

Mosaic authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy was taught by our Lord and His inspired servants—that their teaching in this matter was in harmony with the teaching of the Old Testament Scriptures, and particularly with what is said in the Book of Deuteronomy itself. It now remains for us to decide whether we shall adhere to the teaching of Scripture, or accept some one of the many various theories and conjectures of modern critics; for it is plainly impossible to accept the Holy Scripture as an inspired and authoritative rule of faith, and at the same time to reject its plain teaching respecting the authorship of one of its books. For my own part I see no good reason for hesitating to prefer the teaching of Scripture, as I have endeavored to explain it, to any of the modern theories to which I have adverted.

But let me now advert to some of the motives or reasons which have induced some modern scholars to reject the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. One reason, which I think has the greatest weight with infidels and rationalists, is that this book, like the other books attributed to Moses, contains an account of some miraculous occurrences, such as the passage through the Red Sea and the giving of the law at Sinai. That such occurrences took place infidels and rationalists are unwilling to admit; but it would seem unreasonable to deny their reality if they were recorded by that Moses who is said to have been a chief actor in these events, and whose character is unimpeached. Hence a strong prejudice is created against the Mosaic authorship of the record, and any slight difficulty is seized upon and magnified into a strong reason for rejecting its genuineness. On this subject there is a frank admission of DeWette, quoted by Keil, "If it is a settled point with the educated mind that such miracles (as the Pentateuch contains) cannot actually take place, the question arises whether they might have perhaps assumed this appearance to eyewitnesses and persons taking part in the transactions; but this also must be answered in the negative. . . . And consequently we arrive at the result that the narrative is neither contemporaneous nor derived from contemporaneous sources." I need scarcely say how utterly unfair and unreasonable it is to adopt such a course as this, and how consistently unfair and unreasonable it is to magnify trifling difficulties into formidable objections for the purpose of justifying an unwarrantable foregone conclusion. But these difficulties have been held as of great importance, not only by infidels and rationalists, but also, as it seems, by some who, claiming to be evangelical, orthodox Christians, nevertheless reject the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. Let us examine a few of these reasons. For a fuller discussion of them I may refer to an excellent article by Professor Murphy, of Belfast, in the last number of the "British and Foreign Evangelical Review."

It has been alleged that the style of Deuteronomy differs from that of the other books attributed to Moses; and that if he wrote these other books, he could not have written Deuteronomy. Now, granting that there is a difference of style, we reply that the difference is just what might be expected between that of a popular discourse and that of a historical record or of a book of law; just such a difference as we find between the style of Paul's Epistles and that of his address to the elders of Ephesus, or his speech before Felix or Agrippa.

A difficulty has been found in the fact that a law is contained in the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy of which it is alleged that both Gideon and Samuel were apparently ignorant. The law in Deuteronomy has reference to the contingency of the Israelites desiring to have a king like the nations round about them. I see nothing inconsistent with Gideon's knowledge of this law, and still less with the fact of its existence, in his saying (Judges viii. 23), "I will not rule over you; neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you. Gideon might be well aware that the desire for a king was not approved by God, although he might consent to give them one, and Gideon might simply be supposed to refuse being a party to a course which savored of rebellion against God. A similar explanation will apply to the displeasure of Samuel, and God's reply to him as recorded in 1 Sam. viii. 6 and 7.

It has been alleged that in Deuteronomy mention is made of places which had not received the names there given them till after the death of Moses. Thus, Moses speaks of Gilgal (in Deut. xix. 30), yet it is only after the Israelites had entered Canaan that this

place received this name. It so happens, however, that there were several places called Gilgal, and the one mentioned in Deuteronomy is not necessarily the same with that which received its name in the time of Joshua. In the thirty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy mention is made of a place called Dan, but, it is said, this place received its name only in the time of the Judges. It happens, however, in this as in the last case, that there were several places of the same name, and that reference may have been made to some other Dan than the Dan which received its name in the time of the Judges. Besides, it is not claimed by us that the last chapter of Deuteronomy, in which the name Dan occurs, was written by Moses.

It is further alleged that there are in the Book of Deuteronomy references to events which did not occur till long after the time of Moses. We grant that there are references to later events, but, as indicated in an earlier part of the lecture, these are in prophetic form. Thus there are prophetic references to the judgments which befel the ten tribes and the Kingdom of Judah in their dispersion and exile. But this is no proof that Deuteronomy was not written by Moses, unless we deny that he wrote under Divine guidance and inspiration. If this objection has any force, it might be urged against the Book of Deuteronomy having been written before the time of Christ, the head prophet predicted in its eighteenth chapter. Nay, more: as some of its predictions are yet unfulfilled, so, after their fulfilment, the sceptics of a future age may endeavor to prove that the Book of Deuteronomy was not written till after this nineteenth century of the Christian era.

It has been objected still further that if the law against high places contained in the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy was really written by Moses, it is difficult to understand how the "high places" could have been tolerated even by the more pious kings of Judah. But the objection has really no force, otherwise it might be argued that the document shown as the Magna Charta had had no existence until the reign of Queen Victoria; or that the Constitution of the United States was not committed to writing till after the emancipation of the slaves by President Lincoln.

