

because he entertains a particular view of the origin of species ; a botanist's claim to the title does not depend on his belief or disbelief in separate creative acts for each kind of plant ; and so the Higher Criticism, which contemplates literary phenomena as these sciences do the phenomena of plant and animal life, includes students of diverse opinions as to the distinctive quality and ultimate purpose of the Scriptures. As a matter of fact, those who are thoroughly familiar with this criticism, and especially those who practise exegesis, disagree in increasing numbers with some of the dogmatic opinions believed by Dr. Watts, for the reason that literary criticism and exegesis both have brought to light many facts that appear inconsistent with the verbal inspiration and inerrancy which Dr. Watts holds dear.

But if the facts pointed the other way, and they drew conclusions that agree with his, these students would be neither less nor more "higher critics" than they are at present.

II. The Higher Criticism being thus purely a science of literary phenomena, and having as its purpose the recognition and classification of such phenomena, it follows not only that it is not concerned with theories of the nature of Scripture as a Divine revelation, but also that the methods which Dr. Watts ascribes to it are not its methods at all. There is no propriety in tossing it into the same basket with "all modern criticism which denies the plenary, verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures," or cataloguing it with "all classes of anti-verbalists," because it is neither verbalist nor anti-verbalist, neither denies nor affirms a doctrine of inspiration ; nor is there any more propriety in charging it with assuming the impossibility of miracle. The possibility of miracle is a philosophical and theological question with which many gifted minds have dealt during the last hundred years ; men who pursue the Higher Criticism may have opinions in regard to it ; and if they are men of ordinary intelligence, probably do have, but they do not all agree in their opinions ; and the genuineness of their criticism is not determined by the orthodoxy of their opinions on this matter, nor by the opinion which one of them may hold about the opinion of another. Still less has any particular opinion the right to be called that of the Higher Criticism.

III. A similar line of remark applies to Dr. Watts's second charge : "It is true of these critics and of all anti-verbalists, that instead of giving a fair and full exhibition of those passages in which a full plenary, verbal inspiration is claimed, they minimize the instances, reducing them to the smallest possible dimensions, while, on the other hand, they are sure to seize upon and hold up to the disparagement of the sacred text every passage which has even the semblance of an incongruity with any other." Undoubtedly, if any higher critic deals thus unequally with two sets of phenomena that belong to his science, his course is reprehensible ; but in such unequal dealing he is untrue to his science, and it is not fair to condemn the science because one of its votaries is disloyal. The fact is, however, as we have seen, that it is not the business of this science to establish