

“ In this discussion the authority of the Pentateuch
 “ is taken for granted on both sides. In using, there-
 “ fore, the common language on the subject, the author
 “ is not presuming to pass any opinion upon the ques-
 “ tions respecting the date and authorship of the books
 “ which divide great Hebraists and theologians, and
 “ which, he is perfectly aware, *can be decided only by*
 “ *free inquiry, carried on by men learned in the subject,*
 “ with absolute faith in the God of Truth.”

And again (p. 1) :—“ It is important in more ways
 “ than one to determine whether the slave-owner’s
 “ plea is true. *The character of the Bible is*
 “ *threatened.*”

A little further on (p. 3) you speak with obvious
 inference, of denying :—“ Not a theory of Inspira-
 “ tion, but a great and manifest fact of history.”

And you propose to yourself (p. 4) :—“ To relieve
 “ the distress caused by *doubts as to the morality of the*
 “ *Old Testament* on other points as well as on the
 “ question now in issue, at a less expense than that of
 “ supposing the existence of two different Moralities,
 “ one for God, the other for Man, and thus making
 “ Man worship, what to his mind must be, *an immoral*
 “ *God.*”

Now here, sir, is a matter on which, as I appre-
 hend, you will be found to differ, at the outset, with
 no small proportion of those to whom your argu-
 ments are addressed. We who believe—as thank
 God the vast majority of Englishmen do still believe—