

tive revelation, all subsequent revelations, stripped of their local and accidental features, are concatenated, whether they be found in the Old Testament or in the New. The Old Testament solves the problem of Jesus of Nazareth; no other ancient scripture does.

Dr. Goldwin Smith tells us that the prophet who wrote the early chapters of Genesis could not be inspired of the God of the universe who knows all, because his views of the universe are geocentric. We know through the studies of astronomers that our world is a very small affair, which knowledge led to a good deal of writing between Thomas Payne and Thomas Chalmers. Moses did not know this, nor did any sacred writer from his day down to that of our Lord's apostles any more than did the Greek and Hindu philosophers. Had the prophets and apostles been automata or human phonographs, they might have uttered the wisdom of the third heaven, but poor flesh and blood would not have understood them. Then *cui bono* all their revelation? God never did violence to human freedom, as His Son never imposed His teaching on those who were unwilling to listen to Him. Buttonholing and coercion are human devices. Man, even the highest prophet of man, is free in his acceptance of divine light, and he can colour that light with his preconceptions, obscure it with his ignorance, declare it in classical and sublime language or in faulty grammar. The filthy prophetic allusions we do not care to read in public, and the cursing *finales* to beautiful psalms that Dr. Goldwin Smith objects to, are evidences of God's respect for the freedom of the creature, be he holy prophet or unholy blasphemer. In view of this inviolability of human freedom, even Israelitish freedom—and we know what that was and is—the wonder, the miracle remains that God was actually able to speak at all. When Dr. Goldwin Smith wants a revelation that shall from the beginning reveal science and the whole mind of God, he becomes an out and out Calvinist, believing in that Augustinian fiction, "Irresistible Grace." He does not believe in this any more than in God's being the author of sin, hence he is inconsequent inadvertently.

The Old Testament is a paradoxical book with its gleams of light and shades of darkness. Some good people say it is all light, and Dr. Goldwin Smith does not say it is all darkness, very far from it. But he seems to say, it is too hard work, this separating what is human from what is divine, therefore the Christian world must divide into two camps, the one holding dogmatically that it is all divine, and the other, as dogmatically, that it is all human. Is there no such thing as discrimination? Is the spirit of sacred criticism dead? Can we not try the spirits whether they are of God or not by the teachings of Jesus Christ? The sons of Zebedee wished to follow Old Testament precedent, and were virtually told by him that their