

*posteriori* and inductively. Some may be afraid of so doing lest old landmarks should be lightly removed. On this subject let me quote Dr. Pope: "The Bible is a divine-human collection of books, the precise relation of human and divine in which is a problem which has engaged much attention, and has not yet been, though it may be, adequately solved. The Holy Ghost never defines inspiration as applied to the whole body of Scripture: we have to construct our theory from the facts, and our theory must take those indisputable facts as it finds them." ("Comp. Theol.," Vol. I., pp. 175, 191.)

But in these days we cannot begin so. Criticism is at work, and must neither be ignored nor defied. How foolish, how wrong, to do either! Criticism means examination; will not the Bible bear examination? Suspicion of criticism may be godly jealousy, but it may mean mere prejudice, an unwillingness to face facts. What we have to be jealous of is a criticism with tacit assumptions concerning the supernatural—criticism only in name, because it hides in its premises the statements which it afterwards triumphantly produces in its conclusions. There must be the greatest care as to the assumptions of this criticism, its methods, its canons, its hypotheses. An unsound criticism must be met, not by denunciation, but by sound and sober criticism. What is the reason why so much criticism is rationalistic, so that the very name bears with some an ill savor? I fear largely because Rationalism has done so much more minute and thorough work of investigation, and orthodox commentators, while anxious about edification, have not pursued Bible inquiries with the thoroughness or scientific precision which is necessary to-day, if work is to be useful and lasting.

Behind, then, the question of inspiration, or the kind of divine influence exerted, come several previous questions. X

1. Are these books genuine, what they profess to be, written by the men whose names they bear?

2. Are they authentic, the stories in them to be believed, or myths, legends, unverifiable traditions?

3. If both, are the writers trustworthy in the details of their narratives, accurate in method, or loose and careless, though honest?