

America, Scotland and England, and however divergent their ideas may be in other respects they all agree in de-throning the Bible from its place of supremacy. Dr. Martineau's words will serve to express the mind of all these writers, wherein he declares that "he rejects the Bible as the sole authority in religion, for the reason that it is not what it purports to be either as to authorship, dates, contents or trustworthiness." Of course the whole Bible is involved in this discreditment, for no one can imagine that if the Old Testament be invalidated, the New Testament would escape the same fate.

For, in the first place, the Higher Critics must in consistency apply to the New Testament the same methods which they adopt in dealing with the Old. The whole Bible must be subjected to the same critical tests. Accordingly we find Archdeacon Wilson of Manchester, at the Rhyle Church Congress (1891) after criticising away the veracity of Old Testament history, proceeding to declare with regard to the Gospels "that we can afford to acknowledge some halo of legend round a nucleus of fact." Some moderate critics, like Dr. Nichol, would like to warn their more progressive brethren from the New Testament, on the plea that the great Gospel verities should not be treated as open questions, but the critical wave flows onward and sweeps before it everything that is fundamental to the Christian Faith, as is abundantly evident in the pages of the Encyclopaedia Biblica, edited by Canon Cheyne, wherein the truth of Dr. Dale's words receive a fearful verification, "The (critical) storm has moved round the whole horizon, but is rapidly concentrating its strength and fury above one Sacred Head." But secondly, the Hebrew and Christian writings are so intimately bound up together that if the trustworthiness of the former can be disproved, the latter