

[From *The Times*, January 23, 1892]

criminals. There is no real inconsistency between the practice and the teaching, and yet to the young child they seem utterly opposed. I need not point the parable. I cannot refrain from adding that to denounce the morality of Psalms, which the New Testament applies expressly to our Lord Jesus Christ, is a bold venture for a clergyman, even though he be benefited and shelters himself by anonymity.

One word as to your correspondent "Hope" and his "Friend A." Their faith gave way on noticing the marked difference between the 39th and 40th chapters of Isaiah. It is a pity that no one was at hand to point out to them that chapters xxxvi. to xxxix. are but a fragment of contemporary history. Where is the contrast between chapter xl. and chapter xxxv. ? Between the prophetic portions of the book "higher criticism" can show no differences that may not be accounted for by the fact which the critics ignore—that at least half a century intervened between the prophet's earlier and later utterances (Is. i., 1).

Men are eager to convict the Bible of immorality or error on evidence of a kind which would not avail to convict a notorious thief of picking pockets. Any *ad captandum* statement is enough if only it be endorsed by someone who is better versed in Greek or Hebrew than his fellows, or has gained a reputation as a scientist. But learning is not scholarship, and something more even than scholarship is needed in the study of the Scriptures. There is a deeper language in the book which philology takes no account of, a language to be deciphered only by tracing the unnumbered strands in the twisted line of type and antitype, and promise and prophecy, which runs unbroken through it. But such a study is unsuited to the columns of *The Times*, as it is entirely ignored in the pages of the critics.

I am, &c., R. ANDERSON.