more different from ourselves than were the New Testamer
authors, and were also far more varied among themselves.

The question is therefore a more complicated one and
seems to have aroused even stronger feelings and cause
harder words. It has one side-issue of importance—viz., tl
extent of our Lord's human knowledge, and his use o
language natural to the men of His earthly day. Did H
accept limitations common to mankind, was His humil
ation so real as to leave behind it his divine insight an
power? Surely here is a problem difficult and needing to b
treated with reverence, but admitting of different views, an
it would seem a vast assumption to make a mere reference
mention from Him decisive of questions that we can stud
for ourselves. I merely mention the problem lest I shoul
seem to pass it by. If as Bishop Westcott suggests in a lette
to Archbishop Benson, our Lord spoke as in common speech o
tle "sun-rising" and "sun-setting" might He not also speal
of "Moses" or "David" as did His hearers, without going
behind their ideas or adopting language of His own?

But when we come to study the Old Testament books
we are met at once by the questions—did the writers use
existing material or authorities, and if so can they be dis
covered? I have had myself to study medieval chronicles,
and I know how the best of them incorporate whole pass-
ages of previous writers. I should expect to find the same
hold good of the Old Testament writers and I need not
remind you here that even moderate critics of to-day accept
that division of the Hexateuch into different layers which
is the foundation of the Higher Criticism. If they accept it
—and I have hardly a right on independent grounds to an
opinion of my own—it is because they wish to find out all
that God has to teach them: they know—and I know—
no other way of doing this than to use on the Old Testa-
ment the same Canons of Criticism, of Scholarship, of com-
mon sense that we do upon other books which do not enshrine
Revelation and have therefore less to teach us. I do not