact is, each man re-edits the Bible according to his own nature, or wish, or idea, so that it becomes merely a book after his own heart.74
It was impossible to keep up with the rapidly changing theories of the critics. One periodical told the story of the gentleman brought before a magistrate for knocking a person down in Fleet Street. "His apology was he was in a great hurry. He had a new work on the higher criticism of the Old Testament, and he wanted to review it before it was superseded."^75 Even Driver's Introduction was already "in the rear", speaking of the Hexateuch rather than the "Octateuch". What believers were left with after the critics had done their work was a chaotic mass of contradictory theories, not one of which had been proven. The critics built on "presumptions and pretensions" and the best they could offer were conjectures. Clearly these were not worth the price Christians were called upon to pay - the sacrifice of their faith.

**The Sure Facts of the Biblical Record**

Most of the traditionalists conceded to the superior knowledge of ancient languages possessed by the critics as well as to the less educated nature of their audiences, and conducted their debate against "internal evidence" on general terms, rather than refuting, for example, specific philological arguments. They struck at the very validity of using "inner consciousness" and "spiritual instinct" in a scientific enterprise, rather than refuting the literary conclusions to which this instinct had come. They were more bold and specific however when it came to refuting the "assured results" of criticism from an objective
historical perspective. In the popular publications the "subjective fancies" of the critics were contrasted with the "facts" of history and archaeology. It was an exercise which could be more readily presented to the layman, and which appeared to the neutral observer to strike a decisive blow in favor of the conventional views of the Bible. There was a strong eighteenth century flavor to this aspect of the debate, as attempts were made to prove that the biblical history was correct, and that the apparent contradictions in the material could be reconciled. As Edward White claimed:

A dry verbal criticism, whether higher or lower, is not the only condition according to Christ, of understanding these ancient and sacred writings...An immense knowledge of ancient and oriental languages is quite compatible with scepticism of temper, and even spiritual blindness; and indeed in some cases equally compatible with the lack of vigorous historical imagination.\(^7\)

One of the most important "facts" in favor of the traditionalist argument was the weight of tradition itself, and this was singled out for constant attention in the popular publications. The ordinary believer could greet those who treated the venerable traditions of two thousand years as if they were old wives' tales only with sorrow and distrust.\(^7\) The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch had been accepted by the Jewish nation of all ages. It could not be overturned easily or lightly by the subjectivities of the experts. According to the canons of sound criticism, claimed Kennedy, a uniform unbroken tradition as to the authorship of an ancient book possessed evidential value and could not be set aside except for very strong reasons.\(^7\) Significantly, the
traditionalists drew from this the implication that the burden of proof lay with those who called the tradition into question, and there were no good, solid, objective reasons for adopting the critical conclusions. Similarly, the whole fabric of Jewish national life - its faith, polity and worship - depended upon the Pentateuch, and since numerous facets of this life, such as the great annual celebrations, could be traced to the time of Joshua, the books which described such practices must be as old or older. Thus, Kennedy concluded, they must be of Mosaic origin. In the prophets and Psalms in fact there were "incidental references without number to the laws and facts of the Mosaic history with exhortations and rebukes which imply or are based upon the laws and teachings of the books of Moses". The fourth chapter of Amos, Psalm 78 and Psalm 6 all made it clear, either implicitly or explicitly, that a book bearing the title "The Law of Moses" was known from the days of Joshua.

The situation was much the same regarding the authorship of Isaiah. The critics had created an atmosphere of uncertainty and doubt with regards to the later chapters of the book which had left the way open for settling the matter on subjective grounds. But the traditional theory of authorship had the force of time behind it. The Jews as well as Jesus and the Apostles believed the entire work to be that of Isaiah, the son of Amoz. The compilers of the Septuagint clearly believed that the whole book was the work of one prophet. Ben Sira, the
learned author of Ecclesiasticus also asserted the unity of authorship. The examples were endless throughout the history of the Jewish and Christian people.\footnote{33}

A subsidiary point of the popular emphasis on tradition as a defense was the persistent examination of what the books of the Old Testament stated themselves on matters of authorship. It took only common intelligence to see that the actual text supported the Bible as the infallible revelation of God by proving the conventional views to be correct. A strong presumption in favor for example of the early or Mosaic dating of Deuteronomy was the report given in the first five verses of the book. Here it was clearly and plainly stated that the words were those of Moses. This did not mean that the last chapter concerning the death of Moses was not added by another hand, nor that the marginal notes were not later added by Ezra; the critical theory however was \textit{prima facie} unlikely and would have to be supported by very strong and indisputable evidence. In a similar fashion, the unity of Isaiah was upheld. The title of the book in the first verse should have removed any doubts; it clearly referred not, as Cheyne claimed, to a small collection of prophecies on Judah and Jerusalem, but to the entire body of material following the first verse of the second chapter. This was obvious to even the most unlearned reader.\footnote{34} The critics however continued to argue that nowhere in chapters 40 to 66 was it claimed that these prophecies were delivered by Isaiah. Kennedy turned the tables, arguing
that nowhere did they say they were not delivered by the eighth century prophet. He made the point that the anonymity of the later chapters, if not written by Isaiah, was unparalleled in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament. 85

The critics, it was claimed, supported many of their a priori assumptions by pointing to alleged historical inaccuracies or contradictions in the Old Testament text. The traditionalists however argued for a more "reasonable" approach to some of the troublesome texts, which became less puzzling when approached with a degree of common sense. Blomfield for example pointed to the tendency of critics such as Driver to exaggerate the apparently inconsistent manner in which the duties of the priests and Levites are stated in the Deuteronomic and legislative material. 86 It was, in fact, one of the main arguments in favor of separate documents according to the critics. Blomfield refuted this by looking at a situation more familiar to his audience: The clergymen in the Church of England were called "bishops, priests and deacons" in the Prayer Book, "clergy" in Parliament and "parsons" in the colloquial slang of the day. Church members and government officials had no problem in remembering that the terms "clergy" and "parson" contained within them a distinction of status. So Moses in Deuteronomy, as a "people's book", intended only to use the general classification of "priests", leaving it to readers to distinguish between the "priests" and "Levites" so far as duties were concerned.
There were many other examples of critical "over-reaction" to certain passages. Balfour, in Deuteronomy: The Words of Moses on the Plains of Moab, answers the critical query of why God was so displeased, if Deuteronomy was written by Moses, when the Israelites asked Samuel for a king, considering that Deuteronomy laid down regulations concerning the choice of a king. Balfour reminded his readers that God was not offended by the request for a king, but by the motives which prompted it and the spirit in which it was made. The people had shown that they wished to get rid of their direct dependence on God.

While common sense would expose many of the critical theories as baseless, the conventional believers also had at hand, via the popular articles and books, certain more complex historical information which clearly and objectively defended the authority and inspiration of the Bible. This aspect of the debate served to dispel the belief that it was only the trained scholars who could profitably examine the questions of criticism.

Were it indeed a matter of linguistic criticism only, there might be valid ground for this strangely common opinion; but when the field of controversy is enlarged and the chief stress is laid upon 'historical criticism', it is evident that we are no longer constrained to accept, without question, methods and conclusions upon which it is admittedly competent for every well-educated person to form an opinion.

The bulk of the "factual" material which was set against critical "fantasies" was in fact drawn from the archaeological investigations of the day. The argument from archaeology was so significant in the popular debate that
it is independently dealt with in the next chapter. There were attempts to show however that the historical material in the Bible was accurate, even when subjected to the scrutiny of historical investigation.

Sir Robert Anderson, in his book *Daniel in the Critics' Den*, dwelled at length on the alleged historical errors of Daniel which made the book suspect in the eyes of the critics. The critics, and particularly Farrar in this case, questioned the historicity of Darius the Mede as well as the accuracy of the very first verses of the book giving the place and date of the stories. The critics noted that Jehoiakim reigned from 608 to 597 B.C., so that the third year of his reign would have been 606 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar did not become king until 605, and it was not until some four years later, according to II Kings 24:1, that he subdued Jehoiakim, making him tributary for three years. Thus, there was no general deportation in the third year of Jehoiakim nor would it have been possible for Nebuchadnezzar to have invaded Judah until after Egypt had been taken in the battle of Carchemish, in the fourth year of the Judean king's reign.

In refuting these critical contentions, Anderson pointed to the testimony of the Babylonian historian Berosus who claimed not only that as head of his father's army, Nebuchadnezzar had invaded Palestine, but that he also had with him "captives he had taken from the Jews". Moreover, the historian made it clear that the battle of Carchemish was fought in Jehoiakim's fourth year, and
therefore after Nebuchadnezzar's accession, whereas the invasion of Judea was during his father's lifetime, and therefore in Jehoiakim's third year, precisely as the Book of Daniel claimed. "Could corroboration of the Scripture be more complete and emphatic?", asked Anderson. He added that nowhere did Scripture mention a "general" deportation such as the critics were quick to challenge. The narrative in fact is quite explicit in calling the selected captives "children", a fact in keeping with the Jewish tradition of reverence for the counsel and wisdom of young men.

Anderson's vindication of Darius the Mede depended more on his common sense than on actual historical evidence. It was unlikely that the king was a pure fiction, for the writer would have had no reason for inventing such a person; he could have easily assigned the events of chapter 4 to any other reign. It was impossible that the reference was sheer blunder. Even granting that the author was not Daniel, he was obviously a man of great erudition, with access to historical records as well as the works of Ezra, Haggai and Zechariah. Another popularizer attempted to solve the problem by claiming that Darius was clearly a subordinate of Cyrus, and this is why his name did not appear on the newly-discovered tablets.

The external "facts" of topography and history were also called to the defense of the unity of authorship in Isaiah by Kennedy. Kennedy contended that the Babylonian standpoint of the later chapters, of which the critics made so
much, was far from certain, and that he could use the evidence of the critics themselves to prove his point. Ewald for example had not only failed to see this Babylonian coloring, but claimed that chapters 40 to 66 had an Egyptian background instead. George Adam Smith admitted that the Babylonian argument was a weak one, but attributed the Palestinian allusions to the exiles' longing for Zion. Even T.K. Cheyne admitted that references to torrent beds, such as that found in Isaiah 57:5, were wholly unsuited to the alluvial plains of Babylon. Kennedy concluded that there was only one possible reference to Babylon which distinctly favored a late date, and that was in 46:1; readers could assume therefore that "so far as local environment is indicated, the standpoint of the author is not Babylonian but Palestinian".23

Refuting the Literary Evidence

The method selected by the traditionalists to refute the critical conclusions usually involved a comparison of the evidence based on subjective fancies with that provided by the objective facts of history, geography and archaeology. The popular publications of the time tended to place a lower priority on refuting the conclusions of literary criticism, mainly, as we have seen above, because they so often involved linguistic skills not available to either author or reader, or because they were associated with judgments based on a spiritual instinct which in itself provoked the wrath of the conventional
believer. There were however some attempts to deal in a simple fashion and on the basis of common sense with some of the literary conclusions of the critics.

One of the most fundamental canons of criticism, discovered at the very outset of the movement, was that the two names for God used in the Pentateuch indicated that the work of two different authors was present. The final outcome was, according to the traditionalists, an absurd situation in which individual verses were torn to shreds. There was however a perfectly reasonable explanation for the two names in the author's desire to illustrate the different relationships between God and man. Darby in fact expressed sarcastic surprise at such learned men being unable to distinguish between "God" used abstractly as a supreme and self-sufficient being (El Shaddai), and a relative name in which he makes himself known to men in a special relationship (Jehovah). It was a proposition which even the most simple-minded could grasp: "My father is a man, but besides that he is my father without ceasing to be a man."94 The work of the critics, in this respect, while proving worthless so far as dissecting the Pentateuch was concerned, had at the same time thrown a great deal of light on certain passages which could only lead to a deeper understanding of the Bible.95

Another literary observation which led to the documentary hypothesis was the repetition of certain narratives throughout the Pentateuch. Again however the contradictions and repetitions challenged by the critics simply did not
exist. The first chapter, introductory not only to Genesis but to the whole Bible, "was a grand picture of the renovation of the earth for man up to man's creation". The second chapter was a special account of man as he appeared on the earth as the Lord of Creation, to be contrasted afterwards with the Fall. "It has a distinct aim," concluded Carlyle, "and does not contradict the first." 96

There was finally the attempt of Anderson to refute Farrar's assertion that the presence of Greek words in Daniel "demanded" a late date for the book. He began with an illustration which pointed out the unreasonable dogmatism of the critics:

The story was lately told that at a church bazaar in Lincoln, held under episcopal patronage, the alarm was given that a thief was at work, and two of the visitors had lost their purses. In the excitement which followed, the stolen purses, emptied of course of their contents, were found in the bishop's pocket. The Higher Criticism would have handed him over to the police! Do the critics understand the very rudiments of weighing evidence? The presence of the stolen purses did not 'demand' the conviction of the bishop. Neither should the presence of the Greek words decide the fate of Daniel. 97

The question remained however: How did such words come to be found in the Book of Daniel? The Talmud, Anderson told his readers, claimed that Daniel was later edited by men of the Great Synagogue, and that this was the most likely source of such philological difficulties. Also, contrary to the evolutionary presuppositions of the critics, a highly literate civilisation was thought to have existed around the Mediterranean Sea at an early stage.
This left open the possibility therefore "that there was intercourse and contact between the Canaanites or Hebrews in Palestine and the Greeks of the Aegean as far back as the age of Moses."98 The final blow however to the critics, and indeed to their whole preoccupation with literary evidence so susceptible to manipulation, was that the Greek words in themselves were trifling. They consisted only in the names of musical instruments which were probably developed in Greece and carried to Babylon. Once again Anderson asserted that the proper place for the critics was in the witness box and not in the judgment seat.

"Therefore when Professor Driver announces 'the verdict of the language of Daniel,' he goes entirely outside his province. The opinions of the philologist are entitled to the highest respect, but the 'verdict' rests with those who have practical acquaintance with the science of evidence."99

A Want of Empathy with the Human Race

It was also drawn to the attention of the ordinary believer that the experts lacked an understanding of certain basic traits common in human behavior and in the process of developing and preserving a literary tradition. Any man with only a minimum amount of intelligence and sympathy with his fellow men would realize that because a law was not obeyed, this did not mean that it did not exist. There were numerous examples of such ignorance again making
it clear that the layman was far more competent to judge
the validity of critical theories than was the scholar.
If for example the critics would admit that the writers
of the Bible were not fools, a very large proportion of
the difficulties in interpretation would be removed. 100
"I plead," said Blomfield, "for a criticism of a saner
sort, such as we should employ in the ordinary course of
life, or to apply to a modern author; a criticism that
shall start by admitting that the writer possesses ordi¬
mary intelligence, and knows fairly well what he is writing
about; that shall then interpret his words in a fair and
common sense fashion, and be bold enough, when necessary,
to confess its own ignorance." 101 Instead however the
experts imposed upon the ancient literature the "habits
and usages" of the modern writer; when the biblical
authors were found wanting, they assumed that the irreg¬
ularities indicated a diversity of authors or a later
interpolation.

This was seen most obviously in the critical treatment
of the Pentateuch. The critics assumed that every writer
always writes alike, and therefore that only one compos¬
ition of any author could be proven genuine. This,
claimed the traditionalists, had some absurd implications:

The satires of Horace must be spurious, because
he was a lyric poet; the Georgics of Virgil,
because he was an epic poet; the Plaideur of
Racine because he was a tragic poet. One half
of Aristophanes and Shakespeare might be thus
made to prove the other half to be a forgery. 102

Likewise, the Sir Walter Scott who wrote Marmion could not
be the author of Tales of a Grandfather. It never occurred to the critics that a figure such as Moses could have changed his ideas or his style, or that he could have contradicted himself. Moses was not however an immovable and unchanging character; his views were determined, and altered, by what was best for his people. Keeping such considerations in mind, the conventional believer could challenge the premises of the argument against the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. As the people were about to embark upon a settled life in Canaan, it was only natural that he modify some of the laws given at Sinai. Also, Deuteronomy was a hortatory address given at the end of Moses' life to dear friends. It is not surprising therefore to find a style more fervent, free and popular than that found in the legal books.

There were other mistaken assumptions which the critics held about the biblical writers. The critics claimed that one of the factors working against an Isaianic authorship of chapters 40 to 66 was that nowhere in this material was the name of Isaiah mentioned. This, according to Paton, was a valueless argument. It was quite exceptional for an author, either ancient or modern, to repeat his name in the book which he writes. In the past the practice had been to put the author's name at the beginning of the work only, a convention which Isaiah has followed. Furthermore, it was difficult to imagine that one such as Isaiah who was charged by God with important messages not only to his own people but to all nations and ages should not have taken the trouble
to give his prophecies a "fixed form" and proper certification. It was not credible that he should leave his writings in such a loose and fragmentary condition that critics found it difficult to determine whether some prophecies that bear his name are his or not. 107

The behavior of the biblical writers in fact showed that the conventional theories deserved popular allegiance. Those who were very familiar with the biographies of the Old Testament could see that they bore traces of life-like and inimitable reality. The Abraham story particularly was too life-like and detailed to be either a product of the imagination or an oral tradition told by ignorant heathens. "The popular literary instinct of the whole human race, both in the East and in the West, declares for its reality, and the deeper the spiritual nature, the firmer the critical conviction, that the story must be true, authentic, and, in its original sources contemporary." 108

Not only did the critics hold false assumptions about the biblical writers, but they misrepresented the behavior of the Jews to whom the Old Testament was entrusted. It was incredible both from a practical and logical standpoint that so much "pseudonymous" material could have been added to the biblical text, and especially to the Pentateuch, or that the people of Israel, after the Exile, could have made such drastic changes in their national life. How far for example could a fraud such as that of the Deuteronomist have been carried out? If the parchment found in the temple did not look 800 years old, why did
the finders not ask for the original copy? The age, one popularizer concluded, was undoubtedly an uncritical one, but the people did possess ordinary common sense. Throughout the life of the Jewish nation the Scriptures had been guarded and treated with reverence; they were kept in chests and could be removed only by those who were authorized to do so. It would have been impossible for them to have been manipulated in the post-exilic period as the critics suggested.

On a logical level, the idea of an "entire and continued" forgery was more incredible than any of the events in the Old Testament. If the legislation on which the life of the nation depended had not been compiled until the time of Ezra, these "unknowns" would have had to invent all the historical events to go along with the so-called "priestly" material:

It would require a superhuman power of inventive falsehood. The supposition of a forged Pentateuch, at whatever time made, demands a forged history following it, a forged representation of a consistent national life growing out of it, a forged poetry commemorative of it, and deriving from it its most constant and vivid imagery, a forged ethics grounded upon it, a forged series of prophecy continually referring to it, making it the basis of its most solemn warnings...It is incredible.

The critics also ignored nineteen years of Christian history and experience in their bold conclusions. The "Deuteronomist" and "Second Isaiah" had not been discovered for eighteen hundred years of biblical study despite such intellectual giants as Origen and Luther. Those fathers of the Church never questioned the traditional view
of the Old Testament passed from the Jews to the Apostles. One had therefore to keep in mind what the collective spiritual consciousness said on the matter and not just what scientific investigation revealed.\textsuperscript{112}

What was also difficult for the average believer to understand was the critical facility for attributing without second thought some of the most beautiful and significant material in the Old Testament to a number of "great unknowns". The Second Isaiah of the critics was for example more like a spirit without visible form who floated through the Exile, a being of a higher order.\textsuperscript{113} Yet the prophets were public and official figures whose credentials had been approved by the community. They were great poets, seers and statesmen. Even Driver was willing to admit that Second Isaiah was a true and powerful prophet with great public appeal. Yet no trace of this great personality could be discovered; there seemed to be a conspiracy of silence against him. That a man such as the Great Prophet could have lived and died unknown was almost a spiritual and intellectual impossibility.\textsuperscript{114} Kennedy concluded that:

\begin{quote}
Till the name is discovered, or its absence rationally explained, we who have more confidence in the objective facts of history than in the subjective impression of critics, will continue to regard it as an invincible objection to the hypothesis of his existence. Our unknown prophet of the exile had no existence, and is only the child of the imagination of men who put more trust in their own critical feeling than in history.\textsuperscript{115}
\end{quote}

Sir Robert Anderson summed up this critical foible thus:
In a recent sensational murder trial, it was suggested that the real delinquent was a stranger who resembled the accused. The suggestion was a reasonable one, and its acceptance would have explained certain difficulties in the case for the prosecution. But an experienced judge and a sensible jury wanted to know where this stranger had come from, and what became of him. And so here. We want to know something about this Isaiah II.

A similar difficulty made the critical theories on the Pentateuch especially impossible to accept. Where for example would believers look for an author who could combine a zeal for truth with such outright falsehoods? Where could they find such a skillful journalist who had devoted himself to the careful study of Egyptian customs and antiquities? It was clear that historical investigation revealed no possible candidates.

Finally the traditionalists objected strongly to the many arguments advanced by the critics which were in one way or another the "argumentum e silentio". This presumption alleged that the silence of later books respecting events, institutions or persons which according to the traditional view belong to an earlier period proved that these things are an invention of a later time. The chief ground on which the priestly ritual was denied to Moses was the allegation that from the time of the Judges to the Exile, the law as laid down in the Pentateuch was not obeyed, and therefore, that it did not exist. Balfour pointed out however that the law could have existed and yet could have been virtually ignored. The Israelites were not models of obedience, but instead were stiff-necked and rebellious people. By their actions
it was impossible to determine the law under which they were governed. Blomfield pointed to practice in the Church of England as an analogous situation. The injunction "that every parishoner shall communicate at least three times in the year of which Easter shall be one" (which for importance ranked with the Mosaic law of the central sanctuary) was probably never observed in every single rural parish, and certainly not in any populous parish since it was enacted.

The argument from silence also manifest itself in the critics' expectation that a writer would mention particular things in his environment to show that he was writing at a particular time. This, according to the traditionalists, assumed that a writer of history had to mention everything around him. Many writers however did not do so simply because the audiences for which they wrote were also acquainted with such environmental characteristics. Clearly it was a case of using one's ordinary intelligence to expose the weakness of the critical arguments.

The Pious Fraud

One of the concepts basic to the whole critical approach was the idea of a "pious fraud" by which certain pseudonymous writings were represented as if they were the words of some famous and devout person in the history of Israel. The critics attempted to explain that this
was merely the literary convention of the day and in no way was detrimental to a belief in inspiration. The traditionalists however were not convinced. To the ordinary believer the idea that deceit of any kind, whatever the motives, was employed in the composition of God's special revelation was not only logically impossible but morally repugnant. This was a theme reiterated again and again in the popular religious books and magazines. The idea of a pious fraud was unthinkable to the ordinary mind. It belonged to a world in which "two and two do not necessarily make four".

It was admitted that while the idea of inspiration may be compatible with inaccuracies in the text, and even in matters of science, it in no way could be reconciled with the idea of forgery, abhorrent even to men who commonly did not regard themselves as religious. O'Connor claimed that while inspiration did not rule out certain minor errors, it did guarantee a degree of common truthfulness which the world expected to find in men who were guided by no higher principle than the code of the world's honor. Blomfield, also, rejected the Deuteronomist theory on such grounds:

A process strikingly similar to what sometimes takes place nowadays, when some clerk, or manager, or secretary, having a benevolent wish to provide his creditors with just payment for his debts, writes out a check upon a bank, but, fearing lest his own name should not commend itself sufficiently to the bankers, affixes to his check his master's name instead. Such transactions are commonly denoted by a rather ugly name, nor is the goodness of the end in view considered in any way to justify the use of such means.
The critical theory on the late dating of the priestly legislation also left the sacred Scriptures open to a charge of falsehood and imposture. The critics claimed that this was just a case of "legal fiction" and not deceit. Old laws were habitually modified, and all parties concerned understood the convention. Kennedy argued however that what was asserted here was not simply modification but a completely new legal and ritual dispensation. Obsolete forms or "legal fictions" may cling to the new laws, but what judge would allow a barrister to ascribe a law of Queen Victoria to the age of William III and then claim for it authority on the grounds of its antiquity? 125

Apart from the demands of human conscience common to all men, the idea of a pious fraud presented a startling and detestable contrast to the high and lofty moral position to which the Scriptures were exalted by eighteenth and nineteenth century Christians. Indeed, the divine nature of the Bible was verified by the sublime morality and high standards of duty which the reader found in its pages. "The Old Testament as a whole," wrote one popularizer, "has always occupied a very prominent position in the private offices of religious, and in the public offices of the Church; year after year, century after century, from thousands and tens of thousands of pulpits, the heart has been moved by the profound spiritual lessons drawn from the records of its sacred page..." 126

The conclusion was inevitable: the Old Testament record which was interwoven with the believer's spiritual life
could in no way contain myths, forgeries, pious make-ups, dramatic creations or the idealization of history.

Part of this animosity stemmed from the failure of most churchmen to grasp the difference between the truth of edification and the truth of fact. The plain man who had been accustomed to receiving everything in the Bible as the veritable Word of God could not fail to be deeply perplexed when he was asked to accept that God reveals himself in myth as well as by the truth of fact. "Truth," claimed Wells, "in its last analysis is fact." It was facts that these conventional popularizers offered their readers in lieu of fancies. Edward White made it his initial promise that revelation first and foremost consisted in facts as found in personal biographies and national annals. It was also facts which appealed to the people, not abstract disquisitions or ideas.

"Christus Comprobator"

Jesus Christ, the one who gives his seal of approval. This was the title given by Bishop Charles Ellicott to one of the most widely read and recommended books in the entire popular debate. Ellicott saw higher criticism as a problem of such major proportions that he made it the subject of his episcopal charge in 1891. In Christus Comprobator he set out in a detailed and thorough manner an argument against higher criticism which was more simply but nevertheless forcefully echoed in numerous other publications. The argument was essentially that the teachings
of Jesus as found in the New Testament clearly corroborated the traditional ideas on the authorship of the Old Testament as well as the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures. Much of the newer criticism, it was claimed, had as its "real, though not avowed, still less recognised, object the undermining and abolition of the authority of Jesus". As such, it could never be reconciled with the faith of the true believer. Again, Ellicott's argument was one involving the common sense of the ordinary believer, for if it could be shown that Jesus spoke to certain critical issues, then his Word as the Savior and Son would be a final court of appeal. It was in fact a proof suitable to all intelligence levels; it made the discussion of higher criticism a simple one involving no profound learning nor a knowledge of languages nor a special spiritual instinct. 129

The appeal to the authority of Jesus also was attractive as a means by which the results of a healthy criticism could be recognized. For those who were not against biblical criticism as a tool in studying the Bible, the teachings of Jesus provided a key by which those theories consistent with evangelical faith could be discovered. Fearing a resurgence of Arianism, a group of London elders for example made it their business to study the developments of higher criticism with special reference to the deity of Christ. They circulated a petition designed not to denounce criticism generally but only those conclusions which clashed with "the truth of the Lord's Deity or His
recorded teaching respecting the Divine inspiration and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. 130

There were two basic questions involved in this aspect of the popular debate. The first one asked whether or not Jesus' knowledge was such that he could have known the conclusions of the higher criticism long before they were discovered by scholars. The conclusion was reached that Jesus, as the divine Son of God as well as the Son of Man, did possess infallible knowledge and unquestionable authority on all matters. Secondly the traditionalists went on to examine whether or not Jesus directly corroborated conventional views as to the authorship of the Old Testament records, or whether he vindicated the critics, about whose theories he would have known. Ellicott's book particularly dealt at length with the first question, the other works assuming that Jesus was omniscient and would have therefore known about the alleged forgeries and compilations in the Bible before they were even committed to writing.

