

the Modern Evangelical notion of an Atonement." With such parties it would be foolish to attempt reasoning. It is enough to say with Him thus grievously maligned, "*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.*"

An hostility, if possible keener still, is entertained towards the *Evidences* of Christianity than towards its Doctrines. *Miracles* especially are violently assailed. The subtle, though shallow reasoning of Hume, which has been refuted scores of times, is revived. They declare a miracle to be an *impossibility*, and that, even though its possibility could be proved, it is not *fitted to attest any moral or spiritual truth*. A miracle is opposed to experience, therefore it cannot be. Admirable logic! Why! did a miracle accord with general experience, it would *cease to be a miracle*. A miracle is a suspension or contravention of the laws of nature. But were these always or often suspended or contravened, its nature and design would be changed.

To say, too, that a miracle is opposed to all experience, is a simple *assumption without proof*. It makes a particular, the standard of a general experience. Because this is contrary to what I, or those within my limited circle, have been accustomed, therefore in no case and under no conceivable circumstances, can it so be! I am not at liberty thus to set up my narrow experience as an universal test. What may appear at variance with nature's laws in one part of the world, may be quite in accordance with them in another. Grant the reasoning of these wise men, and the Oriental Prince was quite right in denying the existence or possibility of Ice. The idea of water sleeping or becoming solid so that you could walk on it or carry it in lumps, hard as iron, seemed preposterous. It was utterly opposed to his own experience or that of his subjects, therefore, it could not be.

And does it not savour of gross presumption for a puny creature to fetter the action of the great Creator; dogmatically to assert that He may not alter or suspend the laws he himself framed, should occasions occur which he deems of importance sufficient to warrant his doing so? Nor is it fair to put the fallibility of human testimony even against the fixedness of nature's laws. *It* is fallible, *they* are fixed, therefore we must reject *it* and believe that in all cases *they* are without variableness. Here again lurks the fallacy of drawing from particular premises a sweeping general conclusion. Some witnesses turn out false. Undoubtedly! But this is no reason why we should cashier the evidence of all. Every historical fact or document, weighed in such balances, might be found wanting. Admit this principle, carry it out to its legitimate length, and we must cast overboard the richest cargoes of knowledge that have floated down to us on the tide of Time.

How much of our knowledge do we receive at second hand, and when there is not a tithe of the evidence that exists in favor of the miracles of the Bible! Let that evidence be carefully and candidly examined, and the conviction must force itself on the impartial enquirer that its falsity would involve wonders greater than its truth. It is much easier to believe that the miracles so attested are true, than that the parties attesting them in the face of difficulties the most formidable, and dangers the most appalling, and with a world in arms against them, and no worldly object to be gained, should have joined in palming on the public a series of forgeries which could easily be exposed, persisted in the assertion of their truth, and sealed their testimony with their blood. We would leave it with any unprejudiced jury to say, on which side lay the more remarkable miracle or the greater measure of credulity. And as to the alleged impossibility of proving any moral truth through a material medium, we prefer acting on the advice of the faithful and true Witness who brought his teaching to this very test, desiring that his words be judged by his works. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not, but if I do, though ye believe not me,