

Temple preceded the Tabernacle ; and a number of other things, whose acceptance involves greater difficulties than those sought to be removed. In particular, we are asked to believe that the divine origin of the Decalogue is not to be received, on the ground that its precepts were in use in patriarchal times, and, therefore, long before they were given by God to Moses, amid the thunderings and lightnings of Sinai ; as if the silence of Scripture were sufficient to prove that they were not from God, and as if the publication at Sinai could not have been a republication of these holy Laws. The record certainly asserts the divine origin of the fourth and sixth commandments in ante-Sinaitic times ; and why should it not be so with all the rest ? Moreover, it is plainly stated in Ex. xx : " God spake *all these* words, saying, I am the Lord thy God," etc. Notwithstanding, the Higher Critics say : It is but a human code ; and, as human beings originated it, so human beings can, if they please, take it away.

Consider, for a moment, the destructive consequences of such criticism. If we receive it, it destroys our faith in any testimony given by Moses. If we disbelieve him when he says of the ten commandments : " And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying." Why should we believe any of his other statements ? If the Lord did not speak unto him, he was either an impostor, or else grievously self-deceived. Not only was Moses deceived, if his record be not true, but also the whole Jewish nation ; and not only they, but Christ Himself, for He quoted the writings of Moses as being his writings, and as possessed of Divine authority. The Apostles also did the same,—nay more, the whole Christian Church, from the Apostles' days to the present hour. The miracles, also, which support the divine legation of Moses, become discredited thereby, and, indeed, all the other miracles of Holy Scripture. Sweep away, therefore, the Divine authority of Moses, and you sweep away the whole authority of the Bible. You bring it down to the level of all other books. You make it valuable only as a treasury of interesting stories and impressive moral truths, which we are free to accept or reject as we please. This is a strong indictment ; but, is it not a true one ?

I give the following quotations in corroboration of its truth. Speaking of these views as leading to the denial of a personal deity, and the rejection of all true religion and virtue, the writer says :—

" Look in proof of this to the development of modern thought, to some of the speculations of modern Science, to the spirit which animates much of our modern literature, and even to the schools of the prophets themselves, and if you do not see a tendency to the revival of an attractive, but exploded, philosophy, viz., that of Epicurus and Democritus, then I am in error as to the signs of the times. But, if I am correct in this position ; if Scepticism, or Rationalism, or Pantheism, or even Science in the auda-