further back, as is his wont, and thinks he finds
the origin of the very first variations of the first
organisms,—"they conformed to the same general
law as do the changes of the inorganic mass."

Now it is obvious, looking on the nature and
scope of these suggested modifications of Dar-
winism, that no alteration is made in its relation
to religion. The most conspicuous break from
pure Darwinism is that of Mr. Wallace, who
places the origin of man as a responsible moral
being outside or above the line of organic con-
tinuity; but even this is no reversal of anything
Dr. Darwin taught concerning Organic Evolution
in general. The present scientific position is fairly
expressed in Professor Huxley’s words, when taking
a review of the question before the Royal Society,
"The origin of species lies in variation, while the
origin of any particular species lies, firstly, in the
occurrence, and, secondly, in the selection and
preservation of particular variations."

How far the believer in Divine Revelation can
acquiesce in the conclusions thus arrived at, and,
at the same time, be loyal to truth, is a question
for each one to solve. That it is possible to hold
to the certainty of a Divine Revelation for the
guidance of man in spiritual matters, and, at the
same time, fearlessly and cheerfully accept the
well-attested conclusions of science, I most firmly
believe. It is of no avail to simply affirm that
the conclusions are not valid: they must be shown
not to be so, or else reasons must be adduced to
show that there is a considerable element of un-
certainty with reference to them. How far does
Evolution extend? Does it cover all that is in
man? Then, this being settled, what is the true
relation of Revelation to the scientific position?
These are the problems to be solved; and that
they can be solved with due regard to real
scientific authority and the real claims of Revela-
tion, I most firmly believe.

Biblical Archaeology and the Higher Criticism.

By the Rev. Herbert Symonds, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Toronto.

In connexion with Professor Sayce’s paper on
"Biblical Archaeology and the Higher Criticism,"
which appeared in the December number of The
Expository Times, it may be interesting to some
readers to note the views of that great Old
Testament scholar Ewald.

1. Ewald decides against the use of writing in
the patriarchal age. "We must admit," says he,
"that that primitive time... did not possess the
art of writing" (History of Israel, Eng. trans. i. p.
48).

Nevertheless, as a possession of the Semitic
peoples, he regards writing as of the most extreme
antiquity, its origin being lost "in a distant mist
which all our present means are inadequate to
explore," whilst as regards the Israelites "we need
not scruple to assume that Israel knew and used it
(i.e. writing) in Egypt before Moses" (ut sup. p. 51).
One can hardly help questioning whether, seeing
that "Israel did not adopt the Egyptian character"
(p. 52), Ewald is quite consistent in denying the
possession of this art to patriarchal times, since it
would seem to follow that the Israelites must have
taken the Semitic character down to Egypt with
them.

2. In regard to Gen. xiv., Ewald says: "All
indications tend to show that this whole piece was
written prior to Moses" (p. 52, n. 2). But it is
more important to note that he considers it a
document written, not by Hebrew historians, but
inserted in Genesis by a later author who derived
it from the records of some cognate nation, those
of the Canaanites, for example. "When we
consider the ancient narrative contained in Gen.
xiv., so strikingly different from all other accounts,
in which Abraham is described as an almost alien
‘Hebrew,’ much as a Canaanite historian might
have spoken of him;...then it cannot but
appear very probable, or rather certain, that the
earliest historians of Israel found many historical
works (cf. Gen. xxxvi. and Num. xiii. 22)
already existing in the cognate nations" (p.
52).

One would be glad to know what Professor
Sayce’s opinion may be on this account of Gen.
xiv.