

under the same influences as other books. It is true there is one theory of Inspiration which would prevent us from entering upon such a work: it is the theory of Verbal Inspiration which in my opinion—although I am not going to stop here to justify my view—is the twin-brother of Papal Infallibility, and as its brother would weaken and finally destroy all that is strong and active and growing in Christianity itself. But the Church has never accepted and never taught Verbal Inspiration, and I shall venture therefore to pass it by.

But what, one may ask, is my belief in Inspiration? I do believe that God spake to men of old by a religious and moral revelation which is enshrined for us in the Bible and in the history of the Church. At any rate we must believe in the Bible as a record of moral and religious growth: as a progressive Revelation of God. We do not go to it for our Science, we do not go equally to all parts of it for our moral ideas, but we recognize a moral and progressive revelation of God, made through the medium of history, through the medium of men, through the medium of a nation and a Church. That must be the germ of our belief, and around it more may be grouped, but so long as a man is prepared to believe in that we must, I think, welcome him as a brother believer in the Bible and its truth.

But now we come to the contest that has raged around the Criticism of the Old Testament. Higher Criticism, let me remind you, is the ordinary expression for a study which does not confine itself to the text—as the Lower Criticism does, but deals with the composition of the books, their authorship and all internal questions that may arise.

The historic setting of the Old Testament, the history of the formation of its Canon, is very different from that of the New Testament. The one belongs to a world nearer to ourselves, its limits are within say a century and a half: the other ranges from a simple pastoral people to a full developed monarchy: its writers and its people were far