

or history, it does teach both, as a matter of fact. It must not be forgotten, and can scarcely be counted accidental by those who believe in any form of divine supervision in the production of the Bible, that it alone among the sacred books of the world can be fairly said to commit itself to such specific statement in these realms as to subject itself to, and even challenge, criticism. Nor can it safely be ignored that as to the particular points in dispute—the supernatural origin of the earth and man, the primeval revelation of God to Israel and the providential training of that people—these concrete and categorical affirmations of the Old Testament form the essential substructure of the doctrine and argumentation of the New. It will be of small avail to surrender the scientific and historic, in hope of retaining the ethic and religious, to a scheme of philosophy whose essential postulates are in their inevitable implications as hostile to the latter as to the former. The same hypothetical processes that demand the displacement of the Mosaic cosmogony and the disintegration and practical evaporation of the Mosaic narrative, not only actually but necessarily imply the emergence of the ethical system of Israel through natural processes out of slow experience, and the gradual filtering of primeval polytheism into a later monotheism. Still more sophisticated is the suggestion that assaults upon the integrity of Scripture may be regarded with comfortable equanimity, because “our faith is not in a book, but in Christ.” In what Christ do we trust, if not the Christ made known to us in the book? A “liberal” preacher not long since enlightened his congregation with the announcement that not Jesus alone, but “Moses, Isaiah, Paul, Savonarola,” are “the Messiahs of the race”—“Berthold Auerbach being the divinely inspired man of the nineteenth century.” He preached in the “church of the Messiah,” but did not have the grace to tell the waiting world to which of these “Messiahs” his church was dedicated. The world will be equally baffled to discover a historic Christ of whom there is no history, and unwilling to trust an ideal Christ to whom no reality corresponds. “We have not a painted sin,” said sober-minded Martin Luther, “and cannot be satisfied with a painted Saviour.” Paul staked the fate of Christianity itself on the concrete actuality of the resurrection, re-enforcing his own testimony with a reference to that of more than five hundred witnesses, most of them still accessible. “If Christ be not raised,” said he, “your faith is vain.” But if we are to retain faith in the Christ of the New Testament, we must frankly accept Him as He is there presented, and as the New Testament itself represents Him as choosing to present Himself; environed with miracle and prophecy and claiming the performance of the one and the fulfilment of the other as legitimate and competent credentials of His Messiahship. The “common people,” who “heard him gladly,” could hardly have inferred from His answer to John’s disciples that He knew the miracles to

wh
En
exp
self
old
“tj
suc
cha
cha
divi
to
only
or c
deg
fai
ther
ism
stat
His
stro
four
noxi
Of
fensi
the
The
inary
natu
quiry
It
the s
sions
new
or w
that
from
howe
obser
procl
the w
their
secul
physi
thetic
the a