

has been subjected. This may be illustrated in two particulars, which are of special importance in their relation to the intellectual life of to-day—History and Science.

INERRANCY AND HISTORY.

In dealing with the historic records of Scripture, Criticism has to consider two great classes of facts : 1. Facts which form the contents of the history. 2. Facts pertaining to the building of the record. In neither of these classes are the facts to be assumed to lie beyond the reach of criticism. The methods and criteria by which history is tested apply to Scripture as to all other history. The processes and tests to which all literary records must be subjected apply to the Scripture records as to all other records. The best apologists of the day concede that the credibility of the Scripture record is not dependent on its inspiration. Criticism must, therefore, be allowed full scope in testing, cautiously and reverently, indeed, but none the less fearlessly and thoroughly, all that pertains both to the genesis and the substance of that record. No *à priori* theory of Scripture or of inspiration can dictate beforehand to Criticism what its conclusions are to be. *Per contra*, our theories of Scripture and of its inspiration must reckon with the established conclusions of critical science.

But let it be noted that nothing in the claims of Scripture itself requires the assumption of absolute inerrancy beyond the matter that is essential to the great ends for which the record is given. By this is not implied that all outside of the essential matter is of doubtful historicity. Far from it. The record, as a whole—in the New Testament certainly—down to the minutest details, gives evidence of verisimilitude, trustworthiness, the personal attestation of eyewitnesses. At the same time, the account which Criticism gives to-day of the Gospel record make it morally certain that in the historic processes through which the record has passed, the *prima facie* credibility of which is so strongly attested by those graphic touches, those undoubted personal reminiscences which lend their charm to every part of the wondrous story, errors have crept into the story, just as afterward errors crept into the text. But the same Criticism shows that these errors lie not in the fundamentals, but in the circumstantialities ; not in the record of the essential facts, but in the description of accessories ; not in the elements which have a Divine or pneumatic significance, but in the secular, external accompaniments which, by common consent, are wholly unimportant, and which, however regarded, in nowise affect either the substance of the Revelation, or the redemptive, life-giving power of the Record. So long as the pneumatic substance and power remain, it is alike unwise, unworthy, and vain to seek to arrest the functions of criticism, or to suspect or reject its demonstrated results.

INERRANCY AND SCIENCE.

The same principles must decide our interpretation of those affirmations of Scripture which seem to conflict with modern science. Whether such