

cal library and universally acknowledged to be one of the foremost "Higher Critics." Well, now, Canon Driver's reputation as an expert in this field cannot be questioned, and so I will give you his opinions, as we find them in his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" (Scribner's, 1899). Says Canon Driver, "That P. and J. E. (this is the name given to the original documents) form two clearly, definable, independent sources, is a conclusion abundantly justified by the facts. As regards the analysis of J. E. the criteria are fewer and less definite and the points of demarcation cannot in all cases be determined with the same confidence. . . . Dillman attempts to separate J. and E. with great minuteness. But it is questionable if the phraseological criteria upon which he mainly relies, warrant the conclusion which he draws from them. He is apt not to allow sufficiently for the probability that the two writers whose general styles were such as those of J. and E. are known to have been, would make use of the same expressions, where these expressions are not (as in the case of P.) of a peculiar, strongly marked type, but are such as might be used, so far as we can judge, by any writer of the best historiographical style. (Introduction p. 19.)

So then, owing to the nature of the problem, the inextricable difficulties involved, you see the reserve, the moderation, the suspense of judgment of the expert and competent scholar and you can compare it with the unbounded assurance and confidence of Mr. Ewart. It is remarkable how, when one rejects the true faith, one is apt to believe the incredible and the incredible. The credulity of unbelief is a curious phenomenon.

Creed Inspiration and Revelation.

It is not enough to indicate the nature of the problem; the conclusion arrived at by "Higher Criticism" must be considered. Because according to Mr. Ewart, orthodoxy—and to body else, can believe in Inspiration and the authority of the Scriptures. Again, I appeal to Canon Driver—and let us be clear about the point under discussion. And for the purpose, I will refer again to the documentary origin of the Pentateuch, and then you may judge whether it rejects the Inspiration and the authority of the Bible or not.

That the Priest's Code formed a clearly defined document, distinct from the rest of the Hexateuch, appears to me to be more than sufficiently established by a multitude of convergent

indications, and I have nowhere signified any doubt on this conclusion. On the other hand, in the remainder of the narrative of Genesis to Numbers and of Joshua, though there are facts which satisfy me that this is also not homogeneous, I believe that the analysis (from the nature of the criteria on which it depends) is frequently uncertain, and will perhaps always continue so. . . . "The same conclusion is constantly made by Wellhausen, Kuenen and other critics." (Preface, p. vi.)

"It is not the case that critical conclusions such as those expressed in the volume are in conflict either with the Christian creeds or with the articles of the Christian faith. Those conclusions affect not the fact of revelation but only its form. They help to determine the stage through which it passed, the different phases which it assumed, and the process by which the record of it was built up. They do not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. They imply no change in respect to the Divine attributes revealed in the Old Testament; no change in the lessons of human duty to be derived from it; no change as to the general position (apart from the interpretation of particular passages) that the Old Testament points prophetically to Christ." (Preface, p. ix.)

None of the historians of the Bible claim supernatural enlightenment for the materials of their narrative. (See Luke I, 1-4: It is reasonable therefore to conclude that those were derived by them from such human sources as were at the disposal of each particular writer, in some cases from a writer's own personal knowledge, in others from earlier documentary sources; in others, especially in those relating to a distant past, from popular tradition. It was the function of Inspiration to guide the individual writer in the choice and disposition of his material, and in his use of it, for the inculcation of special lessons. And in the production of some parts of the Old Testament different hands co-operated and have left traces of their work more or less discernible. The whole is subordinated to the controlling agency of the Spirit of God causing the Scriptures of the Old Testament to be profitable "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness" (Preface p. x.)

Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the Inspiration of the Old Testament: