

ties which require so many operatives that who may supply them are not half so numerous as the moral ones, nor requiring fewer auxiliaries. The Philosopher, Moralist, Divine, or Man of Science, who should rely upon his own unaided efforts for the culture of his mind, could make little progress in his professional pursuits. We must have recourse to the genius and industry of others. Indeed, in many of the Sciences, as well as in History and Biography, the works of predecessors or contemporaries, or their results, are of so much necessity that we can with difficulty suppose the continuance of the social system without them.—Then the shadow of the first sin is on the mind.—Labour and perseverance could do little to remove it, for most men, if the beams of brighter intelligence than their own were not reflected from the repositories of knowledge. We must read, we must refer to the others, and it is a beautiful bond of fellowship, fostering brotherhood, by the consciousness of mutual weakness, and inculcating affection by the gratefulness to which it gives occasion.”

The Lecturer declared that no work can compare with the BIBLE in sustaining the application of the following Rule :—

“Integrity of character is the first and greatest desideratum in a Historian, a Biographer or Chronicler of events. Without this quality, no reliance can be placed upon his narrations, and his opinions will be as variable as his interest. He must be independent of the views of party—undismayed by the frowns of power—unpurchaseable by the corruption of wealth—devoted to Truth—as the great end of all his endeavours. The votary of selfishness, and the enthusiastic partizan, are soon discovered in their writings. They are seen in the coerced uniformity with which every fact and motive is made to converge towards one darling object. They are seen in the insensibility to every virtue, and the clear cognizance of every vice in one particular class of men. They are seen in the forced construction of motive—which endeavours to strip goodness of its beauty and turns indifference into vice. They are seen in their hate and admiration—contrariety—and contradiction. Wherever such men are found as writers—we cannot believe them.”

The Lecturer has been examining the defects which prove fatal to the claim of any work to integrity. He thus rapidly enumerates the positive proofs of the purity of a Book, and comes to a very triumphant conclusion, regarding the purity of the New Testament text :

“If, however, the work be one of immense interest; if it be in a great number of hands; if it be quoted extensively by great numbers of authors,

and if these authors cite it, and cite it so universally that all their works depend upon it, and many of their works contain it entire; if, finally, all these copies of which we spoke, substantially agree—and if the copies also agree with the quotations, made from them by the commentators just mentioned, there exists the highest degree of moral certainty which a natural fact is susceptible, that the author has reached us pure and uncorrupted. In the supposition of a violation of its integrity, you must suppose two things which are impossible: First, that all the Copies existing had been destroyed together, and corrupt ones substituted for them without the owner's knowledge; and Secondly, that all the works written in relation to them have been forged, while no one was cognizant of the circumstance.

This is beautifully illustrated by the motives of credibility which sustain the integrity of the New Testament Text. It was meet that in a matter of such overwhelming importance, the deepest convictions of the soul should form the substratum of Divine Faith. The “rights of Reason” were guaranteed by Providence, when he enthroned her the directrix of human judgment; and in beautiful conformity with his own prearrangements, he surrounds his communications with such a host of corroborative testimony, that reason yields her readiest obedience where her action is purest, and her vision most unobscured. Religion summons forth the witnesses of her supremacy, and the soul is irresistably led captive by her beauty.

At a very early period the number of Copies of the Gospels was very considerable. Those, too, were scattered through various parts of the Earth. They were found in the possession of many persons, and translated into many tongues. Now all these copies substantially agree. Hence, all must be corrupted if any be. But to corrupt all the copies without the knowledge of those who possessed them, or with their knowledge without some traces of the event is a matter morally—nay physically impossible. Then the ancient writers—called the Fathers—have written commentaries explanatory of the text. These commentaries occupy hundreds upon hundreds of volumes. The text found in these authors does not materially differ from that of our copies; which shews that if our copies be corrupted these texts must have been corrupted also. Now, besides the improbability, nay, impossibility of introducing a corrupted text into these hundreds of volumes—it is really the fact that the whole number should be forged to render the hypothesis admissible: Because the whole work being a commentary on the text, and concurring with the text, both should have been changed if one had been. A child can see the absurdity of this supposition. . . . change the Fathers—Greek