

lievers who could not meet their arguments. And between the two you would have had a vast multitude inclined to believe that Reason and Revelation, Historical Accuracy and the New Testament Story were incompatible. But most surely the lessons of the Renaissance can teach us what Christianity loses if it divorces itself from intellectual study on the one hand or reason on the other: it is well for us in the English Church that our fathers taught us a different lesson. "Keep your faith in criticism and keep your faith in God" were the parting words of Westcott to his sixth form at Harrow.

And it is in this process of reverent study and scholarship that our knowledge of the New Testament has been gained. Without it we should have gone on not gaining a living interpretation for ourselves but repeating to the loss of spiritual energy and the deadening of our hearts the interpretation of ages other than our own. But because we have not been afraid of criticism—in the case of the New Testament at any rate—our knowledge is more complete and our faith in its power has been greatly strengthened.

Is it presumptuous, is it unnecessary, to put in then a plea for a study and a criticism which is to be unfettered and free, which is to use in God's great work every scrap of learning, every atom of intellect, every spark of reason we may possess? Then and then only can we understand what God wishes us to learn and know; how can we work if we are to tie the hand of reason, or to blind the eye of criticism? Thank God our English critics have no Pope to silence a Loisy on the one side or a Sanday on the other;—no Index to check them by its terrors.

We believe then—and the history of the New Testament justifies us in the belief—that we must be prepared to criticize with reverence (of course) but with scholarship and reason the Books of the Bible. For this purpose whatever be our special theory of Inspiration we must deal with them as if they were ordinary books written in the same way and