

ship of the Pentateuch. You are aware, I suppose, what the higher critics say upon this subject. If not, it is alleged, that the books which bear the name of Moses were not written by Moses, as the Jewish and Christian churches have always held, but that they are the product of a later or post-exilic age. It is inferred that the books of the law as we have them, cannot have been in existence in the time of the monarchy, and that all the ritual and the bulk of the legal portion of them was a later edition, for the consolidation of which with the earlier portion and its publication jointly therewith we are indebted to Ezra or Nehemiah, at the close of the seventy years of captivity in Babylon. It is not denied that Moses was the original author of a small nucleus of matter, (some say only the basis of the ten commandments) contained in the books of the Pentateuch, and in this way they make him an unconscious contributor to their varied contents, but they find no room for him either as a writer or an editor of the books, and they hold that in no sense can they justly bear his name. In confutation of this groundless theory I can offer only a few brief and inadequate remarks. For further information I refer you to the article "Pentateuch" in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge. It is my intention to make use of none but Scriptural arguments. 1st. Because it is attempted to base the novel theory upon texts of Scripture. 2nd. Because the Scriptural method of argument was the Saviour's method; and 3rd. Because there is not sufficient time for other kinds of evidence. In doing so I may expose myself to the charge of begging the question at issue, viz: whether the Word of God is or is not a reliable guide. Nevertheless, if I do so, I do it in company with the Saviour Himself, and I am not afraid to walk in his footsteps.

What then are the Scriptural arguments in favor of this view? According to Dr. Leathes they are the following: In chapter vii. 14, Ezra is stated to have come to Jerusalem after the Captivity with the law of God in his hand, and it is forthwith assumed that he had recently invented it, brand new. But as the Dr. says, why should we believe Ezra when he says that the law was in his hand, and not believe him when he says himself in iii. 2, and vii. 6, and elsewhere, that it was the law of Moses, the man of God. Why should we infer that the law in his hand was a recent fabrication, when he tells us plainly that it was old as Moses. Again in the history of the Kings we are confronted