The critics, claimed Ellicott, refuted this appeal to the authority of Jesus on critical matters because they had come to believe that the human nature of Jesus precluded an infallible knowledge of things scientific and critical. 131 The Kenotic theory, the theological grounds for this belief, had resurged in popularity in Germany and England at the middle and end of the nineteenth century. Kenoticism was a term used from the early centuries of Christian history to describe the idea expressed in Philippians 2:7, according to which the pre-existent
Christ "emptied himself", "impoverished himself", or laid aside his equality with God in order to become man. It provided the critics with a method of reconciling the new views of the Bible with the teaching authority of one whom many of them confessed to be Savior and Lord. Jesus could not supply the final proof of the Davidic authorship of the Pentateuch simply because he was ignorant of the methods and results of historical and literary criticism.

For centuries kenosis was understood to mean only the veiling of the divine presence by the assumption of flesh. The issue however became more acute in the nineteenth century with the emerging concepts of personality and the rise of biblical criticism. The orthodox conception of kenosis was stated in ontological terms and dealt only with the problem of reconciling the divine and the human within the same mortal body. The questions which were raised in the nineteenth century were in part psychological: a person was no longer defined in terms of antecedent natures of which he was an individualization, but rather as a set of psychological functions involving the will, the feelings and the reason. The question therefore became: how could the Logos who was fully omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent dwell fully within the limitations of the human personality? The interpretation of kenosis took a radical turn so that the presence of the divine Jesus did not vitiate the distinctively human aspects of his personality. No longer satisfactory was the idea that the divine glory remained undiminished though obscured; kenosis came to mean a literal loss or diminution of
certain aspects of the divine being. 133

In Britain it was also historical criticism which paved the way for the ascendance of kenoticism. The discoveries of the critics brought to the fore evidence which flatly contradicted the assumptions of Jesus regarding the authorship of the Old Testament books. T.K. Cheyne for example had openly advocated kenoticism as a solution to the problems in Christology arising from the modern reading of the Old Testament. Colenso asserted that it was consistent with belief in the divinity of Christ to hold that, "He took our human nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, in that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited." 134 A.J. Mason of Pembroke College, Cambridge, had adopted the doctrine as early as 1887. 135 "But despite the fact that others before him had embraced kenoticism, Gore is legitimately considered to have fathered it in Anglican circles, for his works, together with his reputation and position, were largely responsible for the place it came to occupy in Anglican divinity." 136

In Lux Mundi Gore plainly admitted that Jesus possessed only limited knowledge about certain things, including the compilation of the Old Testament, because the Incarnation was a self-emptying of God to reveal himself under the conditions of human nature. "Restraining the beams of deity, the Incarnate One adopted the science of His own age and put Himself in the same relation to its his-
torical knowledge." He developed the theory further in his Bampton Lectures of 1891 and in his *Dissertations*. The evidence of the New Testament he claimed led him to the conclusion that Jesus "lived and taught, He thought and was inspired and tempted, as true and proper man, under the limitations of consciousness which alone make possible a really human life". While Gore believed that somehow the cosmic functions of the Son continued uninterrupted during the Incarnation, the earthly ministry was more than the wrapping of human nature around divine glory. In the Incarnation men were called to believe that Jesus ceased to exercise those functions, including the divine omniscience, which would have been incompatible with a truly human experience.

With this heritage behind them, the critics and popularizers reasoned that as Jesus possessed only limited knowledge, his apparent verification of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and other such conventional views could be overruled by the recent developments of scholarship without destroying his authority in matters pertaining to salvation. Jesus was a first-century Jew, and as such, he shared many of the beliefs of the community around him, including those on the origin of the Old Testament. This was not the only argument the critics used to explain the Gospel pronouncements on the Old Testament, but it was the most frequently produced. In opposition the traditionalists sought to confirm the infallible knowledge of Jesus: "At all events, a Christian may reasonably
and fitly believe Christ and the inspired Jewish writers of the Bible, rather than Kuenen, or any other professor of the new craft which throws scorn upon the Word of God."^139

Ellicott recognized that many of the popular works were content to list the sayings of Jesus which appeared to pertain to critical questions without taking the trouble to answer the most important question: did Jesus make exegetical mistakes. Ellicott immediately rejected the kenotic solution. These theologians and their critical disciples reasoned from the known characteristics of human nature based on their own experience to the character of the human nature of Jesus. They concluded that since one could only learn of the age and authorship of the Old Testament documents through long and laborious research, Jesus must have been ignorant in these matters. Such reasoning was inadmissible. The human nature of Jesus was like that of Adam before the Fall. It could not be exactly described, but, on the basis of universal catholic teaching, it was clear that this involved certain supernatural powers and gifts, and especially divine illumination. It was only reasonable therefore to suppose that this illumination extended to everything about the Bible.\(^{140}\) The opinion was shared by numerous other popularizers. George Rouse claimed that since Jesus was the sinless and Incarnate Son of God, he possessed a perfectly unclouded and pure mind. It was obvious in fact that his teaching was from a divine source; his knowledge of past and future events and of occurrences like the coin in the fish's
mouth showed that he was no ordinary first-century man.\textsuperscript{141}

Ellicott also turned to the catholic doctrines of the two natures and their relation to one another, as found in Hooker's \textit{Ecclesiastical Polity}, to support his position. Hooker claimed that, "There is no doubt but the Deity of Christ hath enabled that nature which it took of man to do more than man in this world hath power to comprehend.\textsuperscript{142}

This was made clear in certain events such as the walking on the water and the Transfiguration, which had to be accepted if the veracity of the Gospels was accepted. The only reasonable conclusion was that the human soul of Christ must have had an ever-present illumination. Jesus in his human nature knew "all that had been known or can be known about the Bible, and owing to the fusion of His two natures and the inflowing of divine gifts and powers, every question relating to the Scriptures must be considered as finally and forever settled by Him when questions were placed before Him.\textsuperscript{143} Yet in the end, Jesus' knowledge, as revealed to the faithful in his own discourses, was really above and beyond the probing of science and philosophy: "Transcending them as much as the vision of an astronomer, armed with one of the great telescopes of our time,...Christ views things from a standpoint of his own, and through a different medium from the atmosphere of this world.\textsuperscript{144}

While much of the material popularizing criticism favored kenoticism as the most acceptable explanation for Jesus' statements on the Old Testament, it was also occasionally suggested that while Jesus may have been omniscient, he
accommodated his views to his audiences. Feeling that his message would not be enhanced by a critical exposition, Jesus refrained from correcting certain mistaken views on the age and authorship of the Jewish Scriptures. The traditionalists, including Ellicott, were quick to refute this possibility as well. Ellicott dismissed the argument by declaring it inconceivable that Jesus could have uttered teachings on the Word of God out of deference to the prejudices and ignorance of his audience. Kennedy claimed that "nothing could be further from the truth". The facts showed that Jesus was a most unaccommodating teacher. He clearly adapted his modes of instruction to the circumstances and capacities of his hearers, but it was inconceivable that he would have adapted the substance of his divine teaching to men. "He opposed himself to Pharisee and Saducee, to popular prejudices and learned. The traditions with which the popular belief overlaid the laws and doctrines of Moses He branded as making the Word of God to no effect. Instead of accommodating himself to the people, He demanded of them a faith which their prejudices denied Him." Once it had been established that Jesus would have known of the critical conclusions if they in fact were valid, and would have shared them with his hearers because of their far-reaching implications, Ellicott went on to examine whether or not Jesus actually made statements which could shed light on the questions of authorship. It was this aspect of the argument which was most frequently repeated by the other traditionalists as well.
Jestis conveyed a certain attitude towards the Old Testament and clearly verified certain authors, a fact which denounced once and for all the conclusions which the critics had reached. Ellicott went further than most conservatives in admitting that the teaching of Jesus on these matters was normally not directly concerned with historical criticism but was "inferential". It was however of a very conclusive and suggestive character, if the reference points were carefully and cautiously chosen.

There were first of all certain references which Jesus made to the Old Testament which, while not directly concerned with critical matters, did create a certain impression about the biblical record confirming conventional opinion. Jesus for example had a most exact and comprehensive knowledge of the Old Testament which was revealed not only in direct quotations but in general reminiscences as well. It is clear that he regarded the Old Testament as authoritative and divine. The use he made of the books in his life and ministry was evidence of this. He frequently began his discourses with the phrase, "It is written". The New Testament was firmly grounded in the Old, and there was no question of destroying it or breaking continuity with it. The whole fabric of Judaism in fact, the law and the prophets, was regarded by Jesus as a preparation for himself; even without more explicit references, this treatment would have sufficed to abolish any theory which threatened the national history. Jesus mentioned the burning bush, the manna from heaven and the lifting up of the serpent, regarding them all "as having
really happened", and thereby implicitly authenticated the whole record of the forty years in the wilderness. There was in fact scarcely a historical book, the very parts under such severe attack, to which he did not refer. The traditionalists however were convinced that still more specific evidence could be found.

A clear-cut teaching on a matter upon which both the extreme and moderate critics were agreed was seen for example in John 55: 46 and 47. The critics almost unanimously claimed that Moses did not write the Book of Deuteronomy, yet the references of Jesus to the book, particularly the one in John, made it morally improbable that it was written by an imposter. In John 5:46 the words of Jesus, "For he wrote of me", undoubtedly referred to the Messianic prophecy in Deuteronomy 18:15, a prophecy pre-eminently in the thoughts of Jesus. It was made clear in John that the words were a direct communication from God to Moses. Jesus' whole argument in fact in this passage rested on the authorship of this prophecy; if the written words were not believed, how could men say that they believed in the sayings of Jesus? If the words were only nominally the words of the great lawgiver, Christ could be accused not only of accommodation, but of seeking support for himself in untruth.

In no other place did Jesus mention Moses with direct reference to Deuteronomy, but he did refer to the book several times in a way impossible if he thought it the work of a dramatizer. Common moral convictions for example
made it difficult to believe that Jesus would have quoted the great commandment of the law on loving God in Matthew 22:37 if he believed the work from which it was taken to be a forgery. Also Jesus frequently referred to Deuteronomy during his temptation. These were citations made under the most solemn circumstances; it was unthinkable that the fabricated and impersonated could find any place in such a situation. 153

David McIntyre examined the critical claim that the Creation story is mythical in the light of the teaching of Jesus. The argument of Jesus in John 5:17, he claimed, implied the historical truth of the first chapter of Genesis. "It presupposes the creative cycle of six days, or periods, during which creation proceeded, and at the close of which all was found 'very good'. It suggests also that, forasmuch as sin had marred the Creator's work, unceasing labour of a remedial character occupied the thoughts of God, and filled those hours of the seventh day which had elapsed prior to the coming of Christ." The text then was the solemn affirmation of Jesus that the Creation story, as summed up in the opening words of the second chapter of Genesis, is a reliable record of fact. 154

It was believed by the critics that the story of Jonah was not a historical account, but had the marks of a parable or allegory. Even in the minds of Jesus the story was used only for exhortation, so it did not matter whether the illustration was drawn from the realm of fact or poetry. The traditionalists urged however that this mistaken attitude resulted from only a partial reading of
the passages of Matthew 12:39 to 42, and Luke 11:29 to 32. When the full text of Scripture was carefully read and considered, it appeared impossible to believe that Jesus regarded the story as anything other than actual history. If the story was fiction, Jesus would have corrected the misapprehension of his readers and would not have so distinctly and clearly paralleled his own burial and Resurrection with it. The clear inference in such a case would be that if the one is fiction, the other may be so as well: "That He knew the story was believed by the people is clear from the use He makes of it. If they had not believed the story, it would have been impossible for Him to put the great Gospel fact of Resurrection side by side with it. A mere fable or parable would never have sufficed as the basis for such a comparison." 155

Jesus also closely intertwined his references to Jonah with the narrative of another historical event: the visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon. The point of the stories for Jesus was that the unrepentent Jews would be judged by the men of Nineveh and the Queen who had asked for forgiveness. If the story of Jonah was only a fable while that of the Queen was a reality, how could these two classes of witness-bearing tales coalesce? It was absurd to place the fictitious on the same level as the real as witnesses. 156

Another important point raised by the traditionalists was that Jesus distinctly recognized the inspiration of the Old Testament prophets and the predictive contents of their messages, especially as they referred to his own
sufferings and death. He constantly referred to the way in which he fulfilled the earlier prophecies, even with his dying remark of "I thirst". It was not surprising, then, to find that Jesus mentioned Isaiah as the author of the last twenty-seven chapters of the book on nine distinct occasions. Furthermore, he made it perfectly clear in Luke 4:17 to 21 that in quoting Isaiah 61, he was quoting the work of the prophet Isaiah. A similar familiarity and treatment in the teachings of Jesus was accorded to the Book of Daniel. Indeed, the visions of Daniel permeated the words of Jesus in Matthew 24, making it obvious that there was a connection between the Savior and the historical Daniel which could only be dissolved at great expense to the Christian faith. The editors of *The Christian* declared of Farrar's Daniel, "We prefer to accept the book as it is, as the Lord Himself quoted from it, and as it is capable of vindication by facts and arguments...We cannot but express our pained surprise that in this series of expositions there should be such a weaving together of linen and woollen, such a mingling of divers seeds." 

There was one additional aspect to this argument which at least some of the popular works considered. While the extent of the knowledge of Jesus during his earthly ministry may have been open to question and discussion, his words after his Resurrection on matters of authorship would have to be taken as final and authoritative. Thus, J.N. Darby pointed out that in the famous Road to Emmaus
passage Jesus on two occasions verified the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. 160

Finally, the traditionalists had a supplementary court of appeal to which they believed they could go for vindication in the Apostolic writers of the New Testament. Numerous lists of references were produced in the popular material to show that the early Christian writers assumed such facts as the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the historicity of Daniel. The evidence, so the traditionalists believed, conclusively favored their own views on the Bible. Any man who believed himself a Christian had to submit to the authority of Jesus and the Apostles; to do otherwise was to submit to infidelity. If the critics continued to believe that the teaching of Jesus contained such great imperfections, their profession of faith could be considered as nothing more than a delusion or a lie. It was, in the end, a matter of common sense which any churchman could understand:

Any sober reflection on the nature of the case must lead to the inevitable and painful discovery that the thing is impossible. For, to hold that a genuine profession of faith in Christ, along with rejection of his teaching on such momentous matters, can coexist in the heart and soul of the same person, is distinctly not only against every principle of logic, but an outrage on the common laws of judgment and conscience. 161

Thus, the traditionalists refuted the higher criticism by asserting that when the canons of common sense and reasonableness were brought to bear on the conclusions of the critics, they would be found wanting. Also, the traditionalists were confident that Jesus provided in his
teaching a final court of appeal which ruled absolutely against the new views on the Bible. There were few attempts by those who accepted the higher criticism to specifically refute these accusations of the traditionalists. Such churchmen instead concentrated on building up a picture of the way in which criticism positively and constructively aided ordinary believers in their understanding of the Bible. Their case established, they generally rested on the requirements of a modern scientific age to validate their conclusions. More effort however was expended in answering the traditionalist's arguments involving the discoveries of the archaeologist. Appearing in some manner in nearly every conservative publication, the finds unearthed by the spade appeared to be gifts from heaven in the battle for the Bible. The conventional views seemed vindicated at last, as a stark and unquestionable contrast was made between the "subjectivities" of the critics and the objective evidence of the monuments. Furthermore, it took not years of linguistic study or even hours with a critical tome, but only the five senses and ordinary intelligence to see that the Word of God could be depended upon as accurate and authoritative.
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Chapter V
THE STONES CRY OUT:
ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM

One of the most striking features of the popular material on the Bible in the nineteenth century is the constant referral to the geography, customs and ancient monuments of the land of Palestine. The monuments especially, in lithographs and photographs, in lantern lectures and in the British Museum, fascinated the public and bolstered their faith in the accuracy and authority of the Bible. The development of archaeological research, a product of the scientific method and the persistent pursuit of origins, occurred in the second half of the century and coincided therefore with the rise and popularization of biblical criticism. It is not surprising that they became closely linked, as the same canons of historical investigation were brought to bear upon various types of evidence for the same events. How far the finds of the archaeologist confirmed the truth of the biblical record constituted a major issue in the popular debate over biblical criticism. The campaign against criticism based upon archaeological discoveries was most actively conducted by those who supported the conventional views of the Bible. The stones, they claimed, were crying out against rampant infidelity;
the archaeologists were digging a grave for the higher criticism. The force of their argument was not in the soundness of its scholarship, for this was often noticeably lacking; rather its force depended upon the popular interest in archaeology and the widespread coverage which this cornerstone in the traditionalist position received in the popular publications of the day.

Popular interest in the East had been cultivated over the entire century, making it more than probable that any anti-critical arguments based on archaeological evidence would be eagerly seized upon by receptive believers. It has been said that in archaeology, adventure is coupled with bookish toil and "romantic excursions go hand in hand with scholarly self-discipline and moderation." There is little doubt that the lure of exotic lands and the thrill of exploration did much to fix popular attention on the lands of the Bible. There was also of course the natural enthusiasm of the common reader for the world about which he had heard since childhood. Finally people were attracted to travel and exploration in the East because it appeared to them that each new observation triumphantly confirmed the Bible which they knew all along was truthful. The preparation of Christians for the anti-critical onslaught can be examined more closely by looking at three aspects of this growing interest in the East: that of exploration, confirmation and finally excavation.
The Development of Travel and Exploration

The exploration of Palestine and surrounding countries in any comprehensive and methodical fashion was virtually unknown up until the eighteenth century. Visitors to the area were relatively few, their main interest usually being devotional. Highly regulated tours and the danger of attack permitted little individual exploration and encouraged the passive reception of traditional historical information concerning the sacred sites. Some works of topographical and botanical interest were produced however and these were expanded by more serious if not more organized exploratory excursions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Again the resulting books dealt mainly with the natural life and geography of the land, but the explorers were more commonly merchants and resident foreign officials. As early as the sixteenth century Anthony Sherley, travelling for a company of merchants at Aleppo, had fascinated Englishmen with his description of the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon. The commercial activity of the area then gradually increased, bringing more visitors into the East and in turn increasing the quantity and quality of material describing the antiquities which was made available to the public. The advent of diplomatic relations between European and Eastern countries developed further opportunities for discovery and travel.

The fruits of exploration up to this point however were largely confined to geographical material with some
description of the ancient sites and the occasional notice of ancient inscriptions. The world in the West had little idea of the treasure buried in the East until the campaigns of Napoleon at the end of the eighteenth century. The Egyptian campaign, looked upon as a major step towards the mastery of the world by threatening the commercial supremacy of Britain, took the French down the Nile to Aswan, across the Sinai Peninsula to Mount Tabor and then back to Cairo. The map of the Holy Lands therefore became an object of great interest to the British public. When the hand-picked army left on the campaign of 1798, Napoleon insisted that it be accompanied by a number of men fit to explore the country as well as by artists and scientists. It was realized that the land harbored vast ruins worth bringing to the attention of the world. Thus pen and pencil combined to make Egypt famous. Numerous drawings and descriptions were published at the expense of the French government, and the antiquities of Egypt, far greater than previously anticipated, became the topic of lectures, articles and conversations. 

Interest in the monuments of the East was aroused therefore, on a significant scale, by the Napoleonic Wars. It was sustained however by the expanding opportunities for distant travel afforded by more efficient transportation systems. The steamship was securely established as a popular mode of transportation by 1840. Efficient speed combined with larger ships made long journeys rela-
tively comfortable. One result of this greater comfort and convenience was the swift rise in tourist travel, as an increasing number of Europeans spent the winter season in Egypt. The P & O Steam Navigation Company noticed the new market and popularized their cruise route from Malta to Alexandria via Athens and Constantinople by giving free passage to the novelist Thackeray in exchange for a book describing his travels. In 1844 Thackeray made the cruise, complete with shore excursions to Cairo, Jerusalem and the pyramids of Egypt. He fulfilled his end of the bargain in the popular Irish Sketch Book: and from Cornhill to Cairo. The book was lauded as "an excellent piece of publicity" which did much "to make the possibilities of such travel known to the public."^6

The French campaigns were doubtlessly heeded by the British public, but the travels of British civic notables and clergymen as well as pleasure seekers recorded in diaries and travel handbooks did even more to encourage widespread interest in the lands of ancient history. The first popular travel books published in the post-war period took the form of diaries in which lengthy descriptions of scenery and visible monuments were given, interspersed with historical details or allusions to the works of Homer and Cicero. Robert Ker Porter for example published in two volumes his Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenia, etc. during the years 1817, 1818, 1819 and 1820, in which he kept a careful record of the places visited each day. Particularly interesting is his account of the
ruins of ancient Babylonia, an area of special interest to Bible students. After quoting Herodotus on what the city was once like, Porter describes his exploration of the ruins at Birs Nimroud. Backed by the speculation of the German historian Niebuhr and the testimony of the British resident in Bagdad, he concludes that the site was that of the ancient biblical tower of Babel. The interest of Porter's readers was stimulated by a series of engravings as well as Porter's startling revelation that he may have even stumbled across the original base of the edifice constructed in the primitive days of Genesis.

Also significant in Porter's work was his suggestion at this early date of the potential importance of inscriptions for the scholar and biblical student. About the ruins at Susa he wrote, "All that I have seen of the cuneiform inscriptions of Persia appear less complicated than those on the bricks of Babylon...The result of these operations furnishes the following general principles: that the characters are alphabetical, and to be read from left to right." Inscriptions continued to hold a certain fascination for all explorers, whether armchair or actual, as they seemed to put nineteenth century man in touch with the very life-stream of the mysterious past. The popularity of Porter's work was enhanced by his efforts to transport certain objects, particularly inscribed cylinders, to the museums of Britain.
The popular travel material passed from the diary form to that of travel handbooks containing information about certain routes as well as the inns and points of historical interest along the way. A series of such handbooks was marketed by the publishing firm of John Murray in the 1830's. The first series included books on Holland, Germany and Belgium but it was not until several years later that a volume on Palestine, written by Josias Porter, appeared. The whole series was a success, and Porter's volume went through several editions. It was true of course that Porter's book provided a stimulus to travel through its engravings and descriptions which gave an exotic picture of far-off lands. In a preliminary section the author gave a sketch of the geography, history, climate, inhabitants and local customs of the area, and then followed this by a detailed description of certain travel routes recommended for visitors. The work was also important in that it gave expression to that strong link being forged between the explorations in the East and the attempts to confirm the biblical record as accurate and inspired history. The confirmation of biblical truth by such popular works formed an important phase in the preparation of the public for the debate against higher criticism based upon archaeology.

The Bible on Tenter-hooks

Josias Porter claimed in his preface that the Bible was
really the best handbook for the traveller in Palestine, and that his own work was only intended as a companion to the Scriptures. It was the association of this particular country with the "most wondrous events in history" that made his book worthwhile. "It is the religio loci," he wrote, "which gives such a charm to the cities and villages of Palestine. To pass any of them without knowing, or without remembering, their story, is to rob travel of half its interest and all its profit."  

Porter provided an index of Scripture references relevant to the places he discussed in the handbook. The link between travel observations and the Bible however went further than the evocation of sentimental interest in the antiquities of Palestine. Porter himself suggested in the body of his book that the Eastern exploration served to confirm the factual truth of the biblical record and to elucidate its contents. This notion was taken up with great enthusiasm in the middle and later decades of the nineteenth century.

In looking back over the developing interest in the East, Canon Robert Girdlestone captured this enthusiasm in his claim that, "Those who visited Palestine felt as if they were living in Bible days. The towns, villages, hills, valleys, climate, customs with which we are familiar... are still there. They have not evaporated. They throw light on the book at every turn..." The essay, appropriately entitled "A Bird's-eye View of Discoveries Illustrating and Confirming the Old Testament," rejoiced in the fact that the land of Palestine greatly supplemented
the testimonies of the ancient historians when it came to such a task. Numerous books on the confirmation and illustration of the Old Testament appeared in the years coinciding with the expansion of travel and organized exploration. Books such as Thomas Nicol's *Recent Explorations in Bible Lands* (1892) were aimed at the general reader and even Bible class student as they omitted scholarly detail and often included lavish illustrations of Palestine as it appeared in the nineteenth century. The books had a common objective: to provide a mass of information respecting Palestine and the "manners, customs, religion, literature, arts and attainments of the inhabitants..." They frequently drew upon popular travel accounts such as those of R.K. Porter and Josias Porter for their contents.

Usually acclaimed as a major source for confirming the accuracy of the biblical record was the geography and topography of Palestine and surrounding lands. Geographical facts had long been recorded by travellers to the East, but the study was given a powerful stimulus, in the early stages of archaeological research. Detailed surface plans of Jerusalem and its environs were produced by John Silk Buckingham as early as 1821, while a much more extensive and critical geographical study was conducted in the late 1830's by the American, Edward Robinson. Between the years 1872 and 1878, the Palestine Exploration Fund conducted another extensive and accurate survey which was used in research work throughout
the rest of the century. These works plus the information gleaned personally by the authors provided what was seen as the "strongest evidences of the truth of the Bible."\(^{15}\)

In popular works such as Richard Newton's *Rambles in Bible Lands* (1879) or Margaretta Shekleton's *Biblical Geography in a Nutshell* (1884), the main geographic features of Mesopotamia, Assyria, Arabia, Syria, Phoenicia, Egypt and Palestine were surveyed and carefully linked with the relevant portions of Scripture. The second edition of Newton's book, for example, was described by *The Christian* as "a very useful and interesting sketch of an extensive tour in Bible lands. It is replete with incidents, and its copious allusions to Scripture scenes add greatly to its value, by refreshing the memory of the reader, and associating with each place its biblical history."\(^{16}\)

While Newton chose his own route of travel as a basis for the book, Miss Shekleton followed the biblical record, beginning therefore with the first chapters of Genesis and the River Euphrates. She approached it in the following manner:

We come first to the River Euphrates, the largest, longest, the most important of the rivers of Western Asia. It is first mentioned in Scripture as one of the four "heads" of Eden's "river." Its name must have been well known in this world's early history, as the writer of the book of Genesis gives no geographical indication of the countries through which it passed; he simply says, "The fourth river was Euphrates." It is called in Scripture, "The Great River," "The Flood." Its entire course from its rise in the mountains of Armenia, or Ararat, till it falls into the Persian Gulf, is calculated at 1780 miles. About 100 miles from the sea
the Euphrates is joined by another of the rivers of Eden.

