

consequence come to regard the Bible as only *one* witness to the ground of our faith, and even a prejudiced witness that has its own side to support. But to obtain a more accurate conception of the Word of God we must regard the sacred Scriptures not as one book, but a whole library, consisting of some seventy different volumes, standing side by side on a shelf with the names of the various authors on the backs of each—Job, Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, etc.—the sacred books of the Christian Church. This obvious character of the Scriptures is not sufficiently realized, and yet it has an important bearing on the evidence of the facts of revelation. All who have had anything to do with evidence must know the difference between *one* witness, and many, who give independent testimony to a certain fact—“In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.” But in the case before us we have not merely two or three, but forty or fifty different and independent witnesses to the same facts. Moreover, these independent witnesses are not as a series of propositions in Euclid, the last leaning on and springing from the first, nor are they as links in a chain, for no chain is stronger than its weakest link. The witnesses are rather as strands in a cable stretching across the centuries and anchoring man’s faith to the Throne of the Eternal. And even if one strand were to break it would still leave all the others as strong as ever, whereas if a link were to break, the whole chain would fall in pieces. If the Song of Solomon were proved uncanonical this would not touch the testimony of Matthew or Moses, for they are independent of each other and claim to be believed on their own separate evidence, evidence that becomes greatly strengthened when we consider the number of the witnesses.

Would not every man receive as true an historic fact corroborated by Horace, Virgil, Cæsar, Cicero, and Livy, in regard to the Roman Republic? When Cæsar, Cicero, Sallust all unite in testifying that Cataline was involved in a conspiracy against Rome, does any sane man doubt this historic fact so attested? Would any one doubt, though the witnesses belong to the same nation and age and city? Nor would the separate testimony of these witnesses be invalidated if in after years (as is the case with a volume now lying before me), their separate writings were all