

ment book was not really written within a century or two of the time we are accustomed to assign to it, what have we got to be alarmed about if the writer had access to the necessary information? When God touches our hearts and rouses our consciences by the record of words which He inspired of old, what difference does it make whether they were written a few generations earlier or later?

If we are shown that the early inspired historians, instead of taking down the history of Israel with infallible correctness from the lips of God, had to laboriously use older histories and annals and records and chronologies, like any modern historian, and with the risk, too, that inaccuracies of detail might creep in from these materials into their work; if it teach us that this sort of composition comes under the head of inspired, as well as that in which an enrapt prophet records his vision or the thoughts directly given to his soul by God, what is there about all this to alarm or disturb us? If we did not know before how the books were composed, ought we not to be thankful that somebody should teach us? If our previous notions about inspiration were wrong, is it not a very good thing for us to have them corrected?

Or if there be pointed out to us the dramatic setting of the Book of Job, the imaginative picture