

tific examination of primitive Christianity has been since building; but even so conservative a scholar as Weiss is forward to yield to Baur the credit of bringing the criticism of the New Testament books into fruitful connection with the historical investigation of primitive Christianity. "He it was," he says, "who first made it the problem of criticism to assign to each book of the New Testament its place in the history of the development of primitive Christianity, to determine the relations to which it owes its origin, the object at which it aims, and the views it represents." In order to appreciate Baur's importance this must be kept in mind. His conclusions are, for the most part, wrong. His own disciples have abandoned many of his most important positions. Hilgenfeld defends the genuineness of Philemon, Philippians and 1 Thessalonians, all of which Baur rejected. Volkmar, who even surpassed the audacity of Baur in postdating the books of the New Testament, shatters the Tübingen theory of the gospels by putting Mark first. But while it is true that one might cull from the writings of Baur more discredited theories than from the pages of any other modern critic, he still stands at the head of the science, because he introduced a new method, or if he did not introduce it he yet gained currency for it by the brilliant use he made of it, and the daring conclusions he reached. His method was the now universally adopted method of historical criticism, a criticism which finds a place and a *raison d'être* for each writing in the history of the period to which it belongs, and which posits each in that particular stage of development to which its contents testify. Along with Baur's criticism there necessarily went a theory of the development of the early Church, and although this theory has been proved to be erroneous, his disciples have striven so to modify it as to bring it into harmony with the facts. Baur's method and the commanding ability, learning and insight shown in his works attracted to him many disciples, all of whom, Zeller, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Volkmar, Keim and Pfeiderer, while differing considerably among themselves, yet agree in rejecting more or fewer of the Pauline epistles. These men are probably as well equipped and as acute critics as are likely to appear in any age. They had a theory which compelled them to bring the dates of several of the New Testament