

*Thesis for Degree of Master of Arts,
Manitoba University*

DEP COL
THESIS
M 2796
C 2

J. S. Mahood B.A.

*Protheroe
Saskatchewan*

Jan. 27. 1906

THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND REVERENCE FOR THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The Holy Bible, commonly called the Holy Scriptures, that collection of ancient writings, dating from the age of Moses to the close of the first century, a period of fourteen hundred years, has been so generally regarded by the Christian Church throughout its history as its Great Rule of Faith, that the result of any criticism brought to bear upon its pages must be of vital importance, directly to the Christian and indirectly to the whole world. I say the result of criticism, because criticism itself is important so far as it affects the opinions of men. All things that come within the scope of the human mind inevitably undergo the searching examination of the intellect demanding truth. The great text book of the Christian religion can hardly be expected to escape the common lot to forge the minutest inspection. Momentous issues are involved in that inspection, issues which affect not only the beliefs but the conduct of the human race.

The term "Higher Criticism" has lost by popular usage a great deal of the dignity of its meaning. Its frequent employment in the conversation of men of all classes and degrees of learning and its occurrence in all kinds of discourse and literature have vulgarised the phrase so as to comprehend all arguments views and opinions which are at variance with those of traditional orthodoxy. In point of fact, the term as first used in the latter part of the eighteenth century did not imply a disposition to unorthodoxy, but merely described that method of criticism which differed in its nature from that which went by the name of "Lower Criticism"—the latter embracing all such studies which relate to the letter or text of the sacred writings, the manuscripts, versions, various readings, determination of the

correct text, etc.; the former, the studies, relating to their style, structure, sources and literary characteristics. Both are important and necessary branches of Biblical study.

Dr. Moule, the present Bishop of Durham, has truly said: "The most earnest defender of the Supernatural character of the Scriptures may be, and very often is, as diligent a Higher Critic as the extremest antisupernaturalist." But there has undoubtedly attached itself to the term a sense of inquiry into the authenticity of the Scriptures, and it is useless to ignore this fact.

Professor Sayce defines the Higher Criticism as "a critical inquiry into the nature, origin, and date of the documents with which we are dealing, as well as into the historical value and credibility of the statements which they contain."

The inquiry into any subject does not necessarily denote a disbelief in its truth or accuracy, in spite of the popular idea that the Higher Criticism is essentially destructive. On the contrary, its methods which are quite scientific and justifiable are applied to the study of the Ancient Scriptures by those whose purpose it is to establish their authority not less than by those who wish to undermine it. To be content to rest in simple and perfect faith in the inerrancy of the Scriptures, steadfastly determining to close the mind against modern thought, surely this is not the way to make intelligent and faithful Christians. If Christianity is true it will eventually triumph over all forces antagonistic to it. To examine the foundations is not to admit a flaw in them; but to refuse to examine where flaws are pointed out might well be construed into a doubt of their impregnability. Critics of all schools of thought, ranging from the most destructive to the most conservative have bent their utmost energies to the most thorough inspection of the books of the Bible, making the most searching

inquiries into such questions as : " when these various books originated; whether they were written by the authors to whom they are popularly assigned; of what material they are composed; whether they are self-consistent, and to what extent they agree or disagree with one another; whether additions have been made to them from time to time; whether they are confirmed or discredited by the monuments and the history of the period in which they are supposed to have originated." (Universal Cycl., V.551) To such an analysis and inspection have these ancient writings been subjected by these men that their opinions must necessarily have influenced a countless and varied band of followers, and the question which naturally arises in many minds is, What effect has the Higher Criticism on the Reverence for the Holy Scriptures?

The derivative meaning of the word "reverence" is "standing in awe or fear of", and applies to the feelings of that class of believers who regard the Bible very much in the light of the old Rabbinical theory, which claimed the Scriptures to be verbally dictated by God and absolutely accurate in every word, letter and vowel-point and therefore regarded it blasphemous to raise a question concerning any part of it. The great Calvinistic Divine, Dr. Charles Hodge, writing in the early seventies of the last century, no doubt well described the faith of many at that time. "Protestants", he says "hold that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God written under the inspiration of God the Holy ^h G_ost and are therefore infallible, and consequently free from all error, whether of doctrine, of fact, or of precept." (Systematic Theology , vol. 1. p. 152) And again (p. 163.) " All the books of Scripture are equally inspired. All alike are infallible in what they teach." Those who hold the opinions of the learned Doctor, as expressed above, and who do not go even so far as to embrace the theory of the Rabbins, must undoubtedly reverence the Scriptures in the most literal sense of that word - they must regard those scriptures with a feeling of awe akin to fear.

