sidered the highest standards of academic teaching and method. For our purposes it will be sufficient to single out a few names as leaders and representatives of the critical method which then already received the name of the "Higher Criticism." 1 These names were J. M. Gesner (1691-1761), C. G. Heyne (1729-1812), and tive higher J. G. Eichhorn (1752-1827). I select these three names, as from them emanated two prominent streams into which the critical spirit poured its refreshing as well as its devastating waters, namely, classical criticism (philology) on the one side, and biblical criticism (exegesis) on the other.

I have already on a former occasion (vol. i. p. 164) mentioned how the foundation of the University of and the Göttingen marked an era in the history of German spirit. thought. It not only initiated the modern conception of liberal studies in Germany, it also gathered into a focus intellectual developments which had before been

1 Higher Criticism is frequently ! distinguished from Lower Criticism. The latter is occupied mainly with the text of writers, its emendation, purification, and restitution: Higher Criticism introduces the historical and philosophical aspects. It studies the genesis, historical surroundings, and antecedents of its subject, and advances to an interpretation of the meaning of prominent writers, notably the ancient Classics and the Holy Scriptures, aiming, in the last instance, at a reconstruction of the thought and culture of important periods of history. This Lower and Higher Criticism is, as I have already remarked, quite different from that criticism which is allied to rhetoric on the one side and to the history of literary taste ! on the other-two distinct studies

which have in modern literature been carried on consistently and continuously only in France. Prof. Saintsbury in the work already referred to (supra, p. 96) separates this criticism from that kind of criticism I am now dealing with, which is, in its development, though not in its origins, a characteristic creation of the modern German mind. For this criticism, with its philological, philosophical, and theological branches, Prof. Saintsbury has evidently only scant appreciation (see loc. cit., vol. i. p. 4). On the term Higher Criticism, as connected with Bible studies, see H. S. Nash, 'The History of the Criticism of the New Testament' (1900), especially p. 12, &c.