

prospect but that of evil in relation to the most valued of temporal interests, is simply incredible. We may say of it, as we cannot say of a miracle in the ordinary sense of the term, that it is contrary to uniform and universal experience. In the testimony of the early Christian witnesses to the resurrection of Christ, we have testimony of the *highest kind possible*; and to throw upon it the suspicion that attaches to the most untrustworthy class of witnesses, as Hume does, is an instance of sophistry of the highest order.

---

*Note B, page 224.*

That the assertion of the text is not lightly made will be, we think, sufficiently manifest from the following extracts, the one from a believer in the divine origin of the Mosaic record, and the other from one who rejects divine revelation. Professor James D. Dana, in the article on Cosmogony, in his "Manuel of Geology," in which he shows the correspondence between the order of events in the Mosaic cosmogony and that inferred from the combined study of geology and astronomy, sees in this correspondence a proof of the divine origin of the Mosaic record. "*This document*," he says, "*if true, is of divine origin*. For no human mind was witness of the events; and no such mind in the early age of the world, unless gifted with superhuman intelligence, could have contrived such a scheme—would have placed the creation of the sun, the source of light to the earth, so long after the creation of light, even on the *fourth* day, and, what is equally singular, between the creation of plants and that of animals, when so important to both; and none could have reached to the depths of philosophy exhibited in the whole plan. Again, if divine, the account must bear the marks of human imperfection, since it was communicated through man. Ideas suggested to a human