

who represents, not the conservative, but the liberal wing among German theologians. "There was a time," so Dr. Harnack wrote in 1897, "when people thought themselves compelled to regard the oldest Christian literature, including the New Testament, as a tissue of frauds and forgeries. That time is past. . . . The oldest literature of the Church is, in the main lines, and in most details, when considered from the literary-historical standpoint, true and authentic." And again: "A time will come—it is already on the threshold—when we shall little more trouble ourselves about the decipherment of the literary-historical problems in the domain of Christian origins; for what in the main can be ascertained on this subject will come to be generally recognised—namely, the essential truth of tradition, apart from a few important exceptions." The "exceptions" are important: Harnack, e.g., does not recognise the genuineness of the Catholic Epistles; and he will not allow that the Fourth Gospel is by St. John the Apostle, although he regards it as the work of a personal disciple of the Lord, and as having been composed before the year 110 at latest. But you will recognise at once how far removed his position is from that of Baur and the Tübingen school of half a century ago. Criticism will not permit us to make so clean a sweep of the New Testament documents as Baur's theory demanded. It is not too much to say that the extravagant theories of the Tübingen school have been discredited in Germany as well as in England, and that this has been brought about in part through the fine scholarship and shrewd commonsense of scholars like Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Sanday, and our own venerable Provost. There is little doubt that the critical verdict upon many problems of New Testament criticism is not nearly so far removed from the popular teaching of half a century ago as it is from the negations of Tübingen.

No problem engages more anxious attention at the present day than the problem of the mutual relations of the Synoptic Gospels. Scholars are not at all in agreement as to how their remarkable unity in diversity is to be explained. It is thought, for instance, by some that the nucleus of these wonderful records is to be sought in oral tradition, which very early assumed a stereotyped form. It is objected by others that the verbal agreement between them is too close to