The point of popularizing this information was to provide believers with firm arguments in defense of the accuracy of the Bible. Believers could be confident that the Bible was what it claimed to be: the infallible Word of God. The fact that one could take the book of Joshua and identify each of the villages mentioned in it, as well as all the cliffs and ravines, should have convinced the most adamant skeptic that the Bible was a genuine product of Palestine and an accurate one. Newton stressed this point in an appealing illustration entitled "The Bible on Tenter-hooks" which involved two cloth manufacturers, one a skeptic and the other a Christian. The skeptic, so the story went, had made a fine piece of cloth which was subsequently stolen. His only means of identifying his property turned out to be through the holes made by the tenter-hooks on which the cloth had been stretched. Newton claimed through the words of the Christian that such convincing evidence for the truth of the Bible was also available:

Put it on tenter-hooks. Take the Bible and travel with it; go to the place where it was made. There you find the Red Sea, the Jordan, the Lake of Galilee, Mount Lebanon, Hermon, Carmel, Tabor, Gerizim; there you find the cities of Damascus, Hebron, Tyre, Sidon, and Jerusalem. Every mountain, every river, every sheet of water mentioned in the Bible is there, just as the Bible speaks of it. Sinai, and the desert and the Dead Sea are there. The holes and the hooks come together exactly. The best guide book through that country is the Bible. It must have been written there on
the spot, just as your cloth must have been made and stretched on your tenter-hooks. That land is the mould in which the Bible was cast, and when you bring the land and the book together, they fit to perfection.

Geographical facts however were not the only evidence confirming the biblical record. The agreement between the "flora and fauna" and customs of the Bible with what was observed by travellers and explorers also provided the Christian with powerful weapons. One book was advertised on the grounds that a particular reader had been converted from skepticism to belief "by reading the Bible in the full light of the customs of the country in which the narrative takes place." Newton corroborated the account of 1 Kings 18:4-6 by describing a young Arab boy acting as runner and waving a rod in front of the Englishman's carriage to allow free passage through the narrow streets. The examples drawn from local habits were endless, as were those taken from the natural life of Palestine. A very popular book by the American missionary William Thomson concentrated on the scenery as well as the customs which he had noted in his travels. The living world in Palestine provided a duplicate copy of the world described in the Bible. On his journey from Tiberias to Nazareth, Thomson found wild mustard and tares and experienced first-hand a deluge of locusts. An even more readable work defending the biblical account of the Flood pointed to the fact that only the olive and laurel trees in Palestine could grow under water. As the olive tree was taller, it would naturally have appeared
as the flood waters receded, a fact which clearly absolved the Genesis story from any charges of ficticiousness.\textsuperscript{22}

Although formal archaeological excavation did not begin until the second half of the century, the ruins at certain sites in Palestine were noted on maps and provoked much speculation. Again, what was known or speculated about these buried monuments became further fuel for the fire of biblical truth. Alexander Keith's book on the evidence for the truth of Christianity based on prophecy was one of the earliest and most popular works to use this monumental aspect of exploration in addition to evidence based on local customs and geography. In the fifth edition of the book in 1830, Keith made it clear that he had been able to expand and complete many of his arguments because of the published works of authoritative travellers. "The researches of travellers in Palestine," he wrote, "have been so abundant, and the prophecies thereby verified are so numerous and distinct, that no labour is requisite for elucidating their truth, but to examine and compare the predictions and the events, and the literal prophecies need no other interpretation than the literal facts."\textsuperscript{23} It was obvious to anyone who visited the East for example that the prophecy of the desolation of the Babylonian cities had been literally fulfilled. Keith describes the scene in great detail: the whole country was strewn with the fragments of decayed buildings and especially desolate was the actual site of the capital city, now confirmed by geographers. Every general as well
as every particular prediction about the city had been fulfilled. Regarding the prophecy that, "Babylon shall become heaps," travellers claimed that, "The whole face of the country is covered with vestiges of buildings, in some places consisting of brick walls surprisingly fresh, in others merely a vast succession of mounds of rubbish..." Regarding the prediction that, "Babylon shall become pools of water," they reported that workmen in search of bricks had created large cavities which were filled by the overflowing Euphrates. In conclusion Keith wrote on Babylon, "Is it possible that there can be any attestation to the truth of prophecy if it be not witnessed here? Is there any spot on earth which has undergone a more complete transformation?...Its ruins of late have been carefully and scrupulously examined by different natives of Britain of unimpeachable veracity, and the result of every research is a more striking demonstration of the literal accomplishment of every prediction..."24

Significant for a discussion of archaeological studies and its relation to biblical criticism is the fact that this material which appeared to confirm and illustrate the Bible was produced in enormous quantities and read widely throughout the century. A number of reasons for this popularity may be suggested. The East featured large in the popular consciousness because of expanding travel facilities and explorations. People also believed that a new means of proving the divine nature of the Bible had been sent from heaven to bolster the evidences
supplied by miracle and prophecy. Believers could reinforce their faith in the historical accuracy of the Bible as well as confidently meet the challenges of the skeptic.

The fortress of orthodoxy had been badly shaken in the past decades by the infidelity allied to political radicalism as well as the encroachment of historical and literary studies; here however was new hope which could be easily understood and easily communicated.

It is evident that Infidelity, having become more rampant today than ever before, and seeking to extinguish the light of Divine Truth, God, in His Providential care of His own Word, is calling forth from secret chambers of the earth, where they have long been concealed, "the stones," and other ancient monumental records of ancient times to "cry out" in bearing witness to the veracity of His Word which alone is Truth, in a manner that cannot be gain said.  

The material produced on the lands of the Bible was also made popular by the transformation it effected upon the Sacred Scriptures: For many Christians what was at times a puzzling and confusing book became more attractive and comprehensible. Linked closely with the confirmation of biblical truth was the concept of elucidation. People became convinced that they could better understand the Bible after they had delved into the dressing habits of the Assyrians or studied the anatomy of the locust. There seemed to be something in these facts and descriptions which the common believer could grasp. Though it was rarely admitted, the Bible was an exceedingly difficult book in the eyes of many people; here however was information which could shed light on very obscure pages.
The travel books also lent a certain sense of reality to the biblical events of a very distant age. One could, by reliving another's journey through Palestine, relive the biblical narratives and ultimately remove doubts as to their veracity. Canon Girdlestone described the thrill of actually seeing "the same land as the Israelites did." The railway train, he continued, actually ran through the valley (Wadi Tumilat) by which Israel must have fled.26 An article on Egypt appearing in the magazine Life and Work claimed of the temple at Karnak that, "There one can look into the actual face of the Pharoah who was a boy with Moses and whose sister found the child Moses among the reeds by the Nile."27 Likewise the description of the river Euphrates in Miss Shekleton's book gave a concrete sense of reality to the Garden of Eden not likely to have been felt before.28

The developing art of book illustration gave an impetus to the popularity of these volumes illustrating and confirming the Bible. An advertisement for the Illustrated London Library reflected the atmosphere of the latter half of the nineteenth century: "Illustrated works are everyday becoming more popular. The aid which Art can afford to literature is beginning to be more thoroughly appreciated by the reading public; and the Education of the mind through the eye is felt to be not only of advantage as a source of refined amusement for the passing hour, but of more positive and permanent instruction."29 Several related forces came to bear upon the printing enterprise
in the nineteenth century, making it the "heyday" of book illustration. The promise of a growing population and increasing literacy made publishers willing to risk the production cost of an illustrated volume. An ample supply of cheap labor, the "designer's shadow and publisher's drudge", made the processes of, first, wood engraving and then steel engraving productive and profitable ones. The latter technique produced works of great refinement, giving the illusion of half-tones in the drawings by allowing for cross-hatched lines. Advances in color printing and finally photography were made in the second half of the century. Books on the Bible were vividly illustrated with every type of drawing and eventually with photographs, making them all the more attractive and instructive; thus the traditionalist position was strengthened by the fact that the discoveries of the East were intriguing subjects for the artist's tools.

Activity in Palestine however was not confined to exploration and travel which resulted in books describing the area and confirming the biblical narrative. Serious archaeological excavation began to replace the limited observations of curious travellers in the second half of the century. Popular interest in the East and the material feeding it came to include books describing the actual procedures and results of scientific investigation and excavation, and the decipherment of ancient inscriptions as well as books of confirmation and elucidation. It was the flood of material on archaeological
investigation which was most significant in the debate surrounding biblical criticism. Scientific exploration in Palestine came to attract as well as develop popular interest in biblical studies; it was also widely used by traditionalists in the campaign against biblical criticism.

The Rise and Popularization of Archaeological Studies

Serious archaeological investigation developed at a rapid pace in the years following 1850. By that time most major cities and towns in Palestine as well as the main topographical features of the land had been located with certainty upon a map. The value of inscriptions on the monuments above the level of the ground had been recognized and work on their translation initiated. The importance of the tells around the countryside as well as the sherds of pottery remained however a matter for future scholarly investigation. Neither had any general and coherent picture of the growth of ancient civilizations yet emerged.

The era of excavation in Palestine is said to have begun in 1850, the year in which the Frenchman Félecian de Saulcy, mourning the death of his wife, journeyed to the Holy Land where he visited the Tomb of the Kings just outside the walls of Jerusalem. His curiosity aroused by the occupants of the tomb, de Saulcy applied for and received permission to excavate the area. He carried out his plans in 1863. His belief that he had found a
monument to Herod and an inscription referring to Zeadekhia's wife led him to date the tomb too early, but his work nevertheless set a precedent in revealing the necessity for careful excavation at the traditional sacred sites.

In 1864 Ermite Pierotti, an engineer working for the Turks, published two volumes entitled *Jerusalem Explored* in which he described in detail the interior area of the buildings which had up until that time been taboo to foreigners. Many of Pierotti's descriptions were inaccurate, but were enough to convince the Englishman George Grove that a more careful and scientific perusal of the monuments in the sacred city would prove to be a profitable venture. This realization led to the establishment in 1865 of the Palestine Exploration Fund, an organization which proposed to send expeditions of "thoroughly competent persons" with "perfect command of funds and time" to scientifically investigate the archaeology, geography and topology of the Holy Land. Denominational and doctrinal controversies were to be avoided; the Fund "simply invited support...from all those persons who happened to be interested in a certain collection of books, apart from any doctrine which may have been deduced from those books, or any opinion as to the weight of those books apart from the fact that to very many these are and always will be the most precious books in the world." Apart from its non-sectarian character the Palestine
Exploration Fund was also specifically designed as a popular body. It depended upon small subscriptions from a very large number of contributors for its existence, clergymen being numbered among its most loyal supporters. The Quarterly Statement, the organ of the Fund, took into account this mass of popular support and managed to include more general as well as scientific reports in its issues.

In its first expedition the Fund took upon itself the formidable task of excavating the city of Jerusalem. Under the leadership of Charles Warren some possible sites for Solomon's temple were partially cleared and the job of determining the position of the ancient city walls commenced. No decision was ever reached as to the exact location in the case of either monument. Warren's method of tunnelling was crude and he lacked the means of accurately dating any monuments which were successfully unearthed. More important was the survey of the most significant ruins in Jerusalem, conducted by the Fund between 1872 and 1878. A more rapid development in the procedures of excavation was retarded by the persistent need for an accurate dating methodology. The problem was not resolved until 1890 when Flinders Petrie, investigating a tel near Gaza on behalf of the Fund, developed a chronological scheme based upon the texture, shape and ornamentation of potsherds.

The work of the Fund was not confined to Jerusalem. A survey of Western Palestine conducted in the 1870's
commanded the efforts of both Claude R. Conder and Lord Kitchener. The final product was a vast compendium of geographical and topographical information of which it was said: "Nothing had ever been done for the illustration and right understanding of the historical portions of the Old and New Testaments, since the translation into the vulgar tongue, which may be compared with this great work." A similar study of Eastern Palestine was also begun by Conder but only completed several years later.

Excavation was also developing simultaneously in the two other areas of interest to Old Testament scholars: Egypt and Mesopotamia. Since the days of Napoleon, the monuments of Egypt had aroused much popular interest in Britain. The archaeological importance of these monuments increased greatly after the Rosetta Stone was deciphered by Champillion and a museum was established at Boulak for the careful and systematic preservation of the finds. In 1883 the Egyptian Exploration Fund was founded jointly by Britain and the United States in order to conduct large-scale, organized excavations.

Up until 1842 it was commonly believed that all that remained of ancient Babylon could be easily stored in a packing case three feet square. The work of Henry Layard however brought to attention buried monuments on a scale never before conceived. The pioneer in Mesopotamian excavation was the French consul Botta, who, encouraged by tales of surface finds lodged in the British Museum,
commenced his own investigation. Forced by native threats to abandon his work at the mounds of Nineveh, he turned to the site of Khorsabad and there unearthed the ancient Assyrian palace of Sargon. It was Botta's work which in turn persuaded the British adventurer and politician Layard to begin excavation work at Nimroud in 1846. Layard was responsible for retrieving from the earth an enormous store of Assyrian treasure including the record chamber of King Assurbanipal as well as the palaces of Assurbanipal and Sennacherib.

The archaeological work of Botta and Layard was of course important because of the monuments uncovered, but it was also significant in acting as a powerful stimulant to the growth of Assyriology. A large number of cuneiform inscriptions were discovered among the Assyrian ruins, suggesting that until they were translated, the secrets of the ancient world would remain a mystery to modern man. Ancient inscriptions from various cities had been published by Niebuhr as early as the eighteenth century, and by travellers such as Robert Ker Porter, who went to great lengths to obtain accurate reproductions. By 1840 the sight of inscriptions was commonplace, but their decipherment was regarded as a hopeless task by many scholars. Yet it was clear from the progress of Assyrian excavation that the work could not be abandoned if sense were to be made of the treasures of the earth. Basil Evetts in New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land (1892) claimed: "It was recognised that some great results must follow if the inscriptions could be deciphered
and translated. Pliny had spoken of the ancient records, reaching back to a fabulous antiquity, which were preserved at Babylon upon baked bricks; and here were some of these very baked bricks at the disposal of anyone who could read them..." Leading those who were successful in reading them was Sir Henry Rawlinson. In 1845 Rawlinson broke the linguistic code with his translation of an inscription from a wall at Behistun, and progressed from there to the deciphering of the Assyrian palace inscriptions.

Popular attention continued to be focused upon Palestine and the surrounding countries as the fruits of exploration and travel were supplemented by the fruits of the archaeologist's spade. Contemporary enthusiasm for the work in the East was sustained by a number of factors. The romance of discovery as well as the magnitude of the treasures uncovered by archaeologists undoubtedly increased popular fascination. A whole body of literature with themes of intrigue and adventure centered on the ancient East. The books of the German Egyptologist George Moritz Ebers for example were popular romances with an educational aim: to convey a knowledge of Egyptian history and antiquities by weaving together fact and fiction. His book *Uarda: A Romance of Ancient Egypt* was set in Thebes in the fourteenth century B.C., and told the tale of the Regent's conspiracy to usurp the throne while Ramases II was warring against the Arameans. The book, translated into English in 1877,
provided readers with massive information about the habits, religious rites and intellectual currents of ancient Egypt. Even more popular were the books of the British novelist and agriculturalist Sir Henry Rider Haggard. Not only were the ancient histories of the biblical countries woven into the plots of his works, but also the methods and results of archaeological investigation. In Haggard's book She, the story opens with the discovery of a mysterious potsherd covered with ancient inscriptions which results in adventure in the heart of Africa.

Mission work in Palestine was increasingly in the minds of British churchmen during the years of archaeological development. After 1850 the Anglican London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews was joined in its efforts by the Church Missionary Society. Mission stations in the East at Smyrna, Cairo and the island of Syra had been largely restricted to running schools and distributing literature during the first half of the century. Little expansion of numbers or facilities had occurred, in spite of the establishment of a joint Anglo-Prussian bishopric at Jerusalem in 1842. The situation was transformed however as a result of the appointment of a Swiss bishop, Samuel Gobat, to the see at Jerusalem. His efforts to convert the Jews and to encourage the Eastern churches to seek instruction resulted in the opening of a Church Missionary Society mission in Palestine in 1851. Gobat's work remained in
the public eye for some time to come as he became the subject of a bitter controversy over proselytizing among the Eastern churches. The conflict ended with the Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Dublin taking the unprecedented step of issuing a public declaration of confidence.\(^35\)

The work of the CMS in Palestine and Egypt grew steadily. The mission at Jerusalem expanded to include the towns of Jaffa and Nazareth as well.\(^36\) The CMS mission in Egypt, abandoned in 1862, was revived on a more efficient scale in 1882. A CMS hospital was founded in Cairo, providing a center for evangelistic and medical work and attracting student volunteers in large numbers.\(^37\) A similar enterprise was undertaken by the Church of Scotland. A deputation of Scottish "Wise Men to the East" including Alexander Keith and Robert Murray McCheyne was organized to gather reliable information about the Jews, and to produce popular adventure stories, all with a view to advancing the cause of missionary work among the Jews. The culmination of this effort was reached in 1840 when the Church formally instituted the Jewish Missions Scheme.\(^38\)

Important also for popular knowledge of archaeological work was the organization and expansion of museums where the public would have ready access to the treasures of the East. Attempts had been made by Robert Ker Porter early in the days of exploration to deposit portable specimens of antiquities in the British Museum as well as in
the museums of Edinburgh and Dublin. The practice was taken up by most travellers and archaeologists. Not only were teachers and students of the Bible encouraged to observe the finds of archaeology firsthand, but guide books were written and recommended to make such visits more valuable. Canon Girdlestone's essay for example commended to the public a book prepared by Joseph Bonomi in which the lay-out of the Assyrian and Babylonian chambers of the British Museum were presented and discussed. Additional discoveries and popular satisfaction with the book created a demand for four revised editions between 1855 and 1869. Later in the century The Bible Student in the British Museum (1892) was published by the Rev. J.G. Kitchin in an attempt to show Bible students "how much is contained in the British Museum which may assist them in studying Holy Scriptures." The book was simple in format as well as brief and concentrated on aiding church teachers in becoming "guides" for parties of young students visiting the museum.

Singularly important however among all these reasons for popular interest was the confirmation which the excavator's spade appeared to provide for the facts of the biblical narrative. Major archaeological discoveries multiplied at an increasingly rapid pace in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, and popular opinion willingly received these advances as confirming the dependability of the Bible as a record of facts. The explorers and travellers had bolstered orthodox faith,
and it appeared to many that the excavators were doing the same. The weight of the ancient monuments was now added to the arguments based upon the geography as well as the flora and fauna of Palestine. Prophecies and miracles may have been difficult, even impossible, to defend as evidence for an inspired Bible; here however in the monuments was external evidence which any person could understand and touch with his own hands. Archaeological digs were unearthing the very storehouses of pharaoh built by the Israelites and the very marks left by the Phoenician stonemasons on Solomon's temple; the evidence was enough to convince the most ardent skeptic. Archaeological studies became an integral part of the literate, educated culture of the day and for many such believers, skepticism seemed to falter in its relentless advance. It was in this climate of archaeological progress and popular acclaim that the traditionalists pursued one of their most thorough attacks upon the conclusions of literary and historical criticism. The "stones were crying out" in the face of rampant infidelity and no one sound in mind could reject the factual truth of the Bible.\(^41\)

The name of Archibald Sayce featured most prominently in the archaeological attack of orthodoxy upon the higher criticism. A prolific writer as well as an outstanding Assyriologist, Sayce did much to popularize the archaeological work of the late nineteenth century. In spite of his more liberal views on inspiration and author-
ship, he also chose the weapons and led the assault on the higher criticism as it was popularly understood. Sayce was the exponent of archaeology versus criticism, eventually coming to believe that there could be no reconciliation between the two since the methods of the critics led them to conclusions which were clearly contradicted by the external evidence of the archaeologist. He developed and proclaimed a carefully constructed case for the superiority of external evidence over the internal philological criterion on which the critics depended.

Archaeology versus the Higher Criticism: Archibald Henry Sayce

Archibald Henry Sayce was known in Victorian circles for his work as an orientalist and comparative philologist as well as for his wide travelling. Shortly after receiving a first class honors degree from Oxford in literae humaniores, Sayce became a classical lecturer and college tutor at Queen's College. His interest in philology developed in the 1870's, a decade in which he presented the first translations of the difficult astronomical and astrological tablets from Nineveh to the Society of Biblical Archaeology and was chosen as one of the Oxford representatives to the Old Testament revision company. In 1876 he became a deputy professor of philology.

From 1872 onwards Sayce spent most of his vacations
travelling on the Continent, thus beginning a lifetime of exploration in Europe, Asia, including the Far East, and North Africa. In 1890 Sayce resigned his professorship and other university offices, retaining only his college fellowship, and determined to spend the rest of his days in Egypt. With the exception of a few months each year during which he filled the post of professor of Assyriology, created in 1891, Sayce spent his remaining years living in a houseboat on the Nile. There he immersed himself in the culture of the East, and devoted himself to archaeological research and the production of books.

It is clear that Sayce had earned for himself the reputation of a Broad Churchman in the early years of his career. His tendencies towards theological liberalism were several, with far-reaching implications. Early in his life Sayce had developed a keen friendship with Professor Earle, a Broad Churchman who had resigned his professorship of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford and had taken the living of Swainswick near the Sayce household. Sayce wrote that, “Fortunately for myself he took a fancy to me, and I used to spend Sunday after Sunday drinking in his conversation and all the new knowledge it opened out to me, and revelling in the books of his library.”

One of these books was the controversial volume on the Pentateuch written by the Bishop of Natal, John Colenso. It was a scandal to the orthodox, but to the young Sayce it was a highlight in his pursuit of the new critical scholarship. “I had already amused myself,” wrote Sayce,
"with collecting words and phrases characteristic of
different portions of the Hebrew Genesis, incited thereto
by an article by Hupfeld, a translation of which I had
read in the Journal of Sacred Literature. Colenso's book,
accordingly, fell on fertile soil, and I began to look
forward to the day when I could champion his cause."\(^{43}\)

It was at Oxford that Sayce, both through his votes
and his writings, championed the cause of Colenso as well
as other Broad Churchmen. In spite of his continuing
friendships with orthodox churchmen, Sayce was regarded
as one of the leaders of the "German" critical theology
and quite "unsafe" for ecclesiastical appointment. Although
he had received assurances from Pusey that he would
succeed him in the Hebrew chair at Oxford, the Assyriolo-
gist was rejected by Gladstone on the grounds of his
heterodox tendencies. Even a strong recommendation from
Liddon was of no avail. Gladstone's reply was firm: "I
have great respect for Mr. Sayce's talents and learning,
but under no circumstances could I give him an ecclesias-
tical appointment."\(^{44}\) The Hebrew specialist S.R. Driver
instead was appointed to the chair. Those involved could
not have foreseen that the day would come when Driver
would be the protagonist of the higher criticism and Sayce
would be the champion of orthodoxy.

Up until the 1880's Sayce's work had been largely
confined to academic publications on Assyrian language
and writing. With his first edition of Fresh Light from
the *Ancient Monuments* in 1883 however, Sayce marked the beginning of his career as a popularizer of archaeology and as an opponent of the higher criticism. Commissioned by the Religious Tract Society, the book passed through many editions and stimulated numerous imitations both in England and on the Continent. The object of the book was to present in simple terms the bearing which archaeological discovery had upon the Old Testament. While this exercise by no means involved a direct refutation of the higher criticism, it is possible to detect in the preface a departure from the early enthusiasm Sayce had shown for the new German scholarship. In the book the reader was promised striking confirmations of the biblical narrative which not only facilitated Bible study but which provided a defense against the spirit of skepticism which had laid its hands on the Old Testament and determined that the sacred histories themselves were nothing but myths and fables. Sayce admitted that *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments* was a surprisingly successful attempt at "quasi-theology" as well as an occasion for reconsidering his previous position: "It introduced me... to the theological world, especially on its literary side, led me to reconsider and test the fashionable theories regarding the Hebrew Scriptures, and was the first of the numerous books and articles on Old Testament archaeology which occupied me during the next decade."
His own continuing research combined with several fresh discoveries in the East convinced Sayce that the current literary and historical criticism lacked validity. The suggestions in *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments* that archaeology clearly contradicted the historical skepticism of the critics became a firm conviction. At the heart of this conviction was Sayce's insistence that only the ignorant could still deny the existence of writing and the production of literary works in the Mosaic era. He described the steps of his conversion in the following paragraph:

My Hibbert Lectures on Babylonian religion had... concentrated my attention on the religions of the ancient Orient, and the discovery of the Tel-Amarna correspondence suddenly threw a new light on the whole subject and revolutionised my view of it. It was henceforth plain that the assumption of the late date of the literary use of writing was false, and that already in the Mosaic age education was widespread and an active epistolary correspondence carried on to an even greater extent than in the Middle Ages. The excavations of Schliemann and his followers had shown us that Homeric tradition was founded upon historical fact, the sceptical criticism which had divided the Homeric poems among a variety of unknown authors was already discredited; it was now the turn of the East.47

That the antiquity of writing was not denied by the higher critics was asserted in vain; Sayce had discovered what he believed to be the key-note in an ever-intensifying debate. It was a note sounded in all of his subsequent works. It provided the rationale behind his claim that, "Hence forward the character and credibility of a Hebrew document must be settled, not by the assumptions and subjective fantasies or ignorance of the critic, but
by archaeological research." Sayce admitted in 1895 that he had over the past decade changed his attitude towards criticism in the light of archaeology; he had only then come to realize the true character, tendencies and results of the higher criticism. "We have all committed follies in our youth; and one of the few compensations which old age is supposed to bring is that of growing out of them."  

