

is just the opposite. The reverse also may occur. You may read what I have written and, failing to grasp its fulness, may decide that the spirit exhibited in that writing is unfair, narrow, destructive, irreverent, and your decision may be a wholly mistaken one. Two men may do exactly the same thing, one doing it with the right, the other with the wrong, spirit. It is not surprising, then, that in forming judgments concerning certain work, men should be mistaken as to the spirit which prompted the work. I kill my neighbor. The man who knows that it was done in self-defence, that otherwise I should have lost my own life, will not condemn me; but that other man who knows only that my neighbor has been killed, and that I did it, pronounces sentence upon me. There is, of course, a difficulty here, and care must be exercised not to mis-judge. (b) Every man who reads a Psalm and asks, who wrote this? when was it written? what historical event was the occasion of it? what use has been made of it? and similar questions, is a critic—a Higher Critic. This is something not to be overlooked. (c) The rationalistic critic is one who gives undue prominence to the authority of reason. Here must be classified, of course, those who enthrone reason as the sole authority, denying the authority of the Scriptures, and the supernatural origin of Christianity. There is, however, another class, not often called rationalistic, yet truly so-called. They magnify the authority of scripture, but in their work, though perhaps unconscious of the fact, place reason still higher. Their form of argument is, God being so-and-so, therefore. . . . ; Jesus Christ being so-and-so, therefore. . . . The difference between these two sub-classes is in one sense, very slight. It may be summed up in two parallel formulas. The first class argues, there being no supernatural revelation, this material had its origin thus and thus, and is of this particular character. The second class argues, there being a supernatural revelation, and God and Christ being what they are, the material had its origin thus and thus, and is of this particular character. Both classes adopt, practically the same method, and do their work with the same spirit; the premises being different, there is a wide difference in the conclusions reached.