

specialist. That, too, is a grievous error. The Bible is our text-book, our authority for offering salvation to men. Scholarship is a valuable auxiliary, but only an auxiliary. The translator must be a scholar, but once the right rendering is secured the learned linguist has no advantage over other men; nay, it often happens that the expert and the specialist is unqualified for the more comprehensive task. The specialist everywhere is prone to lose sight of the broader aspect of things in his constant examination of the minute and the specific. Dr. Pusey rightly says: "It is an infelicity of the German mind that it is acute in detail rather than comprehensive in grasping resemblances." So a new kind of priestcraft is arising amongst us. Men still love pre-eminence, and calmly tell us that these things must be left to the experts, that their verdict must be sought, that we must not dare to sift and weigh evidence for ourselves, but lean on their opinions. Other forms of priestcraft have come and gone, and this, too, will, I doubt not, follow in the long procession and be buried in the sands of its own wrecked ambitions.

Again, we are told that the questions at issue are not vital, that they do not affect the general teaching of the Word, that the great saving truths are just as present in the Bible whether we accept or reject the conclusions of these higher critics. That may, of course, be admitted on some points. The authorship of a book may not be vital to its acceptance as a divine revelation. But if that book announces its