Sayce's lectures and writings as an opponent of the higher criticism gained considerable publicity in the last decade of the nineteenth century, so much so that the publication of his most important work in the debate, The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments, was eagerly awaited by believers who hoped to vindicate the Scriptures once and for all. In Sayce's book on The Hittites (1888) for example the distinguished scholar who claimed that the "unhistorical tone" of II Kings 7:6 was "too manifest to allow our easy belief in it" was dismissed as mistaken. Sayce triumphantly declared that, "Recent discoveries have retorted the critic's objections upon himself. It is not the biblical writer but the modern author who is now proved to have been unacquainted with the contemporaneous history of the time." It was hoped therefore that The Verdict of the Monuments would give a definitive statement as to how irreconcilable criticism and the discoveries of the East were; what appeared in 1893 was totally unexpected.
In the eyes of the orthodox the book did little to curse the higher criticism and much to bless its results if not its methods. *The Church Times* declared that, "Much disappointment has arisen on the appearance of the treatise from finding that at present Mr. Sayce is not so wholly upon the side of the traditionary interpretation of the Old Testament as was before supposed." The review went on to point out that the Tract Committee of the S.P.C.K. even thought it necessary to insert a special preface stating that the author alone was responsible for the opinions found in the book. These opinions were a rude shock to those who had anticipated "nothing but immediate gain from his exposition of the results of archaeology." The *Church Quarterly Review* expressed the wish that the attitude of the author had been that of the committee responsible for the publication:

> The general public looks upon the works issued by the Society as having a certain *imprimatur* of orthodoxy. Persons who are ignorant both of theology and of criticism buy them with a feeling that they are safe guides; they are not infrequently chosen for presents for young people as being unlikely to exercise a harmful influence of any kind. It is a false step, which many supporters of the Society will deeply regret that this work should have been published by it.

What was it in Sayce's *Verdict of the Monuments* which provoked such surprise and disappointment? Clearly one source of distress was Sayce's caution to those who seized too readily upon the finds of the archaeologist to vindicate the accuracy of the Scriptures. Sayce specifically warned his readers against supposing that
oriental archaeology and the higher criticism were irreconcilable foes. The learning of the long line of critics who had labored and fought over the words of Scripture had not been altogether in vain. Much had been established by them which the progress of oriental research increasingly tended to confirm. He also cautioned that, "In some instances the facts are still so imperfectly known as to make the conclusions the oriental archaeologist draws from them probable only."

Underlying Sayce’s presentation were certain conceptions which, as The Church Times pointed out, made it clear that believers would not return "to the old unscientific way of reading the Bible." The archaeological conclusions which Sayce accepted and propagated took the Hebrews as a nation out of an isolated position by showing their affinities with and dependence upon surrounding nations. Gone was the belief that the nation was determined in every feature by a direct revelation from Heaven; the idea of Babylonian elements in Hebrew religion was compatible only with some type of critical view, however conservative.

More significant however was Sayce's apparent agreement with many of the conclusions to which the higher critics had been led. "One of the most assured results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament records," he claimed, "has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch...The fact is fully in accordance with the teachings of oriental archaeology."
Angus Mackay, in a popular introduction to biblical criticism in 1901, even used Sayce as an example of one whose work could reinforce the moderate conclusions of higher criticism. "The professor...accepts such of the new views as are confirmed by his own special study, and seeing that he does this with obvious reluctance, we may well believe that in these we have the irreducible minimum of the settled results of modern criticism." The Book of Esther, as an example of Jewish Haggadah was regarded as unhistorical and of late date. Sayce also admitted that the story of Jonah, at least in its present form, was written much later than the days of Jonah, the son of Amittai.57

Driver, in an article in The Contemporary Review, made the surprising assertion that he would have to make only three minor corrections to the critical analysis set out in his Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament in order to satisfy Sayce. He concluded, "In no other respect is a single argument or conclusion expressed in my work affected unfavourably by the facts which Professor Sayce has adduced, while in several cases... they are materially confirmed by them. If this be the net result so far as regards the present question of archaeological discovery, the critical study of the Old Testament has not much to fear at its hands."58

It is not surprising therefore that charges of inconsistency were levelled at Sayce, for here was an orientalist with orthodox views who gave the appearance of
being a higher critic. After a lengthy discussion on the book, Driver concluded that, "To all intents and purposes Professor Sayce is himself a 'higher critic': he differs from those whom he represents himself as opposing only by the fact that whereas...they belong to the extreme left of the critical position, he stands on the right." 59 Those who sympathized with Driver's conclusion were quick to agree. The Expository Times described the book as a vindication both of the methods and the results of the higher criticism: "Already it must be sufficiently evident that if the Committee of the S.P.C.K. took Professor Sayce to curse the Higher Criticism, he has blessed it altogether...It is not too much to say that from beginning to end Professor's Sayce's new book is on the side of the Higher Criticism. It accepts its methods; it strengthens its results." 60

Yet a careful examination of The Verdict of the Monuments reveals fundamental ideas which show Sayce to be neither a higher critic as the designation was normally understood nor inconsistent with his attitude towards criticism after 1883. It was true, as Sayce claimed in the preface, that the book satisfied neither the apologists nor the critics. 61 The work was an attack on the higher criticism and not a defense of orthodoxy. Those who were hoping for an irrefutable argument on behalf of the tenets of the traditional faith were disappointed; likewise, those who sought to claim Sayce's allegiance for the higher criticism were mistaken. The Verdict
of the Monuments contained an enmity towards the methodology of the critics which had its origin in Sayce's earlier popular works on archaeology and which intensified in the later stages of Sayce's career as an author and popularizer.

In 1895 Sayce refuted the accusation of inconsistency in adopting this hostile position after the apparently conciliatory tones of The Verdict of the Monuments by claiming that, "I cannot admit that I have changed my attitude towards 'criticism'." He clearly believed that the critics had a legitimate role to fulfil, and expressed this belief in his 1893 publication as well as in his later works. A sober and reverent examination of the Old Testament documents and history was always to be encouraged. Within its own sphere, the philological work of the critics had done much to revitalize the human element in the Bible and to discourage the fundamentally anti-Christian doctrine of verbal inerrancy:

Within the lawful domain of philology the work of the critic has been fruitful. We have learnt much about the text of the Old Testament Scriptures which was hidden from our fathers, and above all we have come to take a truer and more intelligent view both of the text itself and of the literature to which it belongs. We have learnt that the Old Testament Scriptures are as truly a literature as the classical productions of Greece or Rome, that they were written by men, not by machines, and that they reflect the individual qualities of those who wrote them, and the colouring of the various ages at which they were composed.

In the beginning of The Verdict of the Monuments
Sayce set out what he regarded as the central rule of higher criticism: the degree of credibility which could be assigned to a particular narrative depended largely upon the length of time which had elapsed between the period when it was written and the period when the event it recorded actually took place. It was this apparently inextricable link between literary analysis and historical criticism that aroused Sayce's opposition. He was adamant that while the philological studies in which the critics were engaged could provide valuable information, they could not legitimately determine the historicity of a particular biblical event. The only type of criticism which Sayce was prepared to accept was a literary criticism which subjected its own conclusions to scientific and impartial comparison with external evidence. It made little difference whether the critics were extreme in their conclusions, as in Germany, or whether they were of a more moderate school such as those in England. The methodology of the critics was fundamentally wrong: they took as conclusive the internal evidence of philology, refusing to compare their results with the evidence of the archaeologists.

The 'higher criticism' meant, claimed Sayce, a critical inquiry into the nature, origin and date of the biblical documents as well as into the historical credibility of the statements they contained. The higher critics had a just goal, but they too rapidly forgot "from whence they came." They failed to see that their work was
largely dependent on the work of the lower or textual critics, whose method, while soundly scientific, was wholly philological and paleographical. It had to be admitted that the facts which they ascertained could not be disputed; they did not depend on the taste or sentiment or prejudices of individual critics, but had to be accepted by all scholars. The situation changed considerably however when one moved from textual to higher criticism. The critics lost their ability to balance evidence and their strictly scientific methodology when they turned from a consideration of philological to historical and religious facts. They not only refused to consider the testimony of archaeological evidence, but continued to propagate theories which were based solely upon subjective criteria such as verbal or stylistic inconsistencies.

The "popes" of the higher criticism contended that the Scriptures could be explained and interpreted only through themselves, a method which Sayce claimed was argument "from a single instance." Scholars believed that internal, philological evidence was all that they had in their possession; there was nothing similar with which the documents could be compared, no contemporaneous record which could throw light on the facts they contained. Yet they were sadly mistaken. The critic had "closed his eyes to a most important source of evidence," that of archaeology, and had preferred the conclusions he had reached from a narrower circle of facts to those which the wider circle opened out by
Narrow, internal evidence without the check of external facts could lead only to false theories. Scientific inquiry became a largely subjective exercise when critics moved from literary analysis to historical criticism. When they were no longer restricted by facts, the critics could give free reign to their European assumptions and prejudices. Sayce focused much of his argument against criticism on an archaeological refutation of three of these assumptions: (1) that the oriental world was inferior to the classical world in education and culture, and therefore, no literature worth speaking of existed before Herodotus; (2) that the ancient world possessed only a limited geographical knowledge, thus relegating the use of highways and the regular transportation of large bodies of men to the realm of imaginative fancy, and (3) that the language and statements of an ancient oriental writer must be measured by the standard of a modern European, requiring from the former a high degree of exactitude and consistency. Sayce continually opposed these assumptions in his popular works, insisting on the antiquity of writing and the certainty of distant military expeditions such as those recorded in Genesis 14.

If Sayce had reached some of the same conclusions of the higher critics, it was only because the facts of archaeology had verified them. Traditionalists were surprised to see his agreement with the composite author-
ship of the Pentateuch, but it was made quite clear that this conclusion was borne out by archaeological evidence. The Verdict of the Monuments claimed, "One of the most assured results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament records has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch...The fact is fully in accordance with the teachings of oriental archaeology."66 The place occupied by the Pentateuch was similar to that occupied by the Book of the Dead in the sacred literature of ancient Egypt. After the work of modern research, it had become obvious that the Book's form had changed from age to age. Chapters were added or modified, glosses in the margins were used to explain obscure words; in short, the Book was "an amalgamation of documents and beliefs of various ages and localities."67

By setting out such a conclusion however Sayce was in no way endorsing the methods or all of the conclusions of the higher criticism. In an 1896 article in The Contemporary Review Sayce claimed that he saw no reason for denying the Mosaic origin of most of the Pentateuch, although this did not mean that the Hebrew legislator wrote it in precisely the same form as we now possess it.68 The critics had developed certain theories on the basis of their literary analysis; it was now time that the historian, with his ever-growing store of archaeological facts, acted to verify or overthrow these results. His position is summarized in the following quotation: "The 'higher' critic may be right in holding that the historical
books of the Old Testament in their present form are compilations of comparatively late date, but he is no longer justified in denying that the materials they embody may be contemporaneous with the events recorded in them."

There is evidence as seen above that The Verdict of the Monuments startled the traditionalists in its apparent concessions to the higher critics. Several reviews of the book however did suggest that its moderate tone would in the long-term allow it a wider influence. Driver for example commented that, "The more thoughtful and far-sighted apologists have long seen that the position adopted in a past generation is no longer tenable; it may be legitimately hoped that Professor Sayce's volume will cause this view to be more widely recognised." Yet despite its controversial nature and the fact that it was addressed to "the great body of the religious public," the book remained a somewhat scholarly volume of over five hundred pages. It was a later pamphlet and book, Archaeology and Criticism (1909) and Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies (1902) which popularized more fully Sayce's opposition to the higher criticism. In each publication the content of his argument was much the same as in the 1893 book; the tone however grew steadily sharper and more scathing in its condemnation.

Sayce had stated in 1893 that, "It must not be supposed that oriental archaeology and the 'higher criticism' are irreconcilable foes," yet by 1895 he was writing an article entitled, "Archaeology versus Old Testament Criticism."
War had been declared by Sayce on the critics in his popular works; his enthusiasm for battle often led him to propagate misunderstandings and premature conclusions. As I have attempted to show above, Sayce always opposed the methodology of the critics, but he went to great pains to point out the legitimate role of higher criticism in literary analysis. Only isolated tendencies towards a more conciliatory position however are found in his later popular works.\(^{73}\)

A number of factors were responsible for Sayce's increasingly hostile tone. The Assyriologist was troubled by the extravagant claims and "cocksure" analysis of the critics. Their theories appeared to him to be getting more and more radical. \textit{Monument Facts} was written so that a comparison could be made between the numerous and unexpected finds of the archaeologist and the controversial conclusions set out in a book such as Friedrich Delitzsch's \textit{Babel und Bibel}.\(^{74}\) In the article "Archaeology v. Old Testament Criticism," it was claimed that the critics had become unduly confident in their analysis and dating of documents: "A 'polychromatic' edition of the Old Testament is even being published in America, in which the 'eminent biblical scholars of Europe and America' exhaust all the colours of the rainbow in the effort to represent the literary mosaic-work of the ancient Hebrew books."\(^{75}\)

As the critics appeared to be losing all sense of responsibility, the discoveries of the East were rapidly
multiplying. An impressive case was being built up by those who followed the archaeologists. From 1890 onwards there was a considerable change in the archaeological work affecting the Old Testament. Research was transferred from the territory of Assyria in Upper Mesopotamia to the ancient cities of Babylonia in Lower Mesopotamia. American excavations at Nippur, German work at Ashur and that done by the British Museum at Ur brought to light thousands of inscribed tablets ranging back to the third millennium B.C. which established beyond question the antiquity and general use of writing in an age far earlier than that of Abraham. Then in 1901 French excavators at Susa discovered the important Babylonian column with the laws of Hammurabi inscribed upon it.

Let it not be forgotten that fifteen years ago there was something to be said on behalf of the 'new teaching' which cannot be said for it any longer. On the one hand, the 'higher criticism' of the Old Testament had not yet arrived at its present pitch of extravagance or shown so clearly the goal towards which it tends; on the other hand, oriental archaeology was still struggling for recognition, and the most important and crushing of the replies which it is now making to the dogmas of the 'higher critics' were still waiting to be discovered.76

It is also possible that the tone of Sayce's works and the degree of his antagonism was influenced by the audience for which he was writing. His accord with some of the conclusions of criticism is evident in a few instances in his more popular works, but it receives only minimal attention. T.K. Cheyne, in a letter in The Guardian, reflected this opinion when he claimed,
"Although it has been inferred from various popular essays of Professor Sayce that he is almost as much opposed to the 'higher criticism' as conservative and orthodox scholars of the most profound type...yet it would seem that when he writes for careful students he wishes to be regarded, not as an assailant, but as a reformer of that criticism."??

In dealing with lay men and women Sayce may have been carried away with enthusiasm over the unexpected discoveries of the archaeologists, discoveries which were easy to draw to the attention of the sensation-loving public; yet this also can only account for some of his growing animosity. Of greatest significance was Sayce's profound fear of the new thinking when he considered its possible consequences for the Christian faith. Beyond a certain point (presumably for Sayce the concessions he was willing to grant regarding composite authorship and minor errors in detail) the conclusions of criticism clearly came into conflict with the articles of the Christian faith. One senses a certain urgency in his later works, written in a period when the results of criticism were being increasingly popularized and were growing increasingly extreme. Expressing his fear for the future of the faith, Sayce asserted that:

The same methods and arguments which have made of the Pentateuch a later and untrustworthy compilation, whose divine origin and character is discernible only to the critics themselves, would, if applied to the Gospels, end in the same results. In this country, it is true, our critical friends have hitherto
kept their faces steadily averted from the New Testament, but the Protestant critics of the Continent have been less timid or prudent, and the way along which they should walk has long ago been pointed out to them by the Tübingen school.78

The reduction of the Old Testament narrative to myths and the "illusions of credulous orientals" did not augur well for much of the Gospel material. Criticism, Sayce claimed, indirectly undermined the miracles of the Bible by discrediting the narratives in which miraculous events were involved. The presence of a miracle was in fact sufficient reason for suspecting the truth of a particular passage. Sayce suggested that, "If there was no record of miracles in the Old and New Testaments, it may be questioned whether so much zeal would have been displayed in endeavouring to throw doubt on the authenticity of their contents."79 The implications for the Old Testament were grave, but they were unthinkable if men began to question the miraculous birth or resurrection of Jesus.

Sayce was also troubled by the doubt apparently cast on the teaching authority of Jesus by the critical conclusions. How could the critics claim allegiance to the Christian faith when they refuted the prophetic testimonies to the divinity of Jesus as well as his own words on the authenticity of the Pentateuch? Sayce is worth quoting at some length on this point, for it was central to his entire argument in his later works, and also to those who based their popular publications upon his writing:
Was our Lord right, or must we rather harken to the modern 'critic' when he tells us that the endeavour to find Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, in the sense in which Christ and His Church understood the phrase, is an illusion of the past? We cannot serve two masters; either we must believe that in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah we have a real portraiture of Christ, or else that Christ was mistaken and that the portraiture was only read into the chapter in later days. The words of Canon Liddon in reference to the critical theory of the origin of the Pentateuch still hold good: 'How is such a supposition reconcileable with the authority of Him who has so solemnly commended us to the Books of Moses, and whom Christians believe to be too wise to be himself deceived and too good to deceive his creatures?'

The influence exerted by Sayce's works was extensive. As a scholar he made a considerable contribution to the field of Assyriology, but it was primarily as a "populariser" or "vulgarisateur" of archaeological research that he was known. He attempted to open the eyes of the public to the ways in which the facts of archaeology were "killing" the theories of the higher critics. His works were popular for many reasons. Cheyne, in criticizing the often hasty conclusions to which Sayce was prone, commented,

In spite of this, he constantly popularises his results, without indicating whether they are peculiar to himself or not, and through the attractiveness of his style and the concessions to biblical orthodoxy, these results have obtained such a currency in the English-speaking countries that they are at present practically incontrovertible. The consequence is that our popular literature on the Old Testament is (as it seems to me) becoming an obstacle to progress.

A report on the 1904 meetings of the British Association in The Baptist Times and Freeman declared that, "Whether
or not one agrees with Professor Sayce, it is impossible not to be struck with the decisiveness and clearness with which he speaks. And I have not met a man in whom the religious instinct is stronger. 83

The attractiveness of Sayce's style and the presentation of his books undoubtedly added to their popularity. *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments and Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies* were part of a popular series entitled "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge." The volumes were brief, moderately priced (between 2s 6d and 3s each) and easy to handle. Profusely illustrated, they aimed at giving more complete information on circumstances or events which received only superficial coverage in the Bible. Sayce's essay on *Archaeology and Criticism* was in an even more accessible form in the six penny "Essays for the Times" series. Again the format was simple, the contents clear and concise.

Sayce's work possessed a spirit of optimism with regards to the Bible which also helped to insure its popularity with the orthodox. In *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, he wrote, "Enough has been brought to light and interpreted by the student of oriental antiquity to enable us to test and correct the conclusions of the critic, and to demonstrate that his scepticism has been carried to an extreme. The period of scepticism is over, the period of reconstruction has begun." 84 An element of confidence was built into Sayce's entire pattern of argument, based as it was upon the
distinction between internal and external evidence. Those who wished to adhere to orthodoxy were rescued from the despair and confusion into which they had been thrown by the higher criticism. The monuments, they were told, provided a scientific method of judging the critical theories. They provided weapons which could be grasped and understood much more readily than the linguistic arguments of the critics. It was indeed good cause for rejoicing when in so many cases the conventional views were being vindicated.

Sayce's ideas were also particularly influential because they were summarized and republished in numerous works by other authors. Seen as especially important was Sayce's refutation of the main assumptions of the critics. Many popular writers such as the author of an article on "Unearthing Buried Sinai" in Good Words followed almost verbatim Sayce's position on the antiquity of writing and the probability of Mosaic authorship: "So far as the question of Moses and the Pentateuch is concerned, it is next to impossible to conceive that Moses, educated as a prince of the house of pharaoh as he was, could have been ignorant of the practice of handwriting than in common use. There is probably little doubt that in the Pentateuch a large substratum was originally and actually written down by the very hand of the great legislator."  

Sayce's distrust of philology generally and his confidence in archaeology was also reflected in a number of
popular works. Macy's book on Some Mistakes of the Higher Critics (1913) assured her readers that the confident and learned theories of the critics accepted because many feared to refute them, had been destroyed. She wrote, "But the time came when the science of language had to stand aside before the discoveries that revealed the story of the ancient world; discoveries that came to light in recent years and are still coming to light today."\(^7\) Charles Ovenden's book Modern Criticism and the Holy Scriptures (1913) claimed that there was no justification for judging the character or history of a people on the basis of words alone. It would be ludicrous for example for a scholar in the year 5000 A.D. to construct a picture of the character of the British people on the basis of a word in their vocabulary such as "joke.\(^8\)

An atmosphere of optimism was created by such popular authors as they assured themselves and their readers that the "facts have killed the theory." Just as those learned men who scorned the idea of steam-driven vehicles were proven sadly wrong, so those who doubted the veracity of the Bible were being corrected by the spade of the archaeologist. The works of Sayce and those influenced by him gave a careful if not always accurate account of the facts which allegedly destroyed the theories of the critics. The popular material focused on a vindication of the traditional dating of the Old Testament and its consequent trustworthiness, although attention was also paid to certain finds of the excavator which were
said to directly confirm biblical events. This latter aspect of the books and lectures is considered first in the discussion which follows; the specific critical theories which were attacked on the grounds of archaeological evidence are then examined.

The Facts which Kill the Theories

The development of archaeology gave rise, as seen above, to a parallel growth in linguistic studies, especially that of Assyriology. In spite of caution and skepticism on the part of many scholars, the inscriptions were popularly interpreted as confirming the historical accuracy of the biblical record. The facts and inferences of the Assyriologists, surprising as they were, according to T.K. Cheyne, were accepted en masse by the great sensation-loving public with unquestioning belief. Great enthusiasm was generated for example over the fact that the reign of Shalmaneser II as well as Ahaz of Israel was clearly mentioned on the Black Obelisk found by Layard at Nimroud. It was admitted except in the most dogmatic books that the obelisk's chronology was out of step with that found in the Scriptures, but this was overshadowed by the confirmation of Scriptural details by an external and ancient source. Also frequently presented in the popular material were descriptions of the annals of Assyrian monarchs. In these, claimed Nicol, the inscriptions and the Bible went "hand in hand" as
II Kings and Isaiah 7-8 were corroborated by the mention of the rulers Azariah, Jehoahaz, Menahem, Pekah and Hoshea.\textsuperscript{90}

There was an other-worldly aura of mystery and anticipation surrounding the discovery and decipherment of inscriptions. In many of the popular works on archaeology art pages were devoted to printed samples of cuneiform or hieroglyphic writing.\textsuperscript{91} A Bible Portfolio for example was produced in 1886 by Elizabeth Ranyard with the intention of providing a means of instructive Sunday afternoon entertainment. One page of the poster-size folio was devoted to a reproduction of inscriptions appearing on the rocks of Mt. Sinai which, the accompanying Companion to the Bible Portfolio claimed, had been placed there by the ancient Hebrews and deciphered by the clergyman Charles Foster. Readers were informed that in these inscriptions the words of the Old Testament were clearly confirmed as well as elucidated. A crude sketch of a figure leading an animal for instance was proposed as confirmation of the Psalmist's words, "The people of the Hebrews restrains with the rein..."\textsuperscript{92}

The monuments themselves as well as the inscriptions were looked upon as confirming the biblical narratives. In the introduction to a book on the ancient monuments it was claimed that the publication of works such as Sayce's \textit{Verdict of the Monuments} and McCurdy's \textit{History, Prophecy and the Monuments} had "familiarized the popular mind with the fact that there has been preserved a veri-
table historical record parallel, generally speaking, with that contained in the Old Testament, and serving the valuable ends of elucidation and verification. The site of the Pool of Siloam for example had been verified by Sayce's translation of an inscription on the wall in 1881. Of greater interest however was the confirmation of the biblical record concerning Hezekiah and the famed tunnel: "It is a remarkable proof of the historical accuracy of Scripture," wrote Thomas Nicol, "that explorers within the last few years have found what they believe to be the very plug - a plug of stone - with which Hezekiah shut off these waters so that they might be of no advantage to Sennacherib during the siege of the city."

A series of lectures to Y.M.C.A. audiences by William Walsh, the Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin, aimed at removing the results of archaeological investigation from expensive treatises and laying them before the general public. In a volume based on the lectures entitled Ancient Monuments and the Holy Writ (1878) Walsh described the exact correspondence between II Chronicles 12: 2-4 and certain inscriptions on the temple walls at Karnak. Here one saw the king Shishak and his captives, including the king of Judah with a rope around his neck and arms bound. By adding the symbol for "land," the inscription indicated that not the king of Judah but his land was in the hands of the Egyptians.

Similar enthusiasm was provoked by excavation work done at the suggested sites of the Egyptian store cities
of Pithom and Ramses. In clearing the sites of these granaries, it was believed that a remarkable confirmation of biblical detail occurred. In the bottom row of bricks there was evidence that straw had been used; in the middle rows halfway up the well, reeds had been mixed with the clay, whereas the top layer showed no trace of either straw or reeds. Again the accuracy of the biblical story as recorded in Exodus 5:6-12 was attested to.96

The onslaught against criticism was however more specific in its arguments, extending beyond the positive confirmation of details in the biblical history. The theories of the higher critics which were attacked in the popular material included: (1) that the Old Testament presented certain pious tales which had very little, if any, historical content; (2) that the historical material which was found in the Bible was often inaccurate; (3) that the biblical record assumed its written form far later than conventional opinion was prepared to admit; (4) that certain of the Old Testament books were not written by the author whose name they bore; and finally, (5) that an evolutionary pattern could be discerned in the moral and religious history of the Israelites.

One of the major archaeological finds of the nineteenth century, the Tel-el Amarna tablets, were uncovered in 1887. The discovery was welcomed by traditionalists. The tablets appeared to clearly corroborate the Old Testament record, shedding much light on the political situation of the fifteenth century B.C. and
and revealing an active literary intercourse between the
civilized areas of Egypt, Assyria and Palestine. The
tablets themselves were letters from Egyptian officials
posted in foreign territories to their supervisors at
home. Attractive among other things to conventional
believers was the apparent confirmation of the existence
of Melchizedek, so long an enigma dismissed by the critics.
Thomas Nicol explained to his readers that the governor
of Jerusalem, in writing to his superior, spoke of himself
in the same terms in which Melchizedek was described. The
governor Abdi-Chiba boasted that, unlike the other princes
in the province, he derived his office from the oracle of
a god who was spoken of as "The Mighty King." "Behold,"
he said, "neither my father nor my mother have exalted me
in this place; the prophecy of the Mighty King has caused
me to enter the house of my father." He apparently
regarded himself as much a priest as a king. The parallels with Melchizedek were obvious; the priest of the
Most High God without father or mother became credible
as a historical personage.

The primary concern of the traditionalist however was
not the vindication of the historical Melchizedek but
rather of the patriarch Abraham who, the Bible claimed,
worshipped the mysterious priest. The suggestion made
by the more radical critics that much of the material con-
cerning the patriarch was legend and that the name of
Abraham could even represent a tribe rather than an indivi-
dual inflamed the orthodox, who saw themselves defending
nothing less than the Christian faith. Clearly an effort had to be made to restore Abraham to the realm of historical truth. In dealing with the archaeological witness against criticism one popular pamphlet claimed,

If Abraham is not a person, then there is no covenant of circumcision, no chosen People, no Promised Seed, in whom all the families of the earth should be blest, and in a word, no scheme of redemption, and no meaning in the claim to Divinity, made by Jesus Christ...

"Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I AM." 98

A certain measure of historical credibility, it was asserted, was given to the patriarch through the identification of Ur of the Chaldees, his home according to the Old Testament, with the modern town of El-Mugheir. More significant for the orthodox however was the corroboration of Genesis 14, a key passage in arousing the skepticism of the critical reader. The critics, it was claimed, regarded the proper names in the story concerning Abraham as etymological fictions. They insisted that no such campaigns of great distance could have been conducted in such an early age, and they believed that the Kingdom of Elam did not even exist in Abraham's day much less dominate Babylonia. The monuments however had proven that these assumptions were false. They resulted from imperfect knowledge on the part of the critics and not from inaccuracies in the Genesis narrative. Clearly, Sayce claimed, it was dangerous to question a long-held tradition until all the facts were known; otherwise one was only left with a "baseless fabric of the subjective imagination." 99
It was argued for example that the monuments revealed the names of Chedolaomer and Tidal as contemporaries of Abraham, and also showed that Babylonia was divided into two sections during this period, Shinar and Larsa. The latter could be proven to be Ellasar and was definitely associated with the name of Arioch or Eri-ku, while the former was associated with Amraphael (identified only by the most dogmatic of the orthodox with the famed Babylonian ruler Hammurabi). Readers were assured on the basis of further investigation that Tidal and Amraphael were vassals to Chedolaomer, the situation described in Genesis 14.

The antiquity of the Elamite monarchy was also popularized as being proven by the new archaeological discoveries. Again a severe blow was dealt to the higher critics and their supporters. A tablet from the library of Assurbanipal claimed that he conquered Susa 1635 years after Kadur-Nankhundi, the king of Elam, took Babylonia. The Elamite monarchy was therefore clearly established around 2300 B.C., and the king Chedolaomer followed in this line of oriental suppressors. The certainty with which the campaign in Palestine could be greeted varied in the popular material. Henry Wace regarded it as "highly possible" given the nature of the Elamite dynasty. The lack of specific monumental reference to the incursions was due, so some writers claimed, to the ancient historian's need to be selective with his
material. Thomas Nicol however enthusiastically immersed his readers in the actuality of this "first campaign of history" which proved not only the strength but the far-flung ambitions of the Elamites.\textsuperscript{101} Genesis 14 therefore bore the stamp of authentic history on several grounds; neither the ancient kings nor the patriarch Abraham could be relegated to the realm of legend.

In Rudolph Kittel's \textit{Babylonian Excavations and Early Bible History} (1903), a publication by the S.P.C.K. designed to show the "sober" conclusions of some German critics as opposed to the radical arguments of others, the author concluded that,

\begin{quote}
I do not...belong to those who make the maintenance of the personality of Abraham a shibboleth of the Christian faith. But I am all the more confident in declaring it as my well-considered and scientific conviction that, in the present state of our knowledge, there is nothing to require us to regard Abraham as a mythical or legendary figure, but rather that many and strong arguments speak clearly for the contrary.\textsuperscript{102}
\end{quote}

There was certain material in the Old Testament which, according to the critics, was to some extent historical but which was encrusted with inaccuracies and exaggerations when it came to matters of detail. The archaeologists were also called upon to rescue these narratives, the most publicized arguments being those centering around the empire of the Hittites. Sayce devoted an entire book, \textit{The Hittites and the Bible}, to the nature of this ancient civilization as well as its implications for the trustworthiness of the biblical record. Thomas Nicol and Susan Macy also regarded the monuments referring to the Hittites as a major
find in favor of the orthodox position.

The reference to the Hittites in II Kings 7:6 had been dismissed by the critics, according to Sayce, as "unhistorical in tone." They asserted that no Hittite king could have compared in power with the kings of Judah or Egypt. Modern discoveries however clearly proved such assertions false. The Tel el Amarna tablets told of a people, undoubtedly the Hittites according to Nicol, who advanced southwards from the north and threatened Egyptian domination in Canaan. Records had also been discovered which referred to a peace treaty made on very moderate terms between Ramses II and the Khita or Hittite king. This evidence showed that the Hittites were great enough as a nation to negotiate with Egypt on equal terms.

Sayce himself was a scholar of high standing on the culture of the Hittites, and contributed a great deal to the decipherment of Hittite inscriptions. He popularized the discovery and translation of the inscriptions as a major source of information with which to refute the higher critics. The tale of the inscriptions was an intriguing one and would have provided even the indifferent layman with hours of engrossing reading. Images cut in the rock of the Pass of Karabel running between Ephesos and Smyrna had been discovered in 1839 along with a carving of the Egyptian conqueror Sesostros. After a long period of research, a treacherous climb to copy the images and an opportunity to compare them with inscriptions from Asia Minor and Aleppo, they were recognized as having Hittite
origins. It was immediately obvious from the carving of Sesostros that the Egyptians had, in the Pass of Karabel, come up against a power by which they were challenged. The Hittites were clearly a people of military power with widespread influence. Their inscriptions were not meant to be decorative art forms but symbols of conquest, in the case of Karabel showing that the pass had been won and kept by force of arms. The Bible was true, proclaimed Life and Work; the Hittites had been shown to be not a petty tribe but a once-great nation of warriors and merchants hardly less great than the Egyptians or Assyrians.

Numerous other archaeological finds were published as vindicating the historicity of material challenged by the new criticism. The Moabite Stone for example was cited as a confirmation of certain parts of II Kings. The stele, the only major inscription in the Moabite language, was dedicated to the God Chemosh in thankfulness for a Moabite victory over the Israelites. It was here that the existence of the biblical Mesha was corroborated as well as Israelite domination over the Moabites under Omri.

Wellhausen's distrust of the material in II Chronicles 33 (the captivity and subsequent conversion of Manasseh) was also singled out for attention. An Assyrian expedition in the West, so the critics were said to claim, was mentioned by no other extant source and so was highly unlikely. Suspicious also was the fact that the captive Manasseh was taken to Babylon rather than Nineveh, and that he was not tortured or executed. Such doubts however
were quickly dispelled for the faithful by the Assyrian monuments. It had become evident that Esar-Haddon and his son Assurbanipal had conducted military incursions into Palestine. Also evident was the fact that Esar-Haddon had the city of Babylon rebuilt and was therefore referred to as the king of Babylon in certain inscriptions. More difficult to answer was the problem raised by Manasseh's release, yet again the monuments vindicated the Scriptures. In one of Assurbanipal's inscriptions readers were told of two vassals, Sarludari and Necho, who were "bound with iron bonds and iron chains." When the latter arrived at Nineveh, favor was bestowed upon him and he was allowed to return to his home.106

By discussing questions of legendary material and the detailed accuracy of the Old Testament record however the traditionalists did not really confront the threat posed by the higher criticism. For this reason the direct vindication of the historicity of portions of the biblical narrative formed only one aspect of the conventional attack in the popular debate. The critics insisted that many of the biblical narratives were recorded long after the events which they described; the narratives consequently were less trustworthy than if they had been written by eyewitnesses. It was no longer possible to accept the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as it stands, and a number of literary characteristics and historical observations were marshalled to support this
theory. On the basis of these, conservative critics claimed that the oldest sources had been committed to writing no earlier than the age of Solomon; the more radical ones believed that relatively little in the Pentateuch could be dated before the Exile. Sayce and other participants in the debate however believed that central to this critical theory was the assumption that the art of writing was not generally known until the 6th century B.C. What the orthodox believed they lacked was some way in which this assumption could be shown to be fallacious. Once again the archaeologists were called upon to vindicate the Sacred Scriptures. As Sayce claimed, this critical idea crumbled into dust as soon as it was tested by solid facts, in this case the solid facts of Egyptology and Assyriology.

Modern archaeological studies had shown that Egypt, the home of Moses, was a highly advanced and literate civilization in the early stages of human history. Records of contemporary events had been discovered in the tombs of the rulers of the First Dynasty dating back to 3100 B.C. By 2500 B.C., the period of the Fourth Dynasty, there was evidence in the ritual texts covering the walls that writing was widely known throughout the nation. The proverbs of Ptah-Hotep, sophisticated in literary style, appeared not much later. According to the popular nineteenth century books, the list of evidence betraying literary activity was endless. Archaeologists had excavated schools and libraries as well as papyrus books and
toilet articles covered with inscriptions. Even those who supervised the workmen at construction sites, it was claimed, had to submit written accounts to their superiors. By the advent of the Mosaic era, the range of Egyptian literature included historical novels, political satires and even a travelogue on the adventures of an Egyptian official stationed in Palestine. There was no reason then to dismiss the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch on the grounds of probable illiteracy. As Sayce claimed, "The miracle would have been, not that Moses should have written a book but that being what he was, born and brought up in Egypt in an age as literary as that of the Renaissance, he should not have done so." 107

As Egyptology was interpreted as refuting the assertions of the critics, the decipherment of the Assyrian inscriptions was also acclaimed as vindicating the truth of Holy Scripture. Literacy was not only a characteristic of the early civilization around the Nile, but also in Mesopotamia, the home of the patriarch Abraham. Evidence for the existence of literary skills in Babylonia was said to be convincing. A temple library discovered at Calneh for example was described as containing writings from as early as 6,000 B.C. Libraries were also discovered at Accad and Tello, the latter containing over 30,000 clay tablets dating from 4,000 B.C. Literary skills spanned the whole of Mesopotamian society: women as well as men shared in education, and lesson and exercise
books showed that children were acquainted with the art of writing. There was also evidence that a high degree of literary skill was demanded by the nature of the inscriptions themselves. Reading uniform characters minus pictorial reminders was clearly a more difficult task than reading hieroglyphics. In addition to studying cuneiform, educated persons were required to know Sumerian, a classical language used in law and religion, as well. Miss Macy concluded this section of her book by declaring that the critics had spoken too soon. Evidence which could easily be understood by her readers proved that the ancient Babylonians and Assyrians were more educated than Englishmen were in the reign of George III. 108

Literary skills outside the major civilized areas of ancient history were also known, again betraying the widespread nature of the art of writing. Archaeologists had discovered that the inhabitants of Crete once possessed three and possibly even four different systems of writing long before the time of Moses. An unknown script found on the pottery and wall tiles of Palestine was identified with one of these systems, showing that literacy had penetrated into the land of the Hebrews itself. This exposure to writing was supplemented for the Hebrews by knowledge gained during their stay in Egypt as well as by contacts made with the wealthy desert culture of Arabia. Inscriptions discovered in the land of Midian showed not only a longstanding knowledge of alphabetical writing but a capacity for creating elaborate temples and the accompanying
rituals. "The 'Mindean' inscriptions," Sayce claimed, "are full of architectural terms which make it clear that the Israelitish tabernacle might well have been erected in the 'desert' and in the Mosaic age." 109

According to the popular material supporting conventional opinion, the above evidence was conclusive. There was no reason to dispute the belief that Moses wrote the Pentateuch on the grounds that he was not literate. Yet a final proof had been provided by Heaven in case a shadow of doubt still remained. Even if certain critics refused to admit that they were defeated and so continued to propagate their falsehoods, the faithful could take comfort in the discovery of the Tel el Amarna tablets. Here was indisputable proof that the assumption of oriental illiteracy was a wrong one. The higher critics, by the tablets, had been dealt a death blow from which they could never recover. The tablets, claimed the popular works, clearly showed that literary exchanges had taken place as a matter of course in the diplomatic work of the ancient civilized world. 110

Evidence for the early development of writing was important in the popular defense of the Bible, for it was generally and sincerely believed that the theories of the critics could not stand in the face of such evidence. The verification of the biblical narrative, the ultimate goal of the orthodox, could be accomplished however not only by demonstrating the possibility of an early date for written material but also the actuality of composition
by eyewitnesses to the sacred events. This demonstration was carried out in a number of ways involving the work of archaeologists and linguists of the nineteenth century.

Traditionalists turned to geography to confirm the contemporaneous nature of the Exodus account. Archaeological excavations and the study of certain papyri had proven that the cities of Pithom and Ramses were constructed during the reign of Ramses II of the Nineteenth Dynasty who was also the pharaoh of the Exodus. If the critics were right, the geographical details of the Exodus story should match those of a dynasty far later than the Nineteenth, showing that the story was based on legend and committed to writing only centuries later. If the Bible was accurate, the details found there would correspond to those of Ramses II's age. What was revealed by the papyri of the Nineteenth Dynasty was set before readers, and the orthodox claimed the victory.

The papyri described the Shur or Wall which protected Egypt from Asia and which followed the course of the newly built Suez Canal. West of this was the district of Succoth with Pithom as its capital. Still further west was Goshen, an area of land regarded as a private domain of the pharaohs and used for cattle grazing. This description was in accord with the geography at the time Moses was born, but did not agree with the plan of Egypt before or after the Nineteenth Dynasty. After this period, one heard nothing more of Succoth or the Wall and Goshen
was no longer set apart for nomadic herdsmen. Sayce popularized this point in his book Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies:

This exact agreement of the geography of the Exodus with the actual geography of the Delta in the time of the Nineteenth Dynasty could hardly be explained if the biblical narrative had been compiled two or three hundred years after the event, in an age when the map of Egypt had been altered and the older geography forgotten. Still less could it be explained, if the whole story had been invented or thrown into shape in Palestine. There was no atlas to which the Hebrew writer could have turned, much less an atlas which represented geographical conditions which had long since passed away. History fixes the Exodus of Israel in the epoch of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and geography assigns it to the same date. To that period, and that period alone, does the geography of the Pentateuch apply.141

Controversial also was the source and hence date of the Genesis material on the Creation and the Flood. On the basis of the newly discovered Creation and Flood tablets, it was claimed by modern scholars that the biblical narratives were patterned after the older Babylonian tales. Cautious critics argued that though the Babylonian origin of the material was clear, Abraham's ancestors had borrowed the stories which were subsequently transformed by the Hebrews. More radical was the belief that the material was first known to the Hebrews in the era of Captivity. According to some popular material however the critics were all wrong and were guilty of misrepresenting the archaeological evidence. Miss Macy pointed out that in German East Africa a tribe of Negroes shedding light on this problem had been discovered. These people had been found to have a religious faith similar to
that of Jesus and not to the Babylonians. They told a story of Adam and Eve, the Fall, the expulsion from Paradise and the Flood; they also believed firmly that their god was One God. This particular tribe, Miss Macy contended, derived its beliefs from a very ancient source circulating before the Christian or even Babylonian traditions developed. "In the earliest days of all," she wrote, "the knowledge of God, and of the Creation, of the story of Adam and Eve, and of Cain, and the Flood, must have been known to all the existing people of the world, who then lived in Arabia, the cradle of the human race." The stories were carried from this ancient source and kept alive by word of mouth. The Babylonians had subsequently distorted the tale while Moses had accurately recorded it under Divine inspiration.

In a more scholarly work Rudolph Kittel adopted a similar position. Kittel asserted that the Babylonian and Hebrew stories stemmed from a common Eastern heritage. This original material, revealed by God to man, could not be discerned. Kittel insisted however that the polytheism of the Babylonian tablets was but a degenerate phase of an originally higher conception of God. Nor could animism or totemism have developed without some primary concept of an invisible Creator.

"Let us now pass to the second assumption," claimed Sayce, "on the ground of which the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has been declared to be impossible - the assumption, namely, that a code of laws was impossible
at so early a date as the Mosaic period." This assertion had been proven fallacious, the orthodox triumphantly announced: the excavator De Morgan in 1901 had discovered the ruins of Susa, the palace belonging to the Babylonian monarch Hammurabi. At the beginning of 1902 a great slab of black marble was discovered among the ruins and was brought from thence to Paris where it was set up in the Louvre. It was covered with cuneiform characters which embodied nothing less than the Babylonian code of civil law.

The discovery of the Babylonian code demonstrated the fact that legal codification was known in Babylonia for nearly a thousand years before the time of Moses. As Canaan was a Babylonian province, the traditionalists, asserted, the ancestors of the Hebrews must have been acquainted with such a code. This assertion was verified when one compared certain patriarchal practices with those endorsed by the code. The material in Genesis was therefore most certainly from this early period and the higher critics could only retreat from another false assumption. The patriarchal reference for example to the "law" could only be understood as an allusion to the Code of Hammurabi. Whereas the power of adoption was unknown in the Mosaic era, the childless Abraham could speak of his house-steward Eliezer as his heir. This was possible only because the Babylonian law permitted the adoption of a slave who thereby became a free citizen and could inherit the property of his adoptive father. Furthermore it was difficult to see how the Babylonian legislation, once known but for-
gotten in an atmosphere of social and religious transition in Israel, could be suddenly remembered by an author of the Pentateuch writing at a later date. On this point Sayce claimed, "When we recollect that after the Israelitish conquest of Canaan the Babylonian code came to be disused and forgotten and that a writer of a later date would have ascribed the law with which he alone was acquainted to the patriarchal age, the fact is one which it is very difficult for the advocates of the so-called 'critical' theories to explain." 115

While the code, through points of similarity with the patriarchal narratives, ruled out a late date of origin, it accomplished much the same for the Mosaic legislation through points of difference. By the time the Mosaic legislation was composed the situation of the Israelites, in conventional opinion, had become very different from that of the earlier Babylonian communities. It was true of course that the Mosaic and Babylonian codes revealed a common community of origin in certain formulas as well as in the legislatively creative power of the judges. The resemblances nevertheless were limited. The Babylonian code was clearly directed towards a powerful monarchial state with a settled population and a high regard for property. Israel's code originating with Moses however reflected the conditions of life experienced by a nomadic population. It would have been impossible therefore to have such a set of laws originating at a late date in a post-Conquest community of merchants and farmers in the
centuries of Israelite domination in Canaan.

Central therefore to the popular argument against critical dating was new-found faith in the antiquity of writing and of legal codes. Other evidence unearthed by the archaeologists confirmed certain details and phrases in the Old Testament which could have originated only through the observations of eyewitnesses. Critics, claimed Canon Girdlestone, said that the Egyptian names occurring in the Genesis narrative concerning Joseph dated it no earlier than the Twenty-second Dynasty or the tenth century B.C. Orthodoxy however found a champion in the Egyptologist H.G. Tompkins who spoke of the name Petu-baal, similar to the one recorded in Exodus 6:25 (Putiel), which appeared on a stele in the Louvre. This particular name could be traced back to the time of the Hyksos. It was also significant that the name Asenath, once believed to date from a later empire, was found by experts to belong to the old and middle empires.116

A pamphlet by Joseph Angus, published by the Working Men's Educational Union, attempted to aid popular lecturers on the subject of biblical archaeology and particularly on the illustrative value of the painting and sculpture of ancient Egypt. Angus was especially concerned with the fact that the monuments supplied "a timely and incidental proof of the truthfulness and early authorship of the Pentateuch."117 It could not escape the ordinary mind that these books must have been written by
someone thoroughly conversant with the domestic habits and vocabulary of the Egyptians as well as for readers with these customs fresh in their memories. Numbers 11: 4–6 for example was confirmed by the great variety of fruits and vegetables found in the Egyptian paintings. Also revealed was the high incidence of "botch" or "sickness," a situation spoken of in Exodus 15:26.

This corroboration of traditional opinion was strengthened according to Angus when one considered that between the time of Moses and the reign of Solomon, the Israelites had no contact with Egypt and no opportunity to investigate the living standards of a distant kingdom. This state of affairs was verified by the fact that the Hebrew monarchy was not patterned after the pharaohs of Egypt who had become forgotten figures by the time of Samuel. Even subsequent relations were only superficial and became even more so as Egypt passed through centuries of anarchy and decline. Such knowledge as revealed in the Pentateuch, then, was not the result of numerous editings but of accurate and first-hand reporting.

Archaeological evidence was employed primarily in the arguments defending the antiquity and the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Popular fervor however had also been aroused over the late date assigned to the book of Daniel. With this concern in mind, the authors of the popular material frequently devoted attention to the vindication of the traditional views on Daniel which they believed emerged from the facts of the monuments. One
of the points made by the critics who doubted the authenticity of Daniel was that some of the historical allusions in the book, particularly the one referring to Belshazzar, simply had no basis in recognized historical fact. Investigation into the monuments of Babylon had however refuted this point, establishing the historical character of Belshazzar and hence the authenticity of one of the most intriguing popular prophets.

Evetts in his book *New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land* as well as Miss Macy in her work took up the arguments in favor of the conventional views on Daniel. For centuries the only solution to the mystery of Belshazzar had been the unsatisfactory one of identifying him with Nabonidus, mentioned by ancient historians as the last king of Babylon. The solution evoked little confidence as the two names had no real connection; this inconclusive state persisted until the discovery of the cuneiform inscriptions which changed the entire situation. First confirmed was the fact that Nabonidus was the last king of Babylon and ruled when the Persian invasions began. Mentioned along with Nabonidus however was the name of the monarch's oldest son, given as Bel-shar-usur. Partial progress was made therefore towards an identification of Belshazzar, but confirmation of his kingship was still lacking.

Again the cuneiform inscriptions illuminated and confirmed the Bible. In 1882 Theophilus Pinches deciphered
and published the mutilated but legible inscriptions representing the annals of Nabonidus. Here for all to see was an explanation of the Babylonian situation as recorded in Daniel. It appeared that it was common practice for the son of Nabonidus to act as regent during his father's absence from court and to take over the duty of commanding the army. It was obvious therefore that Belshazzar, at the time of the Persian invasion, was acting as his father's representative, presiding over the Babylonian court and leading the Babylonian army.

Conventional views on the authorship of the Old Testament books were left for the most part to indirect vindication, as the material was restored in the popular mind to its traditional dates by the spade of the archaeologist. Sayce did however specifically refute the critical notion of composite authorship with reference to the Pentateuch. The orthodoxy of a significant number of churchmen had been modified by the end of the nineteenth century to allow for a number of sources in the make-up of the Pentateuch. Mosaic authorship, to be sure, was staunchly adhered to, but it was admitted that the lawgiver himself might have drawn upon a variety of documents in order to produce his work. It was this position which Sayce adopted and supported by turning to archaeological evidence.

In Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies Sayce declared that the theory of composite authorship was suspect on the grounds of common sense, for the use of a
variety of documents did not necessarily exclude the possibility of a single author. Even in contemporary times it was not difficult to find authors who used extracts from the work of others without quotation marks or acknowledgements. Even more promising however as evidence for this theory were the facts of archaeology. In the Deluge tablets from ancient Chaldea one could readily see elements from both documents discerned by the critics, a fact which destroyed the argument for a late dating of the flood story because of peculiar elements in a single document. The Babylonian account for example spoke of three birds, answering why the dove was mentioned twice in the biblical narrative. It was clear therefore that the story as it appeared was really a unity. It was not the reader's task in inquire into why differences of detail occurred but only to realize that the facts supported conventional opinion.

Challenged finally was the critical assumption that religion and ideas as well as natural forms underwent an evolutionary process of change. This challenge was more fundamental in the eyes of the orthodox than those presented by the critical theories of authorship and dating, for it gave rise to the critical notions that the art of writing and of legal codification were late developments. To assume that the Mosaic era was also the dawn of culture and that religious development only reached high levels centuries after this period was to befriend foreign philosophies while scorning the clear evidence of
archaeological facts. To doubt the historicity of some of the material in the Pentateuch which presupposed a sophisticated society was to construct an edifice of scholarship on baseless opinion.

Made by Sayce, C.R. Conder and Rudolph Kittel was the point that the civilizations older than the Bible itself were complex and sophisticated. Kittel for example pointed out that archaeology had destroyed the dogma of a continuous and unbroken line of evolution by revealing highly creative artistic skills in Crete two thousand years before the Christian era. Egypt and Babylonia had also been shown to be in the full blaze of culture before the Mosaic era. Constant trade and communication existed, laws were written and land boundaries set out, and public works were carried out on a grandiose scale. Skilled craftsmen worked in gold and bronze and with precious stones. It was this high level of civilization which was known by the ancestors of the Hebrews and which was reflected in the Bible itself.120

The theories of the critics, then, were challenged in the popular debate by what were viewed as indisputable facts. No longer, it was claimed, could the higher criticism trouble the minds of believers with claims that the traditional faith in the genuineness and accuracy of the Scriptures was unwarranted. The series of essays Can We Trust the Bible? concentrated to a significant degree on the vindication of the Bible through archaeology. One author concluded:
We thus see how God in His Providence is vindicating the truth of His Word. The new discoveries of archaeology have been verifying the truth of the Bible and discrediting the critical theories that impugn it, and we may expect that the new light which is coming continually from biblical research and discovery will save the Christian Church from being deceived by these pretentious and baseless theories. 121

The Critical Rebuttal

The assault of the orthodox upon the higher criticism involved the weapons of the monuments more often than any other method of attack. It lasted well into the first decade of the twentieth century. Those who supported the higher criticism conducted their side of the debate for the most part around issues other than those determined by the evidence of the monuments. Their concern rested far more in presenting a flexible view of inspiration within the context of Christian faith and, towards the end of the nineteenth century, the positive and constructive results of criticism for the permanent value of the Old Testament. The fundamental difference between the truth of edification and the truth of fact however remained unheeded by the traditionalists. As a result, the orthodox succeeded only in replacing the vulnerable supports of prophecy and miracle with the vulnerable support of the monuments. While the appeal of archaeological discoveries to the popular mind was great, the discoveries themselves offered only short-lived
protection from the ravages of criticism. More often than not the arguments hostile to critical theories were based on faulty notions both of the work of archaeology and the theories of the biblical scholars. The prediction that "the name of Sayce will be gratefully remembered when that of the critic is forgotten" was not fulfilled.¹²²

There were some contributions to the popular debate surrounding archaeology by those who sympathized with the higher criticism which must be considered. S.R. Driver particularly took it upon himself to deal with the accusations of Sayce and his followers, contributing articles to The Contemporary Review and publishing a popular version of his essay which appeared in David Hogarth's Authority and Archaeology: Sacred and Profane (1899). T.K. Cheyne, William Robertson Smith, Robert Horton and W.H. Bennett also published popular material on the whole question of archaeological evidence and biblical criticism. The arguments which they set out were usually levelled against the work of Sayce, but they could in nearly every case be applied to the popularizers of archaeology in general. They focused in their works on two fundamental questions: How far did the external evidence recalled by Sayce and others go towards specifically refuting the claims of the higher critics? and, how accurate was their understanding of criticism?

