

Old Testament. No one now for example puts the gospels in the second century as was done by many twenty-five years ago. The Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel, ten years ago almost scornfully denied, is to-day pretty well set at rest. One of the most confident conclusions of criticism has been the early date of the Apocalypse before the destruction of Jerusalem instead of at the close of the first century—a conclusion all the more remarkable and apparently all the more trustworthy, because it has been so unusual for criticism to antedate any of the books. In a recent article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Harnack, one of the most prominent German scholars of the day, returns to the old view in a somewhat modified form. Dr. Milligan, in the Baird lecture for 1886, accepts the old view without modification, and ably defends it. Many of us may yet live to see the day when the Pastoral Epistles will be universally acknowledged as Pauline and Moses re-instated as the author of the Pentateuch. Meantime conservative thinkers may patiently wait for fuller vindication in view of these partial confirmations of their general position. It is one of the certainties that very much of modern criticism has been rash and its results untenable.

While adhering to conservative views, we may frankly own, however, that Biblical science owes very much indeed to the labours of many whose views are now everywhere abandoned. If they have been lacking in caution and sometimes even in reverence, they have not been wanting either in enthusiasm or acuteness. They have called attention to the literary characteristics and individual peculiarities of the sacred writings in such a way as to make us study them with a new interest. They have led us back of the writings themselves to the sources from which they were often drawn, and to the movements from which they sprang, so as to make them more really human to us, though not on that account the less divine. They have taught us to interpret them as literary productions rather than as logical formularies in which every word has a dogmatic or polemic point protruding from it. They have helped us to read these books with the eyes of contemporaries for whom they were primarily intended, rather than with clumsy seventeenth century spectacles, which, while better than none, made every object in turn unduly large and threw it out of proportion. They have delivered us from a good many conventional fictions and brought us nearer to the simplicity and naturalness of Scripture truth. Thanks to them we no longer look at the Bible as a series of Chinese pictures, analytically