

with conclusions that are utterly irreconcilable with its divine authority. But this is not all. There is no barrier between the Old Testament and the New to prevent its sweeping with destructive flood over the latter, if we allow it to overwhelm all that is trustworthy and divine in the former. It would, to-day, sweep away the claim of the New Testament, and of our Lord himself, to be trustworthy, because they assume and assert the trustworthiness and authority of the Old Testament which the Higher Criticism denies.

If the Higher Criticism merely claimed that Moses used pre-existing documents in the composition of the Pentateuch; if it only claimed that it was compiled by various men under the superintendence of Moses, I should not so much care, for this would not be in conflict with its claim to be trustworthy and of divine authority. But when we are asked to believe that the religious and moral legislation of the Pentateuch was put forth by priest and prophet hundreds of years after Moses, and attributed to him to induce the people to accept it through a deception which would to-day be regarded as little short of literary forgery; when we are asked to believe that a history was fitted around this teaching put forth with this intention to deceive, in order to support the fiction of its Mosaic authorship by a narrative well-nigh as fictitious; when I am also asked to believe that it was such lawgiving that our Lord declared would stand though the heavens should fall, and such history that He accepted as trustworthy, then the issue becomes too grave and far-reaching to be decided by a process of criticism which is subjective, microscopic, and governed largely by preconceptions. The question is,

whethe
infallib
ground
the Old
require
the crit
even on
all soul
are the
gave, a
power
was the
Truth,
the con
by met
been p
be som
Testam
which
as rec
fought
New, v
the Old
serene