I shall only notice one other objection—one on which special stress has been laid by modern critics and theorists. It has been alleged that the laws regarding the priests and Levites in Deuteronomy are so different from those laid down in the other books attributed to Moses, that it is inconceivable that both could have been given by him. In the earlier books, for example, it is alleged that the Levites always appear in a subordinate position only as servants of the Temple, and that there is a wide difference between them and the priests, while in the Deuteronomic legislation no such wide distinction exists between the priests and Levites. To this it is a sufficient reply that the distinction is again and again recognized in Deuteronomy, as in the tenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, twenty-sixth and thirtieth chapters. The distinction may not be so marked in Deuteronomy as in the earlier books, but this does not prove that all were not written by Moses, who might have had special reasons for making the distinction more clearly in one book than in another. For example, as the Book of Deuteronomy was obviously intended for more popular uses, it was not so necessary to give prominence to the distinction so much as in the Book of Leviticus, which was intended for the special guidance of the priests.

I have now given what I consider fair specimens of the strongest objections which have been urged against the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, and I trust you will agree with me in thinking that such objections possess not the weight of a feather when placed in the scale against the preponderating weight of evidence on the other side, which, as I have shown, may be found in the book itself, in the remaining books of the Old Testament, and in the teaching of our Lord and His inspired servants, not to speak of the all but unanimous testimony, on the same side, of both Jews and Christians for more than two thousand years.

#### OBITUARY.

Another of the pioneers of the Presbyterian Church in Canada has gone to his rest and reward. The Rev. George Cheyne, M.A., died on the morning of the first day of April.

Mr. Cheyne was born at Logie-auld town in the parish of Auchterlees, Aberdeenshire, Scotland, in July, 1802. He received his elementary education in the

parish of Fyvie, and entered Marischal College in the city of Aberdeen in 1818. On the first of April, 1822, he graduated as M.A. The day of the month and the month of the year on which he graduated was the same on which he died.

He was tutor in the manse of Rhynie four years, and in Hatton Castle, Parish of Turriff, two years.

He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Presbytery of Turriff in 1829. After receiving license he taught school in Portsoy, Banffshire, fifteen months.

On the sixth of July, 1831, he was ordained by the Presbytery of Strathbogie, and left Scotland for the field of labor to which he was appointed, on the 30th of the same month. After a tedious voyage he reached Quebec on the 5th of September, and immediately proceeded to Amherstburg, and began his duties as minister there on the 12th of November. In that field he had to endure hardship. There was no Presbyterian congregation between his and Ancaster, some 200 miles. His own parish covered an area of 100 miles, and his efforts to overtake by missionary tours such a field were frequent, untiring, and full of peril. Sometimes he would start on horseback on a six weeks' tour alone. Educational privileges in those days were few and not of a very high order. Mr. Cheyne anxious for the welfare of society, added to his ministerial duties the function of teacher, thus adding to his physical and mental labor. The stipend paid was \$100 per annum. Under the strain and pressure of these offices his health failed, and in course of time he gave up teaching. The smallness of his stipend and the failure of his health led him, after twelve years patient and arduous work, to seek a change. In July, 1843, he was translated to Saltfleet and Binbrook.

During his incumbency at Amherstburgh he was united in marriage to Sarah Maria Hughes, an amiable and accomplished lady, who died a few years ago.

In 1844 the Disruption came, and at Kingston Mr. Cheyne cast in his lot with the Free Church party. From that period until he resigned in April, 1874, his labors in the Master's vineyard were unfailing, abundant, and successful.

In July, 1872, he took a breathing time, and revisited his native land. Though well stricken in years he made his visit a most extensive and observant one. It was a treat to listen to the recital of his experiences in the old country.

Besides faithfully attending to his own charge, Mr. Cheyne organized and supplied Eastern Seneca. He also organized and supplied Abingdon, Caistor, till his resignation in 1874. These congregations now form part of the Rev. Mr. Vincent's charge.

During his long and faithful ministry his services were not forgotten by the Church. He was a man whom it delighted to honor. He was appointed Moderator of the Synod held at London in 1856, and preached at Kingston at the ensuing meeting. He was also appointed the first Moderator of the Synod of Hamilton by the first General Assembly of the Canada Presbyterian Church which was held in Knox Church, Toronto, in 1870, and he preached and presided at the first Synod at Hamilton in Knox Church the following spring, and preached and organized that Synod at Hamilton in 1871, on which occasion the Rev. Mr. Smellie of Fergus, was chosen Moderator.

As a man, Mr. Cheyne was reserved and quiet, but firm. In all his dealings, upright. In his home he was kind, pleasant, and sociable. In his feelings, sensitive. Though not of a poetical, but a practical turn of mind, he was a minute observer and strong lover of the beautiful in art and nature. He enjoyed the flowers and fields. He was a man who put conscience into everything, and this it was which gave him character and impressed that character upon others. He was abiding in his friendships, a man to be trusted.

As a minister Mr. Cheyne was devoted, faithful, laborious. His scholarship was extensive and correct. His doctrinal views were Calvinistic and therefore sound. He was an evangelical preacher.

The last sermon he preached was from the words, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up." The life theme of his preaching was the cross.

This sermon was preached last fall. A few days after he took ill, and it might be said that he never got over that illness. He rallied sufficiently to attend church, and occasionally visit during the winter, but it was evident he was growing daily weaker, and this became very marked five weeks before he died. I was with him frequently during his last illness, and as he