The supporters of biblical criticism made an effort to point out that the "archaeology versus criticism" confrontation which had been fixed in the popular mind was not in
agreement with reality. The consequence of the popular debate was,

that much misconception is created; the true position and claims of archaeology and criticism are obscured, and two branches of study, which are really complementary, are brought into a false antagonism. No critic, whatever those unacquainted with their writings may imagine to the contrary, shrinks from the facts; the critic's only regret is that there are not more facts at his disposal, and he welcomes fresh facts, whether they come to him from archaeology or from any other quarter.\textsuperscript{123}

The evidence of archaeology did nothing to contradict critical theories and much to necessitate a critical point of view.

It was necessary first of all to stress an important fact which Sayce and his followers ignored. In much of the popular material it was implied that archaeologists as a body, as well as those who interpreted their results, had rejected the higher criticism. This was a false impression. One review of Sayce's work claimed, "Whether he be in the right or in the wrong, it is certain that his conclusions, as to this subject, are rejected by a large number of the most eminent archaeologists now living."\textsuperscript{124} Friedrich Delitzsch, O. Schrader and Paul Haupt were well versed in biblical studies as well as archaeology. With regards to the composite authorship of the Pentateuch, they unanimously supported the theories of the critics, particularly those of Wellhausen. The article concluded, "If Professor Sayce thinks that these well known archaeological authorities are in error, he has, of course, a perfect right to say so; but it is manifest that, so long as he differs from them, his verdict is not
the verdict of 'archaeology'."\textsuperscript{125}

Those who insisted that the methods and results of archaeology and the higher criticism made them irreconcilable foes not only ignored the opinions which eminent archaeologists held; they also failed to accurately represent the claims of literary and historical criticism. This is a point more fully discussed below. Sayce and others were also led to set up archaeology and criticism as opposing forces because they failed to acknowledge the true nature of the external evidence in which they placed so much faith. More particularly, they did not distinguish between the direct and indirect testimony of archaeology. The conclusions reached by the critics had been opposed, not by statements made directly in the inscriptions, but by questionable and even illogical inferences derived from them.

It was Driver who presented the most complete case against the traditionalists, basing it simply on the superiority of a direct testimony over an indirect one.\textsuperscript{126} Where the archaeological witness to a biblical event or character was direct, it was of the highest possible value and decisively determined the historicity of the narrative in most cases. Such evidence existed for events such as Shishak's invasion of Judah or for personages such as the Israelite Omri and his son Ahab. When the narratives concerned the events of an earlier period however the archaeological testimony to the truth of the Bible became indirect and a number of other factors had to be considered
in assessing the value of the testimony.

These other factors included the inherent probability of the narrative, the compliance with other biblical accounts and the degree to which the monumental evidence was circumstantial and precise. If these additional factors were considered and the outcome was completely positive, it was highly probable, concluded Driver, that one was dealing with a substantially historical record. This was very different from saying, on the basis of indirect evidence, that the monuments "proved the Bible." If these factors were considered and the outcome was negative, then the indirect evidence could do nothing to verify the historicity of the biblical material. Yet those who campaigned against the higher criticism more often than not focused their most virulent attacks around the indirect testimonies of archaeology.

Driver gave several examples as to how these other factors would operate, using as one example the popular reference to the vassals Sarludari and Necho in the inscriptions to verify the story of king Manasseh. There was no question of rejecting the account of the capture and transport of Manasseh as well as his repentence and release because of inherent improbability or insufficient circumstantial verification. But the account conflicted with other Old Testament accounts drawn up by earlier and contemporary writers. One had to accept therefore that, "No amount of evidence respecting other kings taken captive to Babylon and afterwards released
can neutralize the special difficulties attaching to the particular case of Manasseh."  

Characteristic of the orthodox abuse of indirect evidence was the way in which the topographical accuracy of the Old Testament was used as a confirmation of certain narratives. Driver and other critics were willing to admit that the topography of Genesis was exact, but this was nothing unusual since the book was written by men who lived in Palestine. In his Historical Geography of the Holy Land, George Adam Smith claimed,

That a story accurately reflects geography does not necessarily mean that it is a real transcript of history - else were the Book of Judith the truest man ever wrote, instead of being what it is, a pretty piece of fiction. Many legends are wonderful photographs of scenery, and therefore, let us at once admit, that, while we may have other reasons for the historical truth of the patriarchal narratives, we cannot prove this on the ground that their itineraries and place names are correct.  

Equally great were the problems associated with the indirect evidence in the form of local customs and institutions and peculiarities of language. It was true that such evidence could provide valuable illustrative material for the Bible student, but it was, as a rule, of a permanent nature. Until customs and institutions could be proved to be limited to a particular age, their occurrence in a given narrative was not evidence that the narrative possessed the value of a contemporary testimony. Driver concluded on this point:

Customs and institutions, especially in Egypt, and names of places generally in the ancient
world, rarely varied from age to age; the
allusions to the former are moreover mostly
of a general kind, being seldom or never so
precise and technical as to imply personal
cognizance of the facts described. The in-
direct circumstantial evidence, in other
words, is neither large enough or minute
enough to take the place of the direct his-
torical corroboration which at present the
inscriptions do not supply for these parts
of the biblical narrative.129

It was also common practice among the traditionalists
to draw direct analogies between the practices of the
ancient Eastern countries and those of the Hebrews. The
alleged results of archaeology on the basis of these analo-
gies was greatly exaggerated. The question was not what
could be established about other nations, but what
could be established about Israel. Modern discoveries
had shown for example that Palestine had inhabitants be-
fore the Mosaic age, but there was not a "tittle" of
monumental evidence to prove that the patriarchs lived
there. What Sayce had done was to draw from the monu-
ments a picture of pre-Mosaic Palestine, and then worked
the history of the patriarchs into it. Having done this,
he claimed that he had proven the historical character
of the latter.130

If, therefore, the traditionalists were abusing the
whole notion of external evidence by attributing exagge-
rated powers to indirect archaeological testimonies certain
key points in their assault on the higher criticism were
invalidated. The orthodox claimed for example that the
relatively late date assigned to the Old Testament documents
was disproved by references to contemporary customs and
topographical details. The truth was that none of the disputed documents had been shown by archaeology to be contemporaneous with the events they described. While it was difficult to believe accounts such as that of the Exodus did not rest upon a foundation of fact, no archaeological evidence had yet been adduced to show that the narratives were the work of a contemporary hand.

"The supposition that, at whatever date they were drawn up, they embody substantially true traditions is one that does abundant justice to the archaeological data which they contain. And of course, there are many parts of these narratives in which even this supposition is not required by the facts of archaeology."[^131]

The same attitude of caution had to be adopted when one was examining the historicity of Genesis 14. The traditionalist attack on the skepticism of the critics was unwarranted. The monuments had brought the four kings of Genesis 14 into the light of history and uncovered many interesting particulars about three of them. They had shown, further, that at least three of the kings ruled over the countries associated with them, and that all four monarchs were contemporaneous. Finally they had shown that an invasion of Palestine and neighboring countries on the part of a ruler of Babylonia was, in the abstract, within the military possibilities of the age. But the monuments had not shown more than this. Driver claimed that, "They make no mention of the particular expedition into Canaan, which forms the principal subject
of Genesis XIV; and they name neither Abraham, nor Melchizedek, nor any one of the five Canaanite kings, against whom the expedition was directed. Their 'confirmation' of the biblical narrative is thus limited to the statements respecting the four kings contained in verse 1. 132

While the traditionalists who looked to Sayce for support tended to give equal weight to direct and indirect monumental corroboration, they were also guilty of drawing over-hasty and over-confident conclusions from archaeological evidence which was often ambiguous and conjectural. It was pointed out in a review of Sayce's work that a unity was claimed for archaeological opinion in some popular works which simply did not exist. "That eminent archaeologists should sometimes differ widely from one another will not appear surprising when we consider the nature of archaeology. There cannot be a greater mistake than to suppose that an archaeologist is a kind of deus ex machina, who can step in to decide all manner of questions with infallible authority." 133 Archaeology had its limitations and uncertainties, brought about mainly by the difficulties involved in translating and reading the inscriptions. The student of Greek, Hebrew and Sanskrit had the assistance of a linguistic tradition handed down through an unbroken series of learned men from the times when these languages were actually spoken; the decipherer of the Egyptian and Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions had no such aid. It was therefore by conjecture
only that the meaning of certain words and phrases could be ascertained. Also causing uncertainty was the ambiguous nature of Assyrian writing. In such a system the same sentence was susceptible to widely differing translations.

It was only very late in the nineteenth century that scientifically sophisticated methods of archaeological excavation and relic dating were developed.\textsuperscript{134} The enormity of the archaeological task and the care with which it had to be undertaken was slow to dawn upon the public. The work of the Palestine Exploration Fund and the many publications on the lands of the East had generated an atmosphere of enthusiasm and optimism. The members of the Fund were certain that given competent explorers and sufficient financial backing, the treasures of the East could be recovered in a few years. It was hoped that Jerusalem, one of the most complex and challenging areas, could be excavated in two years or less. It was indeed set as the Fund's first official task. The popular works on archaeological progress transmitted this bold confidence on which was based a firm belief in the authenticity of the Bible; in time however such exaggerated enthusiasm began to undermine the traditional assault on the higher criticism.

The results of excavations in Palestine during the early years of the twentieth century were meager - and disappointing. Whereas the work in Egypt and Mesopotamia supplied archaeologists with large quantities of written
material on stone, papyrus and clay, Palestine and Syria yielded remains almost entirely of the anepigraphic variety. Even at that, the monumental discoveries were small compared with those from Egypt and Mesopotamia. Scientific reports shed light on the general cultural background of the Bible, but did little to confirm particular passages. Disillusionment grew therefore among those who looked to the corroboration of biblical tradition as the main objective of archaeological research, and as the justification for the subsidies showered upon it:

The general public, which looked for spectacular finds and showy "museum pieces" was disappointed in its expectations; and biblical scholars who looked for the confirmation of the Old Testament records were discouraged by the paucity of written materials. The vague and inconclusive nature of the inferences which could be drawn from the meager material remains led to some disillusionment with archaeology's contribution to the history of the land most directly related to biblical studies.135

A glaring example of premature enthusiasm was that generated over the Egyptian store-cities of Pithom and Ramses. Believers had been bombarded with evidence of the discovery of a wall with many layers of bricks, the upper-most one of which did not contain straw mixed with the clay. They were assured that this confirmed the circumstances recorded in Exodus 5. John Duncan's Exploration of Egypt and the Old Testament (1908), however, admitted that further and more careful investigation showed all of the excavated bricks to have some straw in their make-up.136
Such unfortunate errors were not only distressing; they were also embarrassing to those who passionately defended the Bible. The Church Times recalled with annoyance the premature conclusions drawn by Sayce on the historicity of Genesis 14. In 1895 a tablet had been introduced to Sayce by the scholar Theophilus Pinches. The tablet promised to shed some light on the Genesis narrative which had become the center of controversy. While Pinches however urged a suspension of judgment on the matter, Sayce confidently announced that the tablet was a marvellous confirmation of Genesis 14:1. In his Patriarchal Palestine he insisted on two occasions that the evidence supplied by the tablet was conclusive. Pinches' evaluation had been subsequently published: in it he went so far as to admit that the tablet had no intelligible meaning, being snippets from material of a largely astrological nature. The Church Times, in conclusion, reflected the feelings of a significant number of believers:

Our object in drawing renewed attention to this matter is that such uncritical statements make it more difficult for those who, like us, are upholders of the traditional belief to know on what materials they may safely rest. In their eagerness to put the 'higher critics' in the wrong, the archaeologists take up loosely with any argument that seems to answer their purpose, and are not careful to see that these arguments are based on facts; what guarantee has the ordinary person who cannot read the cuneiform script, and is innocent of hieroglyphic lore, that he is not basing his defence of the traditional books of the Bible on false grounds?
As the opponents of the higher criticism tended to draw more conclusions from archaeological evidence than were warranted, they also tended to misrepresent the claims of the higher critics. The opinions assailed were often not those generally held by modern scholars, but the constituency affected by the titles and perusal of books such as Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies labored under the delusion that such works upset the views of scholars such as Driver and Hastings. The critical theories were not based on the claim that the age of Moses was illiterate, but upon clear and unresolved difficulties which the documents of the Old Testament themselves presented. Nor was it true, especially towards the end of the nineteenth century, that the critics refused to consider the external evidence of the archaeologist along with the internal, philological facts. Many critics, especially in Britain, were prepared to admit the essential historicity of much of the Old Testament, a conclusion which was verified by the archaeologists. The material which they questioned had not been supported by any discoveries so far made by the excavator. Archaeology and criticism were far from being "irreconcilable foes;" they were instead two aspects of scientific inquiry which complemented each other.

In The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments Sayce laid great stress on the monumental evidence for the early origin of writing, and on the extreme improbability that the Israelites at the time of the Exodus
were unacquainted with the art. Quoting an authority from 1795, Sayce led the uninstructed reader to suppose that modern critics still rely on this exploded fallacy and that its exposure had shattered criticism. But, protested Driver, the fact had no bearing on the date of the Pentateuch: the idea that Moses was ignorant of writing was not one of the premisses on which the critical view of the Pentateuch depended. Riehm, for instance, in his Introduction, had a section on the pre-Mosaic origin of writing. Cornhill, an advanced follower of Wellhausen, said that it would be entirely mistaken to deny that Moses had a knowledge of the art. Although he claimed that writing did not flourish until 850 B.C. in Israel, even Wellhausen admitted that writing had been practiced from a much earlier period. What the critics denied was not that Moses might have left written records behind him, but that the existing Pentateuch was his work. The intrinsic character of the Pentateuch and the relation of its various parts to each other was inconsistent with such an opinion. Much the same could be said for the controversy surrounding the Code of Hammurabi. Driver contended that the critics did not deny the possibility of a Mosaic legal code; rather they doubted that the Hebrew leader could have produced the Pentateuchal code as it now stood.

As A.S. Peake claimed, Sayce and many of his followers failed to realize that the critical theories rested upon certain phenomena disclosed by careful scrutiny of
of the Pentateuch itself. The documents themselves, and not the subjective standards of European critics, gave rise to the historical and literary theories of criticism. The interruptions in the logical progression of the material, the differences in style, and above all, the varied viewpoints represented in the Pentateuch remained in spite of the evidence of the monuments. Such evidence had to be considered in determining the date and authorship of the biblical material. It was true that when one passed from this analysis to historical criticism, it could be justifiably demanded that the external evidence of the monuments be taken into consideration; there were however many critics who carefully considered archaeological progress and who admitted the substantial historicity of the Old Testament.

Criticizing Sayce's *Verdict of the Monuments*, Driver asserted that, "From the general tenor of his volume, the reader would imagine that the 'higher critic' was supremely indifferent to the facts of archaeology, and wrote with a lofty disdain of everything that was to be found in an ancient and contemporary document. Nothing could be further from the truth." Wellhausen for example had written an important essay on the chronology of the Kings, in which full account was taken of the Assyrian data. Dillmann's commentaries on the Hexateuch and Isaiah were filled with archaeological references covering much of the material that Sayce did in his own volume. Also, the attention which critics were paying to archaeology
was steadily increasing. An article in The Contemporary Review in which T.K. Cheyne attempted to plead with English scholars for "the expansion of criticism and exegesis in an archaeological direction" was described by The Expository Times only months later as being chiefly historical in interest. Archaeology was increasingly recognized by the critics, and was seen especially in Driver's new commentary on Deuteronomy in the International Critical Commentary series. "Never before," the review claimed, "not even in Cheyne's own books, was Archaeology in all its branches made use of as here. This indeed is one of the features of the series to which it belongs, and one of the ways in which that series marks a new departure in English exegesis."¹⁴³

The charge or insinuation then that the higher critics generally neglected archaeology was regarded by many as an unjust one. In coming to this conclusion, Driver pointed out yet another difficulty with Sayce's work: "But, strange to say, not a single representative critic, whether foreign or English, is named in Professor Sayce's volume; the reader neither learns who the critics are whose conclusions are said to be invalidated, nor has he any suspicion that other critics exist whose judgments practically coincide with Professor Sayce himself."¹⁴⁴ It was seriously doubted in one article in The Contemporary Review that Sayce had ever carefully investigated the higher criticism for himself. The way in which he ascribed to the critics as a body opinions which either no critics
or only a few critics held betrayed a superficial acquaintance with the matter at hand.

This particular shortcoming was important when it came to evaluating Sayce’s argument that literary criticism developed into historical skepticism which had no justification. It was true that there were "hyper-critics" who displayed excessive historical skepticism towards the Old Testament material, but these were far from representative. Many Continental and most English critics refused to draw extreme conclusions. They accepted a nucleus of genuine fact in the patriarchal narratives, never questioning the historicity of the four kings in Genesis 14 or the course of Joseph's career. They welcomed confirmation of the Old Testament documents when it took into account literary evidence and archaeological evidence, and when it carefully weighed the probabilities of historicity. What they refused to do was to base such judgments on the grounds of uncertain archaeological evidence alone. Driver summarized the archaeological aspect of the debate over higher criticism in the following manner:

The fact is, the antagonism which some writers have sought to establish between criticism and archaeology is wholly fictitious and unreal. Criticism and archaeology deal with antiquity from different points of view, and mutually supplement one another. Each in turn supplies what the other lacks, and it is only by an entire misunderstanding of the scope and limits of both that they can be brought into antagonism with one another. What is called the 'witness of the monuments' is often strangely misunderstood. The monuments witness to nothing which any reasonable critic has ever doubted.145
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CONCLUSION

Driver's summary was closer to the truth than many churchmen were willing to admit, yet in the archaeological aspect of the debate, Sayce and his followers were in possession of what appeared to the average believer to be exceedingly persuasive arguments. This is in fact the interpretation we must place upon all aspects of the popular debate: subsequent scholarship has indeed vindicated the general conclusions of the higher critics, but it is unlikely that any but a small minority of believers assimilated into their view of the Bible either the methods or the conclusions of the critics.

This is not to say that modern biblical scholarship had no impact upon conventional attitudes towards the Bible in general. The effort to popularize historical and literary criticism was both persistent and prolific, surprisingly so in light of popular adhesion to some form of literalism and the official outcry over Essays and Reviews and Bishop Colenso less than three decades earlier. We can estimate the strength of this effort by reviewing the number of publications and the editions through which they went, though it is of course difficult to say how many were read and applied with any seriousness. Correspondents in the popular religious press certainly demonstrated
that they were aware of a more critical and liberal approach to the Bible. Comments by church leaders of the day also give some indication that popular opinion on the Bible was gradually changing. In The Sunday School Chronicle of February, 1891, E.W. Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, discussed what we might call the "minimal" acceptance of the new views on the Bible. He claimed that the Bible must not be regarded as a book, but as a library; that believers must use all available helps in studying it, and that they must try to find out what the original intention of the passage was.¹ There were also numerous statements in agreement with that of C.A. Berry's in 1896:

While it is too early to say how far the results of the higher criticism have affected our congregations, I can discern a real difference in their attitude...The school of higher criticism has voiced the general statements of our average intelligent lay-men, and has relieved them of the sense they once had of disloyalty to the Bible.²

In terms of evidence for the purposes of historical research however, an assessment of the spread of higher criticism among common believers is difficult and the above sources of information only very limited. I have based my assessment of the debate more upon certain features of the popular material which most likely inhibited rather than facilitated the popular acceptance and understanding of the higher criticism. I would like to examine several of the features which probably impeded the popularization thrust: the reliance of the critics and their sympathizers on religious experience as the continuum
and authentification of revelation; the contrast presented by this emphasis on the subjective with the "factual" evidence preferred by the public and offered by writers such as Sayce; the difficulties which were created by too great an emphasis on the "expertise" of the critics, and finally, the excessive optimism displayed by the popularizers over the future of New Testament criticism and the viability of a Christocentric solution to the problem of authority posed by a new interpretation of the Bible.

The vast majority of popular introductions adhered, implicitly if not explicitly, to a particular concept of the revelation or self-disclosure of God, and the truth communicated thereby. While the traditionalists tended to equate revelation with the printed word in its entirety, the popularizers of criticism generally went along with the observation propagated earlier in the century that the Bible only contains the revelation of God. The traditionalists believed that revelation included scientific and historical fact, while the popular introductions agreed with R.F. Horton that, "By revelation is meant a truth or truths received from God into the minds of men, not by the ordinary methods of inquiry, such as observation and reasoning, but by a direct operation by the Holy Spirit." God, it was believed, had disclosed himself in the history and experience of the Israelites; the Bible recorded this disclosure and through its truths pointed the way to a recovery of the experiences in which men came to know God. Thus revelation was not some objectively communicated body of facts and dogmas but rather certain edifying truths which
grew out of and were authenticated by the religious experience of believers. 4

We may suggest at the outset that the separation of the "husk" of time-bound narratives or doctrines from the "kernel" of religious truth was an exercise demanding excessive perception and knowledge from the ordinary believer. The popularizers were indeed optimistic: Montefiore for example declared in his Bible for Home Reading that he intended to draw the attention of readers to the great moral and religious truths which formed the essence of the Bible. The reader he claimed could be taught to easily recognize such truths: "He will learn how readily they detach themselves from any dross or alloy by which they may be surrounded, or from the temporary or obsolete setting in which at the first they may have been presented to the world." 5

Another popular work similarly claimed that:

Probably there is no truer conception of the Bible than as a gold mine - a gold mine inestimably rich - yet a mine still. There are quartz and earth in no small measure mixed with the gold, as in all mines...The task of rational men and women surely is to delve earnestly in the mine, casting out, without hesitation, what is plainly not gold, but saving and treasuring up, with glad appreciation and thankfulness, rich stores of what is clearly gold. 6

Yet it was easier for most intelligent laymen to study, learn and teach the factual content of the Bible rather than probe beneath the surface for truths of edification. To separate eternal truth from its "obsolete setting" demanded a degree of philosophical and theological knowledge which many ordinary believers did not possess. A.E. Garvie's
comments on the teacher's task of discerning spiritual and moral truth in his material could have applied to many Christians to whom the popular introductions were addressed: "This is so difficult and delicate a task that it demands not only knowledge of modern scholarship, but a spiritual discernment and moral insight which can separate kernel and husk, and these only a deep religious experience and a strong moral character can give." 7

The liberal emphasis on experience rather than dogma or narrative as the continuum of revelation raised the problem of how one conveyed the truths of the Scriptures to those of tender age, or to those who had little to do with the deep religious experiences of which Garvie spoke. This particular difficulty was pointed to in several of the popular works sympathetic to higher criticism. It was only the "developing experience" of the Christian for example which could "invest the words of Scripture with suggestions and associations that open the door of finite human language and give free access to the Divine truth and grace." 8 Von Oort told his young readers that the inner, spiritual life of man developed only as a person increased in years: "For you it is impossible to sound the depths of a sense of guilt, or to climb the joyous heights of a feeling of forgiveness and redemption; and yet without more or less experience of this it is impossible to understand the Bible - even to grasp the true meaning and comprehend the full value of many of its narratives." 9
A point which should be noted in looking at the difficulties presented by an emphasis on spiritual and moral truth as well as experience is the difficulty which many believers probably experienced in attempting to accept and understand the concept of mythology, essential to a critical study of the Old Testament. Both the origins of mythology and the way in which the myth could embody spiritual truth while really being a "false tale" remained mysteries in the eyes of most believers. As The British Weekly remarked on the word "myth": "There is real insight in the remark that criticism is now not denying the supernatural, but trying to define and interpret it - a definition not likely to be reached."\(^{10}\)

Furthermore, it is apparent from much of the popular material denouncing higher criticism that the eighteenth century view of mythology persisted in the popular mind: myth was taken to mean pagan fables and pagan religion, such as that practiced by the Greeks and Romans, and was therefore, as a word, exactly equivalent to "false". Myth therefore meant only a collection of grotesque tales that needed to be explained away or reconciled with Scripture. Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, popular handbooks which treated mythology with distaste as mere human idolatry proliferated. The attempts of writers such as Charles Kingsley and Nathaniel Hawthorne to "clean-up" and retell the ancient mythologies in a manner suitable to Victorian taste did little to associate deep spiritual truth with mythology in the mind of the average layman. "In the hands of these men and their imitators,
Greek myths came to lose, in the popular mind, their aura of power, of dark origins, of religion, of passion, and of high strange truth, and they became instead something charming, graceful, and trivial, to be associated with belles lettres.11

From the evidence available however the most serious difficulty for ordinary believers with the critics' emphasis on experience and spiritual truth was the lack of clarity which such an emphasis entailed: what "had to be believed" in order to remain a Christian after the critics had completed their work? While some popularizers such as R.F. Horton admitted that certain historical data had to be preserved in order to keep revelation from being lost, little attention was given to the specific "husks" which had to remain to preserve Christian faith.12 Yet there was assurance and safety and clarity for believers in the conventional approach to the Bible. The American churchman Harry Emerson Fosdick, in a critique of liberalism later in the twentieth century, spoke directly to this point:

These defenders of old theologies know exactly what they think. Their formulas have been wrought out and written down for a long time. They can state with embarrassing exactitude their precise opinions on the great facts of Biblical history and the great articles of the Christian faith. They, too, plead for the abiding experiences of the soul with God, but they confidently present them in clearly visualized mental formulas which, when they are credible to their hearers, give to their appeal penetration and power.13
Yet many of the popular works on the higher criticism implied, or preached, an "undogmatic" Christianity which abandoned believers, more often than not, to a wilderness of private opinion, and which failed to reconstruct new and definite categories which could accommodate the conclusions of biblical scholarship.  

The confusion into which believers were plunged by a liberal view of the Bible was in fact one of the main protests voiced by those seeking to preserve an infallible and authoritative Bible. Stanley Leathes claimed for example that, "The question really resolves itself into an antecedent one - What and how much are we to believe?"  

A correspondent fearful of the advancing criticism of the New Testament concluded:

All of this seems to me to open out an endless vista of doctrinal shifting scenes as unstable and unsatisfying as the mirage of the desert. It makes of Christianity not a body of truths 'once and for all committed' to the custody of a Divine institution, but an inorganic mass of private opinions and fancies which leave the seeker after truth no sure ground of faith in the past or hope in the future. Is theology to be the only science without postulates, axioms, dogmas?  

Perhaps even more significant was the lack of comfort offered by the popularizers when it came to clarifying what the faithful should and should not believe. R.F. Horton for example was ready to cast his lot in with the "miseries and diversities" of private judgment rather than continue to hold to the traditional theory of biblical inspiration. A manual on teaching methods warned that spiritual truth is "too great to be capable of exact definition or logical demonstration" while educator Thomas Fry advised teachers
that the inspiration of the Bible could still be felt "without exact definition". B.J. Snell, a staunch supporter of the critical position, wished to warn his readers of the struggle ahead:

Let me caution you against possible disappointment because of our inability to reach definite and certain conclusions to many of the questions that arise... "Dead certainties" belong to an early stage of knowledge and development, and as we grow older we begin to suspect that all is not so sure as we were once apt to believe.