Contradistinctive to such believers are some who undoubtedly have been influenced by the opinions of the extremest critics. These latter start out with the assumption that the books of the Bible are in no respect different from other sacred books, that they are no more a revelation from God than are such books as the Avesta, the Zoroastrian Bible, and the Koran, the sacred book of Islam. Their work is decidedly destructive, and they have attempted in every way to discredit the authority and credibility of the Scriptures.

Those who follow the tenets of such critics can in no way be said to reverence the sacred books of the Christian Church. But between these two classes of thinkers, the idolaters or worshippers of the Word, and the iconoclasts whose aim is to destroy it, there lies a large body of believers who neither worship the letter nor miss the spirit of the Bible; who do not stultify their reason and stifle their moral sense when they read this book, nor do they find it possible to treat it as any other book; who do not regard it as infallible, but believe it to be inspired by God and to contain his message to man; who see in it a treasure to be found for the searching, but hold towards it an attitude of respect and trust. Surely it is from this last class that Reverence in its broader and fullest meaning comes: "the deepest respect and affection for something trusted in". As men can respect and love only those whom they trust, so only when the Bible is believed and trusted in can it be held in deep respect and affection, which is Reverence. This class of thinkers hold that man, who is fallible, wrote the Bible; but God, who is infallible inspired man to utter His message; that the proof marks of man's handiwork are seen on every page, but these same pages are illumined and sanctified by His divine influence.

It must be admitted here that there are many free thinkers who have a great respect for the Bible, and who even study it in the most sympathetic spirit. They believe that as a manual of conduct, as a guide to life, it excels all other books; but they do not accept its supernaturalism. They trust it so far

and no farther. At this point they fall short. They may be said to respect but not to reverence the Scriptures. But it is doubtful whether more than a very small minority of thinkers disbelieve the supernaturalism of the Bible, so instinctive is the belief in unseen power in man. Even a man like Theodore Parker, who took such liberties with the orthodox faith of Christianity that he was regarded even by Unitarians as a heretic, speaks thus of the wonderful power of that book:-

"This collection of books has taken such a hold on the world as no other..... It is read of a Sabbath in all the ten thousand pulpits of our land. In all the temples of religion is its voice lifted up week by week. The sun never sets on its gleaming page. It goes equally to the cottage of the plain man and the palace of the king. It is woven into the literature of the scholar, and colours the talk of the street. The bark of the merchant cannot sail the sea without it; no ships of war go to the conflict, but the Bible is there. It enters men's closets; mingles in all their grief and cheerfulness of life. The affianced Maiden prays God in Scripture for strength in her new duties; men are married by Scripture. The Bible attends them in their sickness, when the fever of the world is on them. The aching head finds a softer pillow when the Bible lies underneath. The mariner escaping from shipwreck clutches this first of his treasures and keeps it sacred to God It blesses us when we are born, gives names to half Christendom, rejoices with us, has sympathy for our mourning; tempers our grief to finer issues. It is the better part of our sermons. It lifts man above himself; our best of uttered prayers are in ^{its} storied speech, wherewith our fathers and the patriarchs prayed. The timid man, about awaking from this dream of life, looks through the glass of Scripture and his eye grows bright, he does not fear to stand alone, to tread the way unknown and distant, to take the death angel by the hand and bid~~a~~ farewell to wife and babes and home. Men rest on this their dearest hopes; it tells

them of God and of his blessed Son, of earthly duties and of heavenly rest." (Discourses on Religion.)

The effect of Criticism on the faith of men must depend very largely on the quality of their minds. All minds from their very constitution and development are not affected alike. To make use of that classic quotation from Terence, it might be said: "So many men, so many minds; every man in his own way." As in the ordinary affairs of men, so in the things concerning their faith: the nature of that faith depends very largely upon the character of the mind, as consequently does the effect of Criticism.

