

considered, the essential doctrine of Spiritual Influences has therefore been confirmed rather than shaken.

The results of Modern Rationalistic Criticism, as affecting the Essential Doctrines of Christianity, have therefore been, to sum them up in brief, both bad and good. The faith of the weak has too often been unsettled, their peace of mind destroyed and their morality and spirituality undermined. On the other hand, the old truths stand fast. The rationalistic canons that have been applied to them, whether professedly drawn from agnostic science, intuition, feeling, literary instinct, or naturalism, have been utterly false and baseless themselves, and have been demonstrated to be so; or they have led to erroneous and worthless results by false methods of application. With the advancing ages the Christianity of the Bible is seen more and more clearly to rest on such a solid foundation of fact in man, nature, and God, that the old revealed truth can no more be uprooted than the pillars of the universe. In fine, the words of one of the broadest-minded theologians of the age, the sainted Henry B. Smith, express the sound thought and firm faith of the strong men of the Christian Church of the day:

"The theology which is pre-eminently needed in our times is that whose substance and manner have met the needs of *men in all times*. This, in its essential principles, is the old, time-honoring theology of the Christian Church, with its two foci of sin and of redemption, all viewed as dependent on God. It is based upon the solid granite rock (the only true *petra*), and built up of living stones, in massive proportions, rising ever upward until its aspiring lines fade away in the bosom of the infinite, whither it leads us that there we may rest. That old theology—older than our schools, older than the earth and the stars—coeval with the Godhead; always yet never old, never yet ever new; it is dateless and deathless as the divine decree, yet fresh as the dawning light of a new day in every new-born soul; it has been known from the beginning to all penitent and believing souls."

II.—WHAT SHOULD BE THE ATTITUDE OF THE AMERICAN CLERGY TOWARDS THE REVISED VERSION OF THE SCRIPTURES?

NO. I.

BY PROF. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., ALLEGHENY, PA.

I MAY as well say frankly at the outset that I do not think the Revised Version perfect. Or, if this be deemed a barren assertion, I do not object to whittling it to a sharper point by putting it into the form of a confession that the Revised Version appears to me to be deformed by many faults which could have been avoided. The Revised Version needs revision. If any one felt it worth while, it would be easy to make out a bill of indictment against it very similar in appearance to those made out fifteen years ago against King James' New Testament, and collected by Dr. Schaff into an instructive volume.* Take

* "The revision of the E. V. of the N. T.," etc. Harpers. New York, 1873.