

days of Josiah; any existence of the Mosaic law, or historical books, or of the Psalms, until after the return from the Babylonian exile.

It is proved in this treatise, from Chapter XII. to Chapter XVII., that some of these positions could not be maintained for a moment, except by omitting from the sources of this Scriptural appeal such historic books as Joshua, which abounds in disproof of Wellhausen's assumptions; that the proof of the existence of the tabernacle in the wilderness is overwhelming in the books of Scripture to which appeal is made; that the existence of the sanctuary, and sacrifice, and prescribed worship is beyond dispute established by an appeal to the historical books, while the prophets can only be coerced into a seeming support of the critical theory by a manifest perversion of their position and the meaning of the language they use—a perversion which never once suggested itself to any student, saint or scholar in the ages gone by as a possible meaning of the language of the prophets.

We submit that the case we undertook to prove, that the arguments and statements that are offered in support of the theory of the critics are illogical, uncoercive, inconclusive, unconvincing, and afford no ground whatever for the demand which the critics are making for the surrender of the traditional view of the Holy Scripture and the acceptance of their revolutionary theory in its place. And when to this argument, conclusive in itself, we submit, we add the authority, teaching, example, and judgment of our Blessed Lord himself—a judgment, the conclusiveness of which can only be escaped through the door of a portentous heresy—the confutation, we submit, is complete. Where, then, are we at the end of this examination? And where is the Bible? And the