Ruskin in his study of the Greek myths of cloud and storm (Queen of the Air) concludes the first lecture of that book by answering the question, what real belief the Greek had in the imaginations of gods? He remarks that the Greek creed was necessarily different in its character as the Christian creed is, according to the class of persons who held it, and he classified the faith of the people under four separate heads:-

(a) "The creed of the common people, which was quite ~~later~~ al, simple, and happy. He illustrates the simplicity of their faith by recalling the artifice of Pisistratus who in Athens "obtained the reins of government through the ready belief of the populace that a beautiful woman, armed like Athena, was the goddess herself."

(b) "The creed of the upper classes, which was ~~more refined~~ refined and spiritual, but quite as honest, and even more forcible in its effect on the life". "The good and unworldly men" he says, "the true Greek heroes, lived by their faith as firmly as St. Louis, or the Cid, or the Chevalier Bayard."

(c) The faith of the poets and artists, which was "necessarily less definite, being continually modified by the involuntary action of their own fancies; and by the necessity of presenting, in clear verbal or material form, things of which they had no authoritative knowledge. Their faith was in some respects, like Dante's or Milton's: firm in general conception, but not able to vouch for every detail in the forms they gave it; but

they went considerably farther, even in the minor sincerity, than subsequent poets; and strove with all their might to be as near the truth as they could."

(d) The creed of the philosophers and sages, which varied according to the character and knowledge of each; their relative acquaintance with the secrets of natural science, their intellectual and sectarian egotism, and their mystic or monastic tendencies..... They end in losing the life of Greece in play upon words, but we owe to their early thoughts some of the soundest ethics, and the foundation of the best practical laws, yet known to mankind."

Thus Ruskin finds in the Greek a varied faith in his religion, a faith dependent upon the constitution and development of his mind, and this varied outlook upon religion he ascribes as much to the Christian as to the Greek. He is undoubtedly correct. While there is no comparison between classical mythology and the truths of Holy Scripture— as a well known writer has said: "The literature of Greece, which goes up like incense from that land of temples and heroic deeds, has not half the influence of this book, from a nation alike despised in ancient and in modern times"— still it must be admitted as a fact that the Christian Creed differs in its character according to the class of persons who hold it, and further, it must be admitted that the effect of criticism depends to a very great extent on the class of persons whose tenets are called in question. There is, for example, the faith of the uncultured and simple mind which has been accustomed to believe in the literal interpretation of Holy Scripture and its infallibility. The danger of criticism in respect to this class is, unless it is obstinate in its belief, to overthrow that belief altogether and to upset the very foundations of ^{its} ~~their~~ faith. To explain away the simple narratives of the Bible as, for instance, the Creation of the world within the limits of a single week, or the entry of the beasts into the ark; to throw doubt upon the literal interpretation of such a story as that of the prophet Jonah being swallowed by

a fish; to dim the conception of Heaven as a real city paved with gold and resplendent with jewelry; to suggest any inaccuracy in the pages of the ~~second~~ ^{Sacred} Book and thus to call in question the unconditional inspiration of all its writers; in short, to hint at the possibility of mistake or error and therefore to challenge the infallibility of the Bible confuses such by doubts or even disbelief. The mere fact that modern scholars have criticized the Scriptures and that men of science have been found to call the Christian Faith in question has given the impression that they are questionable.

On the other hand there are many well educated and cultured men whose faith in the practical infallibility of the Scriptures is undimmed by the views of any critics who believe that time will solve all problems, explain all apparent errors, and reconcile all discrepancies.

Then again there is a large class who may once have believed in the infallibility of the Bible, and yet, when errors and discrepancies have been pointed out to them are willing to reconcile themselves to what they consider to be the true state of things, although it may involve a material alteration in their views concerning the great book, but who, regarding these things as non-essential, retain inviolate their faith in the great truths which it contains.

Lastly, may be mentioned that class of persons, and they are not few, who go so far as to welcome the results of Criticism as a means of clearing away many a difficulty which stood in their way of reconciling Reason with orthodox Faith. And it must be remembered that though there might be many whose faith would be sadly shaken, if not overthrown, if they were convinced of the imperfections of the Bible, Yet there are many who have departed from the faith because they could not reconcile many statements in the Bible with their conceptions of Reason. To the latter class of persons many of the results of Higher Criticism must come with a sense of relief.

To say, under the circumstances, that the result of Criticism has been perfectly harmless is not justifiable, but, on

the other hand, to say that its effects are only harmful is to deny the true nature and purpose of that criticism.

