

conservatism. Graf, for instance, who was one of the founders of the most rampant school of higher criticism, was also the chief defender of the superiority of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah over the Greek. Probably the most satisfactory and permanent work in this department has been done by Baer and Delitzsch in their critically exact edition of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which series is now almost completed.

But even with the text restored to its original word and letter, the Bible student is not yet ready for detail interpretation and exegesis and for the construction of his system of Biblical truth. Modern critical methods, in accordance with their general aim and object, have here put into practice the principles of higher criticism to a greater measure than was ever done before. No term in modern Bible study has been more misinterpreted and misunderstood by friend and foe than this. The idea that it implies superior and esoteric wisdom above and beyond that of ordinary mortals, is foreign to its legitimate aim and sphere, but has quite naturally been nourished by the fantastic and radical hypotheses of some modern scholars, which have been labeled with this name. In reality, higher criticism signifies nothing but the collection of those facts and data bearing on the author, time, age, literary character, etc., of the text, which contribute and aid in evolving the meaning of the words. Generally there is included in it also the constructive process of formulating the scheme of Biblical history and doctrine which the critical study of the books has produced. Essentially it signifies the same preparatory work which a thorough study of a Greek or Latin author presupposes. The unfortunate name "higher" criticism was meant to indicate merely the next step after lower in the process of securing an exact interpretation of the text. The still more unfortunate abuse of the discipline by radical scholarship has completely discredited the term, for which another and better should be substituted. But even as it is, higher criticism is made to suffer for some of the sins of the lower. The demand, *e. g.*, for the elimination from the New Testament of the pericope in John 8, 1 sqq., of the doxology of the Lord's Prayer, of the last verses in Mark, of the Trinity passage in 1 John 5:7, are not the outcome of higher but of lower.

As has already been indicated, the ultimate aim of the Biblical criticism of the day is a statement or restatement of the historical and religious developments of the Scriptures according to what is considered the exact methods of objective criticism. To attain this end the first work to be done is an examination of the sources of information, in other words, of the sacred writings, as to what they teach in the premises. And here it is where both in methods and results, modern Biblical criticism has made new departures and sought new paths. In both the Old and the New Testament the traditional views are not only