An 1899 article identified the cause of such obscurity in the failure of the more liberal Christians to construct new mental frameworks for the theological changes which the higher criticism necessitated. The "seed-thoughts" of revelation were permanent: there was a real creation, a real inspiration, a real atonement. Yet men clearly did not mean by these concepts what their fathers meant. There came a time when the elasticity of words reached a limit and new words had to appear and new dogmas had to be framed. The article asked, "Are we now in such a period? Are the old bottles breaking and is the church called upon to make new vessels?... We are stripping off the accretions of past ages. It is true, also, that we are hesitating exactly what to put in their places."

And, we may add, hesitating about how far one could restate the faith without loosing the substance of the faith. Adding to the confusion and distress of the average believer were statements such as the following which began to appear in books popularizing the higher criticism:

That Jesus, after his death, was alive and appeared to many, is the fact which is presented by that evidence, but the mode of His Resurrection and the nature of His appearances open out wide scope for conjecture, and in reverent thought about these things there must needs be room for considerable diversity.20

The critical enterprise, as conveyed in the popular material, appeared therefore to be rife with difficulties because of its excessive dependence upon personal moods, attitudes and opinions. The critics claimed that there were internal grounds for verifying revelation and an experiential point of contact for that revelation. Also, as we have seen in a previous chapter, the apparently subjective nature of the evidence for the critical theories provoked a protest of major proportions. The critical spirit however, which rejected the Old Testament record "on presumably critical grounds of a slender and subjective character", presented a stark contrast to certain features of the popular frame of mind. We may suggest that these features also prevented many believers from either understanding or accepting a popular form of the higher criticism.

While, for example, the popular introductions emphasized spiritual and edifying truth which tended to be abstract in nature, the average layman was primarily concerned with concrete evidence and concrete results. With minds immersed in the tangible world of profit and loss, and with an educational system which stressed vocational subjects such as mining and bookkeeping and agriculture, there was little room for speculation and abstract theories. Biblical
An article in *The British Weekly* in 1897 pointed out that one of the major problems of the age was not in reconciling new thinking on theology and biblical studies with prevailing confessions of faith, but in bringing it face to face with the man in the street. Theology was being "etherealised" in a materialistic age "coarsely inhospitable to spiritual ideas":

> The cry of the hour is for a religion disengaged from all that is abstruse or metaphysical. If Christianity cannot be made entirely ethical in its postulates, its fundamental truths must be crystallized into the fewest possible dogmas, like a patent medicine. The age is concrete, and passionately so. Amongst educated people the temper has been fostered by admiration for the methods of physical science, and amongst uneducated people, it is begotten by a vague idea that chemists, biologists, electricians have devised tests for every kind of truth, combined with an insistence upon what is prompt, practical, compact, taught them by the necessities of their daily life...The man in the street is as indifferent to abstruse views of inspiration, the atonement, the last things, as to pure mathematics.22

Closely related to this emphasis on concrete evidence and results was a bias in favor of the common sense and sober reasoning of the average layman as opposed to the judgment of experts. It was popular believed that there was no need for special knowledge such as that possessed
by those who practiced literary and historical criticism. Common sense made most of the answers to the biblical dilemmas available to common men. And it was observed of the common man at the end of the nineteenth century that, "A man of business hates elaborate trifling... As to the multiplicity of arguments and the complexity of questions, he seeks them little; he has a plain, simple - as he would say 'practical' way of looking at the matter, and you will never make him comprehend any other." Many of the popular works against higher criticism were not slow to point out the flaws in the critical arguments which were revealed by common sense. The cry that to reject the history of the Old Testament while professing to receive the spiritual truths concealed within its folds was not "agreeable to logic or common sense" was oft-repeated. Considering the temperament of the age, it is likely that similar arguments had a strong impact.

More significant however than the appeal to common sense was the appeal to archaeology which the traditionalists continually made. They pointed to the monuments which not only satisfied the believer's desire for tangible evidence but which could also be understood and evaluated by the man in the street. James Neil for example, in a work popularizing the lands and customs of the East, claimed that, "We live in sadly sceptical times. Yet let it be remembered that, in too many instances, the abstract and unreal treatment of sacred subjects has paved the way to the present popular worship of doubt and uncertainty. An ex-
cellent method of dealing with the epidemic of modern unbelief is to make much of the realistic elements of the Bible." Other traditionalists were contrasting archaeology with the "expert" evidence provided by the critics, which demanded a great deal of time and strength to comprehend. The Expositor pointed out that many of the arguments based on archaeology against criticism were clothed in a dogmatism and technical terminology which made them irresistible to the average laymen. Furthermore, "the halo around the evidence of contemporary monuments and the 'tangible' objects unearthed by the spade has frequently led unthinking minds to the conviction that the construction which has been placed upon them is as real as the precious objects themselves."  

It would not be accurate to say that the popularizers abandoned believers to the vicissitudes of private judgment without providing some authoritative guidelines as to the contents of divine revelation. Critical studies had called into question the infallible authority of the Bible, and necessitated a new investigation into the sources and sanctions of theology. There were many authors sympathetic with the higher criticism therefore who popularized the belief that the person of Jesus was most promising as a source of authority for divine revelation. Other turned to the creeds of the church. In both cases however developments in the early years of the twentieth century challenged the viability of such alternatives, and most likely troubled believers who, in the words of Frederic Harrison,
feared mental anarchy and were fascinated by anything which promised to end it.  

Much of the liberalism which accompanied the popular material was Christocentric, raising the cry, "back to Christ" and obeying the dictum, "Let no theology call itself Christian which has not its source and center in Him." Through the person and work of Jesus there was mediated to men both knowledge of God and saving power. He was considered to be the source and norm of the Christian's experience and thus of religious truth. It is not difficult to point to examples of this Christocentricity in the popular material attempting to wean believers away from biblical literalism and move them on to alternative grounds for religious belief. Thomas Steele for example claimed that believers could only break the bondage of literalism and come to appreciate the value of biblical criticism by getting back to the "truth" which he equated with the "simple teaching of Jesus". A.F. Mitchell claimed that as children needed some supreme religious guide from whom they could derive their ideals, religious education should focus upon the character and teachings of Jesus. W.H. Bennett, in the essays Faith and Criticism, claimed that the Christian church would emerge from this period of controversy over the Bible with a new energy and authority derived from a fuller and truer knowledge of Christ himself. A critical study of the Old Testament revealed a gradual growth of religious ideas and hopes which all pointed forward to Jesus. He supplied what was lacking in Israel, and
fulfilled the highest hopes and noblest ideals of mankind. It was thus to his authority that men owed their allegiance.  

This focus on Jesus rather than on the biblical documents as the Word of God introduced a whole new set of difficulties for believers which, instead of being resolved, became increasingly complex in the decade before the First World War. The state of confusion in which many Christians appeared to find themselves was only heightened by this aspect of the debate over higher criticism. As a foundation for theology, investigation into the life of Jesus seemed to provide a viable alternative; disagreement however over the location of this authority, and an inconclusiveness as to the facts of the life and teaching of the historical Jesus led only to frustration and turmoil. W.F. Adeney for example, in the popular essays Faith and Criticism, located the authority of Jesus in his teaching, while P.T. Forsyth, in the same work, claimed that the authority rested with Jesus' "total self-donation" and his "new way of being". Christians were also becoming aware of the new way in which scholars such as Harnack were approaching this quest for the historical Jesus as the norm of religious truth. In his semi-popular lectures on What is Christianity? (1901), Harnack concluded that the Jesus of the Gospels was solely a prophet of social reform, proclaiming the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Although it was this ethical and humanitarian Christ who was dealt a decisive blow by Albert Schweitzer's Quest for the Historical
Jesus (1910), the work also had grave implications for the initial confidence expressed by churchmen such as Forsyth and Adeney that historical study would enable Christians to stand face to face with Jesus "in a sense and to a degree unknown in the Church since the Apostolic age". Serious questions were raised about the ability of believers to separate the Christ of faith from the Jesus of history. Efforts to find and portray the historical Jesus led to the realization that he could not be separated from first century Judaism, nor from the early Christian community, nor from tradition. Thus, a dissolution of the confidence that the historical Jesus could be discovered and used as a source, firm and sure, of religious truth most likely contributed to the feelings of uncertainty experienced by the average believer who was being encouraged to welcome the higher criticism.

In some of the popular material written by Anglican churchmen, it was claimed that the higher criticism could be welcomed because the Bible did not stand alone as the authoritative word for faith. Nor, in fact, were believers dependent only upon internal evidence of religious experience. Supplementing and supporting the historicity and validity of the biblical testimony to Jesus Christ were the cre-dal statements of the Church. The 1905 declaration of clergy supporting the criticism of the New Testament as well as the Old, concluded with the words:

Our confidence that the faith of the Church in the years to come, whatever historical revisions may await us, will stand, without risk and without discontinuity, upon the spiritual
foundations to which Christian experience and the Creed of the Church alike bear testimony. 32

By the turn of the century however the work of the critics began to influence the interpretation of the creeds. Confidence in the credal statements on the Virgin Birth and the miracle stories was being shaken - and publicly shaken - by, among others, leaders of the Anglican communion. The *Encyclopedia Biblica*, edited by T.K. Cheyne and reviewed in *The Church Quarterly Review* of 1901, questioned a number of miracles, including the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection. 33 Canon Hensley Henson questioned the need for a rigid subscription to the creeds as a requirement for ordination. 34 Throughout the first decade of the century, the tension increased as a greater number of books and articles took up the issues at stake. A climax was reached however in 1911 with the publication of J.M. Thompson's book, *Miracles in the New Testament*.

Thompson, who was a fellow and dean of divinity at St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford, had in 1910 published two works which appeared to be orthodox (*Jesus According to St. Matthew* and *Synoptic Gospels*). The appearance of *Miracles in the New Testament* therefore was all the more shocking. In the course of his argument, Thompson openly questioned the possibility of miracles *per se*, and rejected all the miracle stories of the New Testament. At the same time, he did not question the uniqueness or lordship of Jesus: "Though no miracles accompanied His entry into, or presence in, or departure from the world; though He did
not think or speak or act otherwise than as a man; though He yields nothing to historical analysis but human elements; yet in Jesus Christ God is incarnate..."35

Though he was denounced by many churchmen, including Charles Gore, Thompson was supported by such worthies as Henson and William Sanday among others. The controversy was followed by new events and insistent voices which increased tension over the tenets of the ancient creeds. The publication of Foundations in 1912 added to the perplexity of the times. The essays covered a wide range of topics, but one by the scholar B.H. Streeter touched on a particularly sensitive issue. Streeter's discussion on the Resurrection denied both the orthodox position, which stressed a physical resurrection, and the modern view which conceived of resurrection appearances as a series of "subjective visions". In contrast to both of these stances, he affirmed an "objective vision" theory which admitted that the vision was directly caused by Jesus himself, alive and in personal communion with his disciples.

Another tremor was caused by the work of William Sanday, the highly respected New Testament scholar and Lady Margaret Professor and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In his pamphlet, Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism (1914), Sanday moved away from his earlier cautious acceptance of the miracles of Jesus:

In regard to the 'nature-miracles', I think that of the two hypotheses - that they were performed by our Lord exactly as they are described, and that they came to be attributed to Him in this form by the imagination of the Early Church - the latter is more probable.
I believe that, in most of these cases something happened which gave rise to the story, but that the ost difficult element in it was probably due to an extension of the original fact, rather than itself original.36

The above discussion is not intended as a commentary upon the merits or deficiencies of these various theological positions, but only to point out that the enthusiasm with which the popular introductions pointed their readers to the alternatives of Jesus or the creeds as options to biblical infallibility was unwarranted. If believers did link an acceptance of higher criticism with the hope that in the person of Jesus or the creeds of the Church they could find sure grounds for their Christian beliefs, they probably met with disappointment or frustration. The confidence of the popularizers was also unwarranted however when it came to the corrosive effect which the criticism of the New Testament was having on traditional Christian beliefs, beliefs which most of the popular introductions upheld. Believers were constantly being assured that critical studies were only enhancing the historicity of the Gospel material; what their common sense and their understanding of the apparent course of contemporary scholarship led them to conclude was quite different.

Many of the popularizers emphasized the fact that the constructive aspects of the critical process with regards to the Old Testament were also being repeated in work on the New. Churchmen, it was claimed, had nothing to fear from a frank and critical scrutiny of the Gospels and the records of the Early Church. In 1890 for example R.W. Dale
commented that, "As far as the books of the New Testament are concerned, I think that we are in sight of the practical close of the controversy. After a century of struggle, the historical trustworthiness of the Four Gospels and the genuineness of, at least, all the important epistles are secure." W.F. Adeney confidently wrote in 1893 that, "On the whole the prospect in this direction is decidedly reassuring. The movement of recent years has been towards more general agreement, and that on lines of greater historical credibility. The wildest theories have proved themselves gaseous by exploding." And as late as 1911, another popularizer could assert that, "The man who believes that the New Testament is the shrine of Christian truth has no fear when the fullest light of his age is thrown upon it." And as late as 1911, another popularizer could assert that, "The man who believes that the New Testament is the shrine of Christian truth has no fear when the fullest light of his age is thrown upon it."

Yet despite the predictions of numerous churchmen, the years following 1900 were ones of controversy in the area of New Testament studies. The average believer to whom the higher criticism was being introduced was becoming increasingly sensitive to this controversy. Fears were reflected in The Churchman for example and echoed in countless other popular publications between 1900 and 1914:

I am disposed to think it will be found that the same critical spirit which rejects the Old Testament record on presumably critical grounds of a slender and subjective character, will, in all consistency, be compelled before long to reject also the narrative of our Lord's miracles, and will find themselves unable to stop at that of His own resurrection.

The fears of many clergymen and laymen alike for the New Testament were indeed more justifiable than the judgments
of the popularizers. An article in 1899 expressed the opinion that, "In respect to the New Testament, no such finality of critical results has been reached. Here the outlook is for a continued controversy for some years... Through this controversy...the full genuineness of some of the sayings attributed to Christ and the apostles will be questioned, and doubt will be cast upon the full historicality of certain portions of the New Testament." A great deal of confidence for example had been placed in the historical accuracy of the Gospel of Mark on the grounds of its newly established priority:

From being the despised poor relation, Mark's Gospel came to be accepted as the primary source for all our knowledge of the life of Jesus Christ; indeed, the reaction went almost too far and there was a tendency to establish a kind of verbal inerrancy of St. Mark.

As Mark's priority had been generally agreed by 1881, many of the popularizers of the higher criticism used this fact to point to the assistance which criticism could render in establishing the facts, as they were popularly known, of the life, death and indeed resurrection of Jesus. Stewart Headlam for example reached the position whereby he was sure that on the basis of Mark, it was possible to arrive at a reasonably reliable outline of the life and teaching of Jesus. What Headlam and many others like him did not question was in what sense the Gospels were historical documents. Yet this was a question which became increasingly insistent in the twentieth century: In what sense do the Gospels reflect the traditions and faith of the early Christian community rather than the actual events?
It was this problem which was brought acutely to the fore in Schweitzer's assertion that it was impossible to remove the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith.

The premature faith that the criticism of the New Testament would leave many orthodox views virtually untouched was also exploded in the work done on the Johannine material in the first decade of the twentieth century. Many New Testament critics since 1875 had taken the conservative position that the Gospel had historical value, as it was most probably written by the Apostle John himself, or by John the Presbyter, mentioned in the work of the early Christian writer Papias. The Sunday School Chronicle was led in fact to boast in 1896 that, "Were you to poll scholarly Christendom today, you would find such a preponderance of opinion in favour of St. John as would leave all other possible writers of that Gospel in a miserable minority." Yet in a series of lectures on the Fourth Gospel in 1904, William Sanday pointed out that this early confidence, reflected in the work of many moderately critical churchmen, was unwarranted. At the end of the nineteenth century a sudden reaction had taken place: scholars such as Schneidel, Loisy, Jülicher and Wernle had taken the position of "uncompromising rejection". The Fourth Gospel could no longer be taken as history, and its connection with the Apostle was a myth. The Gospel was in fact to be understood as "an attempt to translate the message of the Gospel into the terms of Greek philosophy, in that attenuated form in which it survived in the decaying world of Greece and Rome."
It is certainly true that if one is sensitive to misrepresentations and exaggerations in the popular debate, the arguments of the traditionalists weaken considerably. We have already considered in some detail the tendency of conservative churchmen to mistake indirect for direct testimony in archaeological investigation, as well as to misrepresent the work of biblical scholars and archaeologists. There were other areas of attack which the traditionalists relentlessly pursued, areas which also expose them to charges of inaccuracy and dishonesty. For the most part these involved the alleged disagreements among Old Testament scholars, the acceptance of the supernatural by such scholars, and their attitudes towards the effect of criticism upon the average believer and the Church. More often than not, in the popular press and on the public platform, these attacks were occasions for ridicule and caricature rather than solid biblical instruction.

The opponents of criticism often focused on the alleged discrepancies in critical opinion on the Old Testament. It was true that varied opinions existed on matters such as the dating of some of the material in the Pentateuch, or the identity of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah; yet such differences did not invalidate the whole critical movement. There were in fact many issues on which all scholars were agreed, issues such as the composite nature of the historical books and the dating of Deuteronomy during the reign of Josiah. Furthermore,
the existing divergences encouraged well-trained scholars
to check on each other, making the discovery of accurate
historical and literary facts more likely.

Traditionalists such as Sir Robert Anderson also em-
phasized the destructive effect which he believed the
modern critical study of the Bible was having on the
faith of the man in the pew. There is no doubt that the
new approach to the Bible did demand some basic intellec-
tual equipment and did present certain difficulties when
it came to establishing compatible theological systems;
the vast majority of British scholars and popularizers
however made it plain that the gains which modern biblical
criticism brought far outweighed the losses. The Bible
had taken on new significance for the preacher, teacher,
missionary and apologist. The strain caused by intellec-
tual and moral difficulties had been largely removed for
intelligent laymen. Many of the critics were not outside
the church, indifferent to her needs, but were leading
devout lives of service.

Finally, the apparent denial or ignorance of the super-
natural by the critics and their popularizers was a point
found in the work of nearly every opponent, regardless
of his persuasion. Yet this was not a universal attitude
of the British critics, who too often were classified
with Kuenen and Wellhausen without further thought. As
historians, the critics demanded more evidence for a mira-
culous event than they did for ordinary events, but they
generally refused to say that miracles were impossible.
This is evident both in the popular introductions for laymen and in the material for day and Sunday schools. The new interpretation of the history of Israel, in fact, showed more clearly the gradual yet miraculous unfolding of God's revelation. Sanday spoke for many when he claimed, "My experience is that criticism leads straight up to the supernatural and not away from it."

Yet despite these weaknesses in the traditionalist attack, as well as the magnitude of the attempt to popularize criticism, those who debated in favor of the conventional views on the origin and nature of the Old Testament had the advantage. The popularizers ultimately failed to speak to the popular desire for a clear and authoritative guide to faith and practice, and to the popular distaste for excessive emphasis on personal moods, internal evidence and "expertise" opinions. They also failed to present an adequately developed synthesis of the new criticism and the old theology, about which so many of them spoke with apparent respect and dedication. The outcome was too uncertain, the price too high and the alternatives too attractive for most people to make the higher criticism the tool with which they approached God's Book.
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Thomas K. Cheyne

b. 1841; vice-principal of St. Edmund Hall, 1864; fellow of Balliol College, 1868-82; rector of Tendring, Essex, 1880-85; elected Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Scripture and canon of Rochester Cathedral, 1885; d. 1915. Old Testament scholar greatly influenced by Ewald; in the van of the critical movement in Great Britain.

John R. Cohu

Fellow of Jesus College, 1882-90; sixth form master, Dulwich College, 1882; headmaster, Plymouth College, 1883; headmaster, Richmond Grammar School, Yorkshire, 1884; rector of Reminham, 1890; rector of Ashton Clinton, 1904.

Claude R. Conder

b. 1848; lieutenant in the royal engineers, 1870; selected to continue scientific survey of Western Palestine for the Palestine Exploration Fund; stationed in Edinburgh, 1878; resumed work for the Fund in 1881; took command of depot company at Chatham, 1883; conducted ordinance survey in Plymouth and west of Ireland; d. 1910. Authority on the Hittite and Altaic languages; industrious writer of popular works on exploration; competent artist.

George A. Cooke

Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, Oxford, and canon of Rochester Cathedral; honorary canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh; examining chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester and the Bishop of Edinburgh.

R.S. Copleston

Bishop of Colombo and Bishop of Calcutta.
H. Costley-White

Ordained priest, 1903; assistant master at Rugby, 1903; headmaster, Bradfield College, Berkshire.

Henry Craddock-Watson

Studied at University of Marburg as well as St. John's College, Oxford; sixth form master, St. John's School, Leatherhead, 1888-1890; master, Tonbridge School, 1890-1903; headmaster, Merchant Taylors School, Liverpool.

James Crompton

Ordained, 1860; minister of Primitive Methodist Chapel, Oxford.

John Nelson Darby

b. 1800; called to Irish bar, 1825; curate at Wicklow; in 1827 joined "The Brethren" formed by A.N. Groves and worked to propagate their views; d. 1882. A voluminous and original writer of doctrinal and controversial treatises; also hymn-writer and popular lecturer; best known for his translation of the Bible into German and French.
Charles J. Ellicott

b. 1819; ordained priest in 1847 and engaged in tutorial work; vicar of Pilton, Rutlandshire; appointed professor of New Testament exegesis at King's College, London, 1858; appointed Hulsean professor at Cambridge, 1860; Dean of Exeter, 1861; Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, 1863; d. 1905. Noted for opposition to Essays and Reviews; chairman of the New Testament revision company; advanced work for general use; most important literary work was The Old and New Testaments for English Readers (1878).

Percy A. Ellis

Vicar of St. Mary's, Westminster.

Basil T.A. Evetts

Official in the Assyrian Department of the British Museum.

F.J. Foakes-Jackson

Curate of Ottershaw, 1879-1881; curate of St. Giles, Cambridge, 1882-84; curate of St. Botolph's, Cambridge, 1884-90; Winchester chaplain and lecturer in divinity and Hebrew at Jesus College, 1882; fellow of Jesus College, 1886; Dean of Jesus College, 1895; assistant tutor, Jesus College, 1896; honorary canon, Peterborough Cathedral, 1901; Select Preacher at Cambridge, 1885, 1887, 1902; Hulsean Lecturer, 1902-03.

David Ross Fotheringham

Curate of Siggleshorne, Yorkshire, 1896-99; Leith, 1899-1900; Christ Church, South Hackney, 1901-04; Holy Trinity, Haverstock Hill, 1904-12.

Thomas C. Fry

b. 1846; assistant master at Durham School, 1868; assistant master, Cheltenham College, 1870; ordained priest, 1873; took living of Wyke Regis, Dorset, 1886; appointed headmaster, Birkhamstead School, 1887; appointed Dean of Lincoln, 1910; d. 1930. Pioneer in work of Christian Social Union; chairman of Church Reform League; played important role in elementary, secondary and adult education; aided the Worker's Educational Association.
Alfred E. Garvie

Minister of Baltic Street Congregational Church, Montrose, 1895; professor at Hackney and New Colleges, 1903; principal of New College, 1907.

John C. Geikie

b. 1824; ordained as Presbyterian minister in Canada in 1848 and then became involved in missionary work; minister in Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1851-54; returned to Britain and was minister of Presbyterian Church in Sunderland, 1860-67; Islington Chapel, 1867-73; ordained into Church of England in 1876; curate of St. Peter's Dulwich, 1876-79; rector of Christ Church, Neuilly, Paris, 1879-81; vicar of St. Mary's, Barnstaple, 1883-85; vicar of St.-Martin-at-Palace, Norwich, 1885-90; d. 1906. Enjoyed wide reputation as a writer of popular books dealing with practical and historical themes; Life and Words of Christ reached circulation of 100,000; deeply interested in the exploration of Palestine.

Edgar C.S. Gibson

Chaplain of Wells College, 1870; vice-principal of Wells and chaplain of Dinder, 1874; lecturer at Leeds Clergy School, 1876; principal of Wells College, 1880; vicar and rural dean of Leeds, 1895; Bishop of Gloucester, 1905; Select Preacher at Cambridge, 1893-94; honorary chaplain to Queen Victoria; Warburton Lecturer, 1903-07.

Robert C. Gillie

Ordained into Presbyterian Church in England; minister to congregations in Selfton Park, Liverpool; Wellesden, London; Eastbourne; Marylebone, London; noted for his talent of teaching the Bible to children through the written and spoken word; pursued study of Italian art as avocation.

William E. Gladstone

b. 1809; four times prime minister of Great Britain; d. 1898.
Michael Glazebrook

b. 1853; assistant master at Harrow, 1878; master of Manchester Grammar School, 1888; headmaster, Clifton College, 1891; ordained priest, 1890; canon of Ely Cathedral, 1905; d. 1926. Noted for skills in educational administration; encouraged music in English education; active leader of "Modern Churchman" movement at Ely; Warburton Lecturer, 1911; became chairman of the Churchman's Union, 1914.

Henry L. Goudge

b. 1866; curate at St. Mark's, Leicester, 1890; joined staff at Salisbury Theological College, 1894; vice-principal of Wells, 1895; principal of Wells, 1896; canon of Ely Cathedral, 1911; professor of New Testament interpretation, King's College, London, 1921; Regius Professor of Divinity. Known as a devout and illuminating teacher; concerned with church unity; member of the committee on Faith and Order.

George Buchanan Gray

b. 1865; appointed tutor at Mansfield College, 1891; ordained as Congregational minister, 1893; appointed professor of Hebrew and exegesis of the Old Testament at Mansfield, 1900; d. 1922. Noted as Hebrew scholar; produced numerous articles and several books on Semitic and biblical subjects; lectured frequently to schools, ministerial gatherings, societies of the Friends; member of the Palestine Exploration Fund.

Frederick Hastings

b. 1838; minister in Woodbridge, Suffolk; also St. John's, New Brunswick; charge at Epping Forest after return to England; then Weston-super-mare and Tolmers Square Church. Reputation as outstanding preacher; co-editor of the Homiletic Magazine.

Paul Haupt

b. 1858; Spence Professor of Semitic Languages and director of the Oriental Seminary, Johns Hopkins University, 1883-1926. Noted primarily as a philologist and Assyriologist; bibliography includes 522 titles; had a wide, accurate knowledge of Semitic languages and dialects.
Frank H. Hayward

Lecturer at Cambridge Day Training College, 1899; organizing teacher for Mid-Devon, 1902; principal at Torquay P.T. Center, 1904; Merchant Venturer's School, Bristol; Inspector of Schools for London County Council, 1905-1933.

