

is recognized that the Psalm is Messianic, and that the august language used in it is not compatible with the position of one who was a mere human son of David."

Canon Gore, in his Essay on the Holy Spirit and Inspiration, follows Driver here, and has helped to force to the front of present day controversy, questions, the answers to which are posited down deep in the mystery of the Incarnation. On the Human side, what limits were there to the Lord's knowledge? Could He make mistakes in matters of dates and authorship? Did He really believe 110th Psalm to be the work of David? And other questions suggest themselves involving, if possible, graver consequences,

Such is an exceedingly imperfect outline of some of the conclusions reached and questions raised by the higher critics. What ought our attitude to be in the premises?

First of all: Let us *Wait*. God will give His own Word all needful vindication. It has stood assaults more terrible than the higher criticism. The old promise is still sure: "Heaven and earth shall pass away but My Word shall not pass away."

Secondly. It is by no means *demonstrated* that the traditional authorship of the Pentateuch, and of various Psalms must be given up. It is certainly not established that David was not, in some sense, the author of the 110th Psalm.

Thirdly. Our Lord says: "David speaking in the Spirit (*en pneumati*) calleth him Lord." Do the critics fully comprehend all our Lord intended to convey by the words *en pneumati*? If the "Fairie Queene" were carefully put into nineteenth century English, say by Longfellow or Tennyson, it would still be Spencer's. Similarly: if the 110th Psalm, in its original form the work of David, were retouched in a later age, by a devout poet of the theocratic nation, the Psalm would still be David's and the Lord's use of it as David's entirely justified.

Fourthly. To those who have a firm grasp of the truth that the Jewish church was a divine society, the sacred Books of which were written by inspiration of God, by Whose Providence nothing was permitted to be added to the canon except what had a just claim to be there,—it will never be a matter of the most vital importance to seek to determine by what inspired man or men the inspired memoranda, or the inspired oral traditions were edited into their present form.