

evangelical faith and life, all that is of pneumatic significance and power — the acknowledged results of Criticism not only leave all this unchanged, but they have immensely strengthened the grounds of our belief in it. The historic credibility and verity of the Gospel record, the personal reality of the Christ, the superhuman quality of His being, life, and work, the Divine institution and endowment of the Church, the unique authority of the Epistles, and all apostolic writings, have never received more solid and abundant attestation than through the critical processes of the past two decades.

2. As regards the minor details and circumstances of the record Criticism has reached a twofold result. On the one hand, availing itself of the researches of archaeology and collateral history, it has established the indisputable authenticity and the wonderful accuracy of the record as a whole, even in the minutest details. Not a few details which were formerly questioned as erroneous have of late years received signal confirmation through the more thorough investigation of external records, and through recent discoveries of monuments, inscriptions, and other witnesses of an exhumed antiquity. And this consideration is assuredly one which should inspire the critic with becoming caution in challenging the accuracy of any Scriptural statement.

But, on the other hand, the discoveries that Criticism has made, and is continually making, respecting the literary characteristics and the genesis and growth of the Scripture records, make it evident that these records as they stand are not free from inaccuracies, discrepancies, contradictions, and imperfections which are distinctly traceable to the human channels through which they have passed. They are the inevitable accompaniments of the genesis, growth, transmission, and elaboration of the record into its present form, precisely as textual errors, the existence of which no one now questions, are the inevitable accompaniments of the literary and historic treatment of the text. Nor should it be forgotten in this connection that the conclusions of the Lower Criticism respecting the text were at first as vehemently assailed as are those of the Higher Criticism respecting the contents of Scripture, and from similar premises. Dr. Owen, the Buxtorfs, and others denounced Walton's Polyglot and Mill's New Testament text and apparatus as dangerous innovations. Criticism has to-day advanced far beyond Walton or Mill, and Christendom thankfully acquiesces in the result. On the one hand, the essential integrity of the text, it is seen, has not been disturbed; although, on the other hand, the individuality of the writers, the compositeness of the record, and the divergencies of the constituent parts have received a much sharper accentuation than in the received text.

So in respect to the conclusions of the Higher Criticism. While they tend to strengthen the foundations of the faith and to establish the superhuman factors of revelation, they tend also to bring out more distinctly the human conditions and limitations to which the production of the record