After all, the question of how the Holy Scriptures are regarded resolves itself into the question of the limitation of man's belief.

If his belief is limited by his physical surroundings; if he has faith only in the things which are seen, how can he be expected to have any deep regard for that which professes to teach about the things which transcend the physical, the things which are unseen? The chief value of the Bible lies in the fact that it contains the data which give us our knowledge of God, or of the supernatural. Unless a man's belief extends to things supernatural he cannot reverence that book.

There is a vague idea in many minds that Science is in conflict with Religion; that it has discredited and disproved it, and so it is commonly thought that the two are irreconcilable; that the man of science cannot be a man of religion. No doubt, cause has been given for this idea by the antagonism of men of science towards religion about twenty or thirty years ago, when they were certainly calling the Christian Faith in question; but this antagonism has since died away, and few scientific experts of the present day would be found to share this erroneous notion.

There is no need of conflict between them, for, after all, they are not opposed to one another. Religion begins where science ends; it transcends it and carries knowledge to realms beyond the stars of heaven.

The word "science" is used above in contradistinction to "Religion," but correctly speaking the word means knowledge, and may be claimed to be applicable to religious as well as to any other knowledge.

The things which are seen, such as the habits of animals, the structure of plants, the motions of the stars and planets and so on, these are the phenomena or data upon which is built the knowledge of Physics or Natural Science. The things which God has made known to us about Himself and His laws and Judgments etc., these constitute the revealed data upon which

may be built the knowledge of God or the science of Theology. There are then a science of Nature and a science of God, called respectively, Natural Science and the science of Theology.

What have these two sciences to say, each in its separate field, and what are the principles on which it says them?

Physic starts with a simple observation of the things of sense, and it attempts to find out their causes, and finally it builds up a theory of the laws of the inanimate universe. This is the method of science.

Now science has two postulates. First, that evidence is to be trusted. Natural science takes it for granted that the evidence of the human senses is to be trusted, to be relied on, and is true. The second postulate is the validity of Logic, that what necessarily follows by a reasoning process from things which are observed, are also true. On these two postulates, science claims infallibility. As long as the observations of scientists are engaged upon things inanimate, all is well; but when they begin to study living things and examine the atomic globule of protoplasm under the microscope, then the phenomena of life reveals great difficulties. The object which lies under the glass is life. It has power to move and to eat up and to assimilate dead matter; it has got some power of self-determination or automatism. But life cannot be seen by the senses. The knowledge of life is an inference from the movements observed, and these movements are inexplicable according to the laws of inanimate nature. If these movements are violently interfered with, life goes away, and that life can never, as far as all experience proves, come back into that matter. It does not exist apart from matter.

The scientist is confronted by two propositions. Either that life is something in itself which gets power over matter and governs it; something superior to matter and energy, or life is simply a condition of matter and energy. Both these conclusions can be drawn from what is observed. They are quite inconsistent with each other, and yet they are both true. Science

arrived
has ~~ended~~ at a Paradox.

Now to turn to Theology. There are certain things which this science says are true. That there is a God, that man was made by Him to serve and to keep His laws, and that if he keeps God's laws it will be well with him, if he does not keep God's laws it will be very bad for him. And if we look at the belief of simple persons - savages for example - we find that there is always at least a vague belief in unseen power and that there is some sort of a law of right and wrong which it would be well for that person to observe.

And so we arrive at once at the basis of two parts of Theology: dogmatic theology, the nature of supernatural powers and moral theology, the nature of the laws of what man should do to please those powers.

As the world grows older and man wiser we find that God reveals himself more fully, and gives more express laws to man. In short, our Creed grows more definite and there is a more definite moral theology. As these become more definite there begins to work into it a secondary thing - the looking forward to a Redeemer; a Messianic hope. It is this wonderful fore-looking towards the coming Messiah which reveals the true inspiration of these old writings, and which makes them to every Christian heart, precious beyond price. Thus says Ewald in his History of Israel. (lv. 203. 204):-

