

advent, as the grand central fact of redemption, we look backward and forward with great advantage upon the whole line of revelation.

We cannot too earnestly inculcate upon the inquirer, the necessity of thus looking at revelation as a whole. Strong as are the evidences for the truth of the Gospel narratives considered separately, they gain new strength, on the one side, from the mighty revelations that preceded them and prepared the way for the advent of the Son of God ; and on the other, from the mighty events that followed his advent in the apostolic age, and have been following ever since in the history of the Christian Church. The divine origin of the Mosaic Institutions can be shown on solid grounds, independently of the New Testament ; but on how much broader and deeper a foundation are they seen to rest, when we find that they were preparatory to the incarnation of Jesus Christ. As in a burning mass, the heat and flame of each separate piece of fuel is increased by the surrounding fire, so in the plan of redemption, each separate revelation receives new light and glory from the revelations which precede and follow it. It is only when we view the revelations of the Bible as thus progressing from "glory to glory," that we can estimate aright the proofs of their divine origin. Even if it were possible to delude men into receiving as miraculous a particular event, as, for example, the giving of the Mosaic law on Sinai, or the scenes of the day of Pentecost, the idea that there could have been imposed on the world a series of such events, extending through many ages, and yet so connected together as to constitute a harmonious and consistent whole, is a simple absurdity. There is no explanation of the unity that pervades the supernatural facts of revelation, but that of their divine origin. In contrast with this rational way of viewing the facts of revelation as a whole, is the fragmentary method of objectors. A doubt here, a cavil there ; a difficulty in this statement, an objection in that—this is their favourite way of assailing the gospel. If one chooses to treat the Bible in this narrow and uncandid way, he will soon plunge into unbelief. Difficulties and objections should be candidly considered, and allowed their due weight, but they must not be suffered to override irrefragable proof, else we shall land in universal scepticism ; for difficulties, and some of them insoluble, can be urged against the great facts of nature, science and natural religion, as well as revelation. To reject a series of events supported by an overwhelming weight of evidence, on the ground of unexplained difficulties connected with them, involves the absurdity of running into a hundred difficulties for the sake of avoiding five. If we examine the claims of revelation as a whole, its divine origin will shine forth like the sun in the firmament. Our difficulties we can then calmly reserve for further light here, or hereafter.

E. P. BARROWS, D.D.