Stewart Headlam

b. 1847; curate at St. John's, Drury Lane, 1869-73; curate, Bethnal Green, 1873-78; after controversy over lecture "Theatres and Music Halls," went to St. Thomas', Charterhouse, 1879; went to St. Michael's, but forced to leave because of stand he took on Bradlaugh case; became active propagandist for the Guild of St. Matthew and for the Church and Stage Guild; editor and leader writer for The Church Reformer, 1884-95; after 1889, became increasingly absorbed in school affairs and municipal politics; elected to London School Board for Hackney, 1888-1904; returned to farming, 1904-07; member of London County Council, 1907; d. 1924.

P.J. Heawood

Lecturer in mathematics at the University of Durham.

H. Hensley Henson

b. 1865; ordained deacon and became head of Oxford House, Bethnal Green, 1897; ordained priest and went as curate to Barking, 1883; chaplain of Ilford Hospital, 1895; canon of Westminster Abbey and rector of St. Margaret's, 1900; appointed Dean of Durham, 1912; became Bishop of Hereford, 1917; Bishop of Durham, 1920; d. 1947. Noted as one of the most eloquent speakers of his time; advocated closer relations with the Free Churches; also advocated liberty in interpreting the Scriptures.

Thomas Hodgskin

Partner in banking firm, 1859-1902; leading member of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; contributed many papers to the society's journal and wrote several books for the entertainment and information of the general public.

Alfred Holborn

Assistant at Old Gravel Pit Congregational Church, Hackney
1866-67; Huyton Congregational Church, 1871-77; College Church, Bradford, 1877-92.

John Page Hopps
Assistant minister, Birmingham Church of the Savior, 1857-60; minister of Unitarian Church, Sheffield, 1860-63; Dukerfield, 1863-69; Glasgow, 1869-76; Leicester, 1876-92; Croydon, 1892-1903.

Thomas Hartwell Horne
b. 1780; barrister's clerk and free-lance writer, 1796; joined Wesleyan Methodists; employed at Record Office in the Chapter House, Westminster; brought out first edition of his Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures in 1818; ordained to curacy of Christ Church, Newgate Street; assistant minister of Wellback Chapel, 1825-33; minister of St. Edmund the King and Martyr, and St. Nicholas Acons in London.

Robert F. Horton
b. 1855; tutor at Oxford, 1879; minister to Lyndhurst Road Congregational Church, 1884; went to Yale to deliver Lyman Beecher Lectures, 1893; elected chairman of the London Congregational Union, 1898; chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1903; president of the Free Church Council, 1905.

Frank Johnson
Assistant master, Borough Road Training College; minister of Congregational Church, Stone Staffs, 1893-99; minister of Hemel Hempstead Congregational Church, 1916-18; publications secretary of National Sunday School Union, 1911; honorary secretary of British International Lessons Council, 1913; d. 1927. Editor of The Sunday School Chronicle and Times from 1899; editor of The British Congregationalist and Examiner, 1909-12; founder and editor of the Graded Quarterlies.

W. G. Jordan
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament exegesis in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.
Alexander Keith

b. 1791; ordained in 1816 to parish of St. Cyrus, Kincardinshire; resigned in 1840 because of illness; d. 1880. Visited Palestine in 1839 and 1844; obtained wide distinction as an author.

John Kennedy

b. 1813; tutor to Earl of Bredalbane, 1830-32; minister of Blackfriars Street Congregational Church, Aberdeen, 1836; Stepney Meeting House, London, 1846-82; professor of apologetics at New College, London, 1872-76; chairman of Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1872; chairman of New College Council, 1884-95; director of London Missionary Society, 1843; d. 1900.

Robert H. Kennett

b. 1864; elected as fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, 1888; lectures in Hebrew and Syriac, 1887-1903; university lecturer in Aramaic, 1893; Regius Professor of Hebrew and canon of Ely Cathedral, 1903; d. 1932. Noted as earnest evangelical teacher as well as higher critic; took prominent part in interpreting the Graf-Wellhausen position in Old Testament criticism; produced original study on the date of Deuteronomy, also on a Maccabean date for the Psalms.

Charles E. Kent

b. 1867; Woolsey Professor of biblical literature, Yale University; also taught at University of Chicago and Brown University; founded National Council on Religion in Higher Education; made the results of modern biblical study widely accessible in a number of popular, readable books; d. 1925.

Alexander E. Kirkpatrick

b. 1849; assistant tutor at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1871-82; junior dean, 1876-82; Bishop of Rochester, 1890-95; Bishop of Winchester, 1895-1903; Archbishop of Canterbury, 1903-28; Regius Professor of Hebrew and canon of Ely, 1882-1903; Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and honorary canon of Ely, 1903-06; Dean of Ely, 1906-36; also Lady Margaret Preacher, 1882-93; Warburton Lecturer, 1886-90; d. 1940.
Rudolph Kittel
Professor of theology at the University of Leipzig.

Herbert T. Knight
Curate of St. George's, Brandon Hill, Bristol, 1893-95; assistant chaplain of St. Mark's, Florence, 1896; curate, St. Mary's, Somers Town, 1895-97; St. Mark's, 1897-98; Mansfield, 1899-1900; St. John's, Sevenoaks, 1904-07; assistant missionary of Rochester, 1907-09; diocesan missionary, 1909-13.

Robert A. Lendrum
b. 1863; studied at Gottingen and Leipzig as well as Aberdeen; assistant to professor of humanity at University of Aberdeen; licensed by Free Church of Scotland; assistant at McCheyne Memorial Church, Dundee, 1889; ordained and inducted, Kirkliston, 1890; St. David's, Glasgow, 1907; St. Margaret's, Fairlie, 1922.

John E. McFadyen
b. 1870; education included Balliol College, Free Church College in Glasgow, and Marburg; appointed to chair of Old Testament literature and exegesis at Knox College, Toronto, 1893; recalled to Glasgow to occupy the chair of Old Testament language, literature and theology at Trinity College, 1910; d. 1933. Noted as a mediator of the new biblical scholarship; work was predominantly exegetical, homiletical and devotional.

David M. McIntyre
b. 1849; brief parish experiences while student at Dundee, also Willesden and Drury Lane, London; pastor to College Park Presbyterian Church, London, 1886; became colleague and successor to Dr. Andrew Bonar at Finnieston Church, 1891; principal of Glasgow Bible Training Institute, 1915; d. 1938.

Angus M. Mackay
Curate of Olney, Buckinghamshire, 1882-84; St. John's, Fitzroy Square, London, 1885; incumbent of St. James's, Aberdeen, 1886-99; rector of Holy Trinity, Dean Bridge, Edinburgh from 1899.
Simeon R. McPhail

b. 1839; ordained into the Free Church of Scotland at Forfar East, 1866; translated to Elgin, High, 1869; Great Hamilton Street, Glasgow, 1878; Canning Street, Liverpool, 1880.

Brownlow Maitland

Ordained priest, 1842; secretary and chaplain to Sir P. Maitland, Governor of the Cape of Good Hope; minister of Brunswick Chapel, Marylebone, 1849-70; d. 1902.

Richard H. Maiden

Curate of St. Peter's, Swinton, Manchester, 1904-07; assistant lecturer at Selwyn College, Cambridge, 1907-10; sometime principal of Leeds Clergy School and lecturer at Leeds, 1910-19; vicar of St. Michael's, Headingly; Dean of Wells; Select Preacher at Cambridge, 1908, 1914, 1919.

Charles L. Marson

Curate of St. Jude, Whitechapel, 1882-84; St. Agatha, Shoreditch, 1885-86; rector of Orlestone, Kent, 1886-89; curate of St. Peter's, Glenelg with St. Jude, Brighton, South Australia, 1889-91; perpetual curate of St. Oswald's, Parkside, South Australia, 1891-92; St. Mary's the Virgin, Soho, 1893-94; St. Mary's, Somerstown, 1894-95; vicar of Hambridge.

F. Meyrick

b. 1827; fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, 1850; tutor at Trinity, 1852; rector of Birkling and Erpingham, 1868; Select Preacher at Oxford, 1855-56 and 1875-76; Whitehall Preacher, 1856-57; d. 1906. Great interest in Vatican Council of 1870; wide traveller and accomplished linguist; secretary of Anglo-Continental Society for forty-six years.

Arthur F. Mitchell

Curate of St. Mark's, Birmingham, 1883-86; St. George's, Everton, 1886-90; Keighley, 1890-91; sub-warden of University Training College, Liverpool, 1891-95; curate of St. Saviour, Liverpool, 1896-98; vicar of St. Augustine's, Sheffield.
Walter F. Moberly
Canon of Southwark and vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Sydenham.

Alfred W. Momerie
b. 1848; fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, 1879; professor of logic and mental philosophy, King's College, London, 1880; curate of Leigh, Lancashire, 1881; chosen as morning preacher, Foundling Hospital, 1883; severed ties with King's College in 1891; preached at Portman rooms on Sundays until death in 1900. Authors of numerous books and collections of sermons on the philosophy of Christianity.

Claude G. Montefiore
b. 1858; known as a student of the Bible and prominent advocate of Liberal Judaism; became editor of the Jewish Quarterly Review in 1888; founded the Jewish Religious Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism; interests in education furthered by his presidency of the Anglo-Jewish Association and work with the Froebel Institute; d. 1938.

Richard G. Moulton
b. 1849; leader in the University Extension Programme from 1874; aimed at popularizing the study of English literature; in 1891 went to University of Chicago to begin similar program and remained there until his retirement in 1919; d. 1924.

Richard Newton
Rector of St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia.

Thomas Nicol
Educated at Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Tubingen; assistant at St. Stephen's, Edinburgh; ordained to Kells, 1873; Tolbooth Parish, Edinburgh, 1879; convenor of the General Assembly's Jewish Mission Scheme, 1896-1911; Croall Lecturer, 1897-98; Baird Lecturer, 1906-07; Moderator of the General Assembly, 1914; d. 1916; Edited Home and Foreign Missionary Record from 1886.
Roderic Owen O’Conor
Rector of Burrishoole, Diocese of Tuam, Ireland.

Heinricus von Oort
Pastor of Santpoort, Holland and professor of Hebrew antiquities at Leiden.

Robert L. Ottley
Taught classics at Christ Church until 1886 when offered the vice-principalship of Cuddesdon; fellow and dean of Divinity, Magdalenecollege, Oxford, 1890; principal of Pusey House, 1893-97; accepted country living; returned to Christ Church, 1903; Bampton Lecturer, 1897; d. 1933.

Charles T. Ovenden
b. 1846; educated in Mannheim, Germany, as well as Trinity College, Dublin; curate, Magdalenec Church, Belfast, 1870; rector of Dunluce, Co. Antrim, 1872-79; Succentor of St. Patrick’s Cathedral, Dublin, 1879-84; rector of Portrush, 1884-86; chaplain to Lord Lieutenant and Precentor of Clogher, 1886-1903; Dean of Clogher, 1903-11; rector of Enniskillen and rural dean, 1886-1911; Dean of St. Patrick’s Cathedral, Dublin, 1911; d. 1924.

John R. Palmer
Curate of Brockmoor, 1891-94; curate of Wiggenton, 1896-99; curate of Christ Church, Wellington, 1899.

Hugh Sinclair Paterson
Minister of Trinity Presbyterian Church, Notting Hill, 1880-93; edited volumes V-VII of Dickinson’s Theological Quarterly.

J. L. Paton
b. 1844; went to Church of Scotland, Airdrie, 1865; St. George’s Church, Paisley, 1879; St. Paul’s, Glasgow, 1881. Great promoter of temperance; founder of Scottish Christian Social Union; supported United Evangelistic Association; also Home Mission Union; in public eye as writer, especially as editor of the autobiography of his famous missionary brother, John G. Paton.
John P. Peters

Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia.

James Allenson Picton

b. 1832; first attempt to enter the ministry in 1856 failed owing to difficulties over his orthodoxy, but later in year was appointed to Cheetham Hill Congregational Church, Manchester; moved to Gallow Gate Chapel, Leicester; St. Thomas's Square Chapel, Hackney, 1869-79; represented Hackney on London School Board, 1870-79; entered Parliament as member for Leicester, 1884; d. 1910. Famous for lectures delivered on Sunday afternoons to working classes; tendency towards rationalism finally led him to pantheism in later years; took active part in public life as uncompromising radical; championed secularism in education; prolific writer in press, also produced many sermons and pamphlets.

Josias L. Porter

b. 1823; minister of Presbyterian Church, High Bridge, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1846-49; sent to Damascus as a missionary to the Jews by the mission board of the Irish Presbyterian Church, 1849-59; appointed professor of biblical criticism in Presbyterian College, Belfast, 1860; became secretary of the college faculty, 1867; moderator of the Irish Presbyterian Church, 1875; appointed to newly-established Board of Intermediate Education for Ireland, 1878; president of Queen's College, Belfast, 1879; d. 1889.

Robert Ker Porter

b. 1777; worked as an artist between 1792 and 1832; appointed captain in Westminster militia, 1803; appointed historical painter to the Czar of Russia, 1804; traveled extensively in Europe and the Middle East; d. 1842.

Francis E. Powell

Curate of St. John the Evangelist, Lowestoft, 1885-88; organizing secretary for the Church of England Temperance Society for diocese of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1890-92; vicar of Church of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead, 1892-94; vicar of Over, 1894-98; St. James, Latchford, 1898-1902; vicar of Sewerby from 1902.
Helena L. Powell
Principal of the Cambridge Training College.

Robert Rainy
b. 1826; licensed by Free Church of Scotland, 1849; spent six months at mission at Inchinnan; chaplain at Huntly Lodge, then minister of Huntly Free Church; minister at Free High Church, Edinburgh, 1854-62; professor of church history at New College, 1862; principal of New College, 1874; moderator of Free Church in 1887, 1900 and 1905; d. 1906.

Thomas Raymont
Tutor at Borough Road Training College; tutor at Central Foundation Schools, Cowper Street; lecturer in education, University College, Cardiff, 1890; professor at Cardiff, 1904; vice-principal of Goldsmith's Teacher Training College, 1905; examiner in education, University of Manchester, 1906-08; same at University of London, 1909-10; Board of Governors, National Froebel Union.

E. Basil Redlich
Curate of Boston, 1908-10; St. John, Hampstead, 1910-17; diocesan inspector of schools, London, 1913-17; director of religious education in diocese of Wakefield, 1918; rector of Leigh, Oakham; director of religious education in the diocese of Peterborough.

Emil Reich
b. 1854; studied in universities of Prague, Budapest and Vienna; family emigrated to U.S.A. in 1884; employed in New York by Appleton firm producing Encyclopedia; travelled to France and finally settled in England in 1893; worked as a writer and lecturer on a wide variety of subjects to both learned and popular audiences in Oxford, Cambridge and London: also coached candidates for the civil service.

Joseph E. Riddle
b. 1804; lived at Ramsgate, tutoring and doing translation work, 1828-30; curate at Everley, Upper Slaughter, Reading and All Souls, Marylebone; also curate at Harrow and Shepton Mynhe, Gloucestershire; returned to Oxford to make use of libraries; incumbent of St. Philip's, Leckhampton Gloucestershire from 1840; d. 1859. Noted for his Complete English-Latin Dictionary and A Copious and Critical Latin-English Lexicon.
William Ritchie

Minister of the East United Presbyterian Church, Duns, 1839-97; d. 1897.

George B. Roberts

Curate of Lower Brixham, 1874-77; curate of Folkstone, 1877-78; chaplain of St. Michael's School, Slough, 1878; vicar of Elmstone, 1879.

J. Armitage Robinson

b. 1853; ordained in 1882; became domestic chaplain to J.B. Lightfoot; returned to Cambridge and engaged in teaching and research; also held curacy at St. Mary the Great; Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, 1893-99; canon of Westminster and rector of St. Margaret's, 1899; Dean of Westminster, 1902-11; Dean of Wells; d. 1933. In 1891 edited a new series of "Cambridge Texts and Studies."

George H. Rouse

b. 1838; after training at Regent's Park College, was accepted for work with the Baptist Missionary Society in India in 1860; superintended the Baptist Mission Press, 1860-64; undertook revision of the Bengali version of the Bible in 1880; also prepared numerous tracts for Mohammedans; prolific author of devotional material and commentaries in other Indian languages.

T. Cyprian Rust

b. 1808; ordained pastor of the Baptist Chapel, Eld Lane, Colchester, 1838; joined Church of England, 1849; curate of St. Michael at Thorn, Norwich; rector of Heigham, 1860; South Heigham, 1868; rector of Westerfield, 1875; d. 1895. Accomplished Hebrew scholar; arranged hymns of Isaac Watts.

Herbert E. Ryle

b. 1856; elected fellow of King's College, Cambridge, 1881; interlude of 18 months (September 1886-March 1888) as principal of St. David's, Lampeter; elected to Hulsean Professorship of Divinity, 1887; Bishop of Exeter, 1901; translated to Winchester, 1903; Dean of Westminster, 1911; d. 1925.
Gilbert T. Sadler

Assistant minister at Lincoln Congregational Church, 1895-97; Chester-Street, Wrexham, 1897-1904; Warple-Road, Wimbledon, 1904-09; Christ-Church, Alwyne-Road, Wimbledon, 1909.

William Sanaday

b. 1843; elected fellow of Trinity College, 1866; lecturer at Trinity College until 1869; held livings of Navestock, Essex, Abingdon, 1871-72; Great Waltham, 1872-73; Barton-on-the-Heath, 1873-76; principal of Hatfield Hall, Durham, 1876; professor of exegesis of Scripture, Oxford, 1882; Lady Margaret professor of divinity, 1895-1919; d. 1920.

Thomas Scott

b. 1747; menial laborer until 1771; curate of Stoke Goldington and Western Underwood, 1773; Ravenstone, 1775; Olney, Buckinghamshire, 1781; joint chaplain at Lock Hospital, 1785; held lectureship at St. Mildred's, Bread Street, London; noted for commentary on the Bible which appeared in 174 weekly numbers; rector of Aston Sanford, Buckinghamshire, where he trained missionaries for the Church Missionary Society; d. 1821.

Thomas G. Selby

b. 1846; entered ministry of Wesleyan Methodist Church, 1867; went to China as missionary, 1868; travelled extensively in India, Palestine and Egypt; after return to England, was pastor of several circuits including Liverpool (1883), Hull (1886), Greenock (1889), Liverpool (1892), and Dulwich (1895); d. 1910. Was successful preacher and sermon writer; published translations of Chinese stories, numerous volumes of collected sermons and very many expositions of Scripture.

George Vance Smith

b. 1816 (?); ordained in 1841 into charge of Chapel Lane, Bradford, West Riding; King Edward Street Chapel, Macclesfield, 1843-46; vice-principal and professor of theology and Hebrew at Manchester College, 1846; appointed principal, 1850; professor of critical and exegetical theology, evidences of religion, Hebrew and Syriac; resigned in 1857; obtained M.A. and PhD. at Tubingen; assistant, St. Saviourgate's Chapel, York, 1858; joined New Testament revision company, 1870; minister of Upper Chapel, Sheffield, 1875; principal of Carmarthen Presbyterian College, 1876-88; d. 1902. Noted for his mildly conservative Unitarianism.
Robert Payne Smith

b. 1818; classics coach, Pembroke College, Oxford; curate, Longerendon, Buckinghamshire; classical master, Edinburgh Academy, 1847; incumbent, Trinity Chapel, Dean Bridge, 1848; headmaster, Kensington Grammar School, London, 1853; sub-librarian, Bodleian Library; appointed Regius Professor of Divinity, canon of Christ Church and rector of Ewelme, 1865; Dean of Canterbury, 1871; d. 1895. Involved in the study of Syriac and Arabic; took leading place among the Oxford evangelicals; member of the Ritual Commission, 1867-68; Bampton Lecturer, 1869; one of the revisers of the Old Testament; contributed to the Pulpit Commentary, The Quiver and Bible Educator.

Sir William Smith


John Paterson Smyth

Chaplain to the Lord Lieutenant, 1889; professor of pastoral theology, Trinity College, Dublin, 1902; curate of Lisburn Cathedral, 1884-85; Harold's Cross, 1883-86; Christ Church, Kinsgton, 1888-1902; vicar of St. Anne's, Dawson Street, Dublin from 1902.

William Woods Smyth

Fellow of Medical Society, London.

Bernard Snell

b. 1856; minister of St. Paul's Congregational Chapel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1878-83; Richmond Chapel, Manchester, 1886-91; Brixton Independent Church, 1891-1930; member of Newcastle and Salford School Boards; chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1917; d. 1934.
Lucy M. Soulsby

b. 1856; staff of Ladies College, Cheltenham, 1885-87; headmistress of the Oxford High School for Girls, 1887; headmistress of private girls' school at the Manor House, Brondesbury, N.W., 1897-1916; d. 1927. Active in the National Union of Women Workers and on the Council of the Mothers' Union; served on educational committees; spoke at Church Congresses; wrote books dealing chiefly with the devotion and education of girls.

S. Stewart Stitt

Tutor of St. Aiden's College, Berkshire, 1891-92; curate of Thring, 1892-94; curate of St. Helier's, Jersey, 1894-97; acting chaplain to the Forces at Cork, 1897-99, and Aldershot, 1899-1901; chaplain of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, 1903-04; vicar of St. Michael's, Cambridge, 1903-06; rector of Stretham, Ely, 1906.

William Henry Griffith Thomas

b. 1861; ordained into Church of England, 1885; after time as a lay curate; senior curate, St. Aldgate's, Oxford, 1889; St. Paul's, Portman Square, London, 1897-1905; principal, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, 1905-1910; professor of Old Testament literature and exegesis, Wycliffe College, Toronto, 1910-19; moved to Philadelphia where he engaged in ministry of teaching, preaching and conference work; d. 1924. Noted for weekly Bible studies in London; active in Keswick movement; edited The Churchman; frequent contributor to popular religious magazines.

William Thomson

b. 1806; American Presbyterian clergyman and missionary in Syria; d. 1894.

Reuben A. Torrey

b. 1856; Congregational minister, 1878; joined Moody evangelistic work in Chicago, 1889; pastor of Chicago Avenue Church, 1894; superintendent of Moody Bible Institute; conducted evangelistic tours in U.S., Great Britain and Canada; dean of Bible Institute, Los Angeles, 1912-24; pastor of Church of the Open Door, Los Angeles, 1915-24; d. 1928.

John Urquhart

Pastor of Baptist Church in Kirkcaldy; member of the Society of Biblical Archaeology; associate of the
Victoria Institute; editor of The King's Own.

Charles Voysey

b. 1828; curate of Hessle, Hull, 1851-58; St. Andrew's, Craigton, Jamaica, 1858-59; Great Yarmouth; St. Mark's, Whitechapel, 1861; St. Mark's, Victoria Docks; Healaugh, near Lancaster, 1864; began preaching in St. George's Hall, Langham Place, which developed into the formation of an independent denomination called the Theistic Church; established regular place of worship in Swallow Street, Piccadilly; attractive preacher; condemned for unorthodox views; d. 1912.

Henry Wace

b. 1836; curate, St. Luke's, Berwick; St. James's, Piccadilly; lecturer, Grosvenor Chapel, 1870; chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, 1872; professor of ecclesiastical history, King's College, London, 1875; principal of King's College, 1883-97; benefice of St. Michael's, Cornhill, 1896; Dean of Canterbury, 1906; d. 1924. Gave Boyle Lectures, 1876; Bampton Lectures, 1879; known as a controversialist and churchman of wide learning; prepared and edited the Dictionary of Christian Biography.

George Woosin Wade

Curate of Basing, Hampshire, 1885-88; lecturer in Hebrew at St. David's College, Lampeter, 1888.

William P. Walsh

b. 1820; curate of Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow, 1845-58; chaplain of Sanford Church, Ranelagh, Dublin, 1858-73; Dean of Cashel, 1873-78; elected to sees of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin, 1878; secretary of the Church Missionary Society in Ireland for many years; Donellan Lecturer, 1860; d. 1902.

Frederick Watson

Curate of Stow with Quy, Cambridge, 1871-75; curate of St. Giles with St. Peter's, Cambridge, 1875-78; rector of Starston, Norfolk, 1878-87; vicar of Stow with Quy, 1887-93; vicar of St. Edward's, Cambridge, 1893; Lady Margaret Professor, 1894; honorary canon of Ely, 1898.
John H. Weatherall

Presbyterian minister, Darlington, 1896-98; professor of Hebrew and Hellenistic Greek at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, 1898-1904; Bolton Bank Street Church from 1904.

James Wells

b. 1833; assistant in Edinburgh Fountainbridge Mission and Glasgow Wynd, 1862-64; ordained and inducted into Glasgow Wynd, 1864; Glasgow Barony, 1867; moderator of the United Free Church of Scotland, 1911; convenor of the Assembly's Committee on Jewish Missions; d. 1924.

Edward White

b. 1819; minister at Womanby Street Chapel, Cardiff, 1840; Englebrook Church, Hereford, 1842-51; St. Paul's Chapel, Hawley Road, London, 1852-58; chairman of London Congregational Union, 1883; chairman of Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1886; d. 1898. Prolific writer; also known as a popular lecturer; involved in controversy over eternal punishment; Merchants Lecturer, 1880.

Philip H. Wicksteed

Unitarian minister; Taunton, 1867-69; Dukinfield, 1870-74; London, Little Portland Street, 1874-97; University Extension lecturer from 1897.

Alexander Wilson

b. 1860; ordained, 1890; assistant at Holburn, Aberdeen and Saughtree and Blairdoff; minister of Ythan Wells, Aberdeenshire; d. 1917.

Nevil P. Wood

Assistant master at Bishop Stortford College.

Francis H. Woods

Curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford, 1874-75; fellow
of St. John's College, 1876-83; theological lecturer at St. John's, 1878-88; vicar of Chalfont, St. Peter, 1888-1903; vicar of Bainton, Driffield, 1903; Warburton Lecturer, 1890-93.

**Violet S. Wortley**

b. 1866; married Edward Stuart Wortley, brigadier-general in British army; known for extensive travelling and also for entertainment of the diplomatic and military corps.

**Charles H.H. Wright**

b. 1836; educated at Trinity College, Dublin and Leipzig; ordained to curacy of Middleton-Tyas in Yorkshire, 1859; English chaplaincy at Dresden, 1863; chaplaincy at Boulogne-sur-mer; returned to Ireland to become incumbent of St. Mary's, Belfast; then Bethesda Church, Dublin; St. John's, Liverpool, 1891; d. 1909. Bampton Lecturer, 1878; Donellen Lecturer, 1880-81; Greenfield Lecturer at Oxford, 1893, 1895-97; devoted to cause of Protestant Reformation Society.
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