"There must come some one who should perfectly satisfy all the demands of the true religion, so as to become the centre from which all its truth and force should operate. His soul must possess a marvelous and surpassing nobleness and divine power, because it is his function perfectly to realize in life the ancient religion, the requirements of which no one has yet satisfied, and that, too, with that spiritual glorification which the great prophets had announced. Unless there first comes some one who shall transfigure this religion into its purest form, it will never be perfected, and its kingdom will never come. But he will and must come, for otherwise the religion which demands

him would be false; he is the first true King of the community of the true God, and as nothing can be conceived of as supplanting him, he will reign forever in irresistible power; he is the divine-human King, whose coming had been due ever since the true community had set up a monarchy in its midst, but who had never come. He is to be looked for, to be longed for, to be prayed for; and how blessed it is simply to expect him devoutly, and to trace out every feature of his likeness. To sketch the nobleness of his soul is to pursue in detail the possibility of perfecting all religion; and to believe in the necessity of his coming is to believe in the perfecting of all divine agency on earth."

Theology goes on to tell us how that Messiah comes, who is God incarnate; how he lives, proving his divine authority by word and deed. It tells how he claims to be God himself, yet speaking of God as His Father in Heaven; how he speaks of a promised Comforter whom he treats as equal to himself; how he claims to pay the price of the sins of the world by dying for mankind; how pursued and persecuted by those in authority, he at length meets an ignominious death, but rises again from the grave and finally ascends into Heaven; how that his faithful followers, endowed with certain powers, preach his testimony and thus extend the Kingdom which in his lifetime he had spoken of founding and which was actually seen to be a fact and a growing force in the world shortly after his death.

We have thus revealed to us a considerable number of data on which to build a science of theology. But when we in finite language attempt to express the nature of the Infinite we can only state it in the form of a paradox. The Godhead we express in these terms: the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. God the Son comes down from Heaven and was made man. He is Very and eternal God; He made the world, is self existent, is everywhere; He is also very Man, with body, parts and passions, with a human soul and will; two perfect and entire natures in

is one Person. Being God and within the blessed Trinity, He is not divisible from the Father, and yet he could say, "Father glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee;" " My God my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" These things are a paradox; they are inexplorable and transcend the finite reason of man.

Natural scientists cannot avoid paradox in stating the conclusions they come to about the laws of physical life; still less are theologians able to avoid a paradoxical conclusion, when they reflect on what God has allowed man to know of His Infinite Self. But this should not trouble the belief^{or} of the Scriptures. He realises his very limited knowledge about those things which his senses reveal to him - the things which are seen -, and naturally expects to meet with difficulties when observing "through a glass darkly" supernatural phenomena - the things which are not seen.

The question which now arises is, can the Theologian come to a certain conclusion, built upon the data found in the Holy Scriptures?

Natural science has its method of arriving at certain knowledge. It is well known that men differ not only in their opinions, but also in their capacities of observation. Many people when they observe are inaccurate in their observations, and many also are illogical in their reasoning and so it follows that their conclusions are full of errors and miscalculations; but Science is not the work of one man. A Man makes certain observations; he comes to certain conclusions, and the results of his efforts are read before a scientific society or published to the world in general. Immediately his theories are tested by the whole body of scientific experts. His theories, observations and logic are searched through and through; so that in the end there is a practical coming to a right conclusion. There is a practical security that the observations are properly taken, and that the deductions from them are correctly logical. The conclusion is attested by a consensus of opinion of experts.

In the same way in the realm of theology is the data contained in Holy Scripture carefully observed and conclusions thoroughly tested before a doctrine is recognised as veritable. But what is there in the science of Divinity which corresponds to that body of experts in Natural science? Not the Bible, because its purpose is to contain the **data**, the knowledge which God gave in the first instance. It must be remembered that the whole science of theology is on a supernatural plane; the things made known are supernatural; the cognition of them, the recognizing them by faith, is supernatural, and therefore the conclusions come to must be ^{by} an authority, supernaturally-guided. That supernatural guidance must come from God himself in the form of revelation through His Spirit to man. Now this infusion of knowledge into the mind by supernatural influence is called inspiration. The only security we have then of the infallibility of Divine doctrine is in the testimony of inspired men. These are the experts of theology, of the science of things Divine. How far the data contained in the Bible comes from inspired sources it is the duty of the Higher Criticism to find out, and to establish a firm belief in the inspiration of that book is the summum bonum of its labours. This does not necessarily imply the infallibility of its text. The Higher critic, however conservatively inclined, finds many human elements in its composition, and, knowing that it is human to err, confesses to finding many minor errors and discrepancies in that text; but as Dr. Newman Smyth says in "Old Faiths in New Light" (p. 59), "His faith in the Word of God lies deeper than any difficulties or flaws upon the surface of the Bible. He will not be disturbed by seeing any theory of its mechanical formation broken to fragments under the repeated blows of modern investigation; the water of life will flow from the rock which the scholar strikes with his rod. He can wait without fear for a thorough and candid study of these sacred writings, to determine, if possible, what parts are genuine, and what narratives, if any, are unhistorical. His belief in the Word of God, from generation to generation, does

