

a special purpose; but that it is a collection of works that have been gradually selected from among a literature certainly *not* "supernaturally dictated and infallibly true." Such an opinion—that the Bible is literally inspired—he distinctly declares to be untenable: "There is not the least merit in its acceptance; it is not helpful to the religious life of the individual or of nations; it has, on the contrary, been prolific of terrible disasters." And he insists upon the importance of remembering that—

"The Bible is, strictly speaking, *not a book, but a library*. The neuter plural *biblia* was mistaken in the Western Church in the thirteenth century for a feminine singular, and from it is derived our familiar name 'The Bible.'"

#### FRAGMENTARY REMAINS OF AN EXTENSIVE LITERATURE.

After discussing the gradual process of collecting the various books of the present canon, Dr. Farrar says:

"No vision of the night, no voice from heaven, declared these books to be the Word of God. Having bestowed on man his reason and his conscience, He does not speak to them by voices in the air. God never reveals to man what He has enabled man to discern for himself. The marked separation of the Bible into the Books of the Old and New Covenants is alone sufficient to show that the Bible cannot be regarded as a simple homogeneous book. Both sections represent the selected and fragmentary remains of an extensive literature. Probably, too, our sacred books are even more fragmentary than at first sight they appear to be. Few competent critics hesitate to allow that it is a work of composite structure; that it has been edited and re-edited several times, and that it contains successive strata of legislation."

#### LET HONESTY AND COMMON SENSE BE OUR GUIDES.

Then, referring to the fanciful "spiritualization" or allegorical interpretations of some of the Old Testament stories that square with neither the teachings of Christ nor the dictates of common honesty and decency, Canon Farrar proceeds:

"As a matter of plain honesty and common sense, it ought to be stated that the morality of some passages in the Bible is not in accord with the words of Christ. When we maintain the supremacy of the moral teaching of the Bible, we mean the supremacy of that teaching which is stamped by the sanction of consciences, which the Gospel has illuminated."

"THUS SAITH THE LORD!"

Dr. Farrar objects to the usual interpretation of prophecy, as being possible only when the prophet was in a trance; and of the arguments of such men as H. L. Hastings—that the frequent use by the "prophets" of the above phrase is unique in literature and shows their firm faith in—as well as proves the fact of—the divine inspiration of the Bible, he says:

"The phrase 'Thus saith the Lord' had no such meaning. It was the common formula of all prophets, and attentive examination shows that the phrase was

simply  
which  
intend  
but ever  
the spiri

On t  
"Such  
criticism  
science.  
this dog  
lunatic  
doctrine  
book its  
special  
of deity  
that div  
Farrar,

"But  
desecrate  
when it is  
or any for  
used when

We nee  
laid down  
posed to  
devoted e  
fectly fre  
abandone  
form, whi  
instead of  
slavery, e  
us to reje  
to make a  
men noble

This is

"It mig  
still profess  
tion to all  
Himself in  
indirectly, F  
His will.