~~Are~~ not depend upon the minor incidents of the Biblical stories; it would not be destroyed or weakened, even though human traditions could be shown to have overgrown some parts of this sacred history, as the ivy, creeping up the wall of the church, does not lessen its ancient stones."

We do not look for infallibility in men and their works, but we do look for inspiration in those who teach about things divine.

Inspired teachers have been found at all times and in all ages. In Old Testament times these teachers were the prophets, whose business it was to speak for God. They were the interpreters of the Divine Will. By some means they came to understand God's purpose, and it was their function to declare it. They exercised their office in many ways: Moses in the enactment of God's laws; Samuel in administering the affairs of his country in accordance with God's Will; Elijah and Elisha in preaching righteousness to kings and people; Hosea and Amos and Jeremiah in denouncing sin and warning evil doers. The function of predicting the future was remarkably illustrated by the prophecies of Isaiah as to the doom which fell later on cities, people or countries, and by his prediction concerning the coming of ^{the} Messiah. Varied were the functions of the prophets; but in some way did each of them manifest the Divine power. Their teachings are stamped, with the divine authority of inspiration.

In New Testament times the great source of inspired teaching lay, first of all, of course in our Saviour, whose words and works have been recorded so faithfully in the four Gospels, and then in that noble band of men, the Apostles of our Lord. These men were undoubtedly inspired, having received the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, which had been promised them by Christ as a Comforter who should come to them, abide with them and lead them into all truth.

It is impossible to read the Bible without coming to

the conclusion that a great purpose runs through its pages, that it is the result of a supernatural force which has for ages been guiding a development which reaches its consummation in the reconciliation of God with man. But we do not expect inspiration to end with the first century after Christ. If the spirit of God has guided the minds of men in the past, surely it will continue to do so in the future. The legacy of the past consists in that collection of data which is contained in the books of the Bible, and it ~~is~~ the duty of Higher Criticism to test the accuracy of that data. As natural science demands as a postulate that the phenomena of nature are real, so does theology require to be granted that its data are to ^{be} relied on and true. But Theology demands further an authority which shall tell whether the inferences drawn from the data or things made known in the Scripture are correct, and this authority must, as in the case of those who in the past gave the data, rely on the supernatural guidance of God's spirit for its revelation.

Does that authority exist? Yes, that authority must exist, for if God has made known to man some of the infinite things, it must follow that He means man to be able to come to sound conclusions about them. It has existed since the time of Christ and does exist at the present time in its simplest form as the Hierarchy of the Church. This body of experts in things divine best corresponds to the body of experts in Natural science. To define precisely of what that body consists is a more delicate proposition. If Christianity were united the task would be comparatively easy; but it may be said in passing, that all religions of authority impose certain external doctrines, and all insistence upon "beliefs" which have no immediate ethical value arises from this clinging to the principle of ecclesiastical authority. There seems to be growing up now in the place of this principle a great universal trust in the divineness of the human spirit. The principle of private judgment rightly understood means no less than that the moral sense of every man

is informed by the Spirit of God, and that in the long run all faithful servants of righteousness must converge upon the same glorious eternal truth, which is God himself. To this the modern mind has come; science is teaching it without knowing it; history vindicates it; daily experience confirms it. Even in the churches themselves men are living out this principle under the intellectual forms to which they have been accustomed.

Who will deny that inspiration may not come to every individual who lifts up his heart for help to find in the Scriptures the way of life? If these Scriptures are studied in this spirit, how can criticism impair one's belief?—Will it not rather only tend to broaden the believer's view of Divine inspiration, though he may be convinced that error in matters not affecting their moral or religious teachings exists?

Man will always reverence the Holy Scriptures for man must be religious. He is forever reaching forth to the whole of things. His struggles after righteousness, truth and love are but yearnings after God, the Soul of our souls, the Life of our lives, the Source from which we come, the End to which we go.