

teaching as the more perfect setting forth of the will of the same God who had spoken by the prophets of old. For all this there can be but one explanation: it is inconceivable that the Author of the New Covenant could have taken this position unless he believed in the essential unity of the two dispensations, and looked upon Himself as the point where they met and coalesced.*

One of the longest and most important books of the New Testament has for its principal object the establishment of the position that in Jesus Christ the types and symbols of the Old Testament have their complete and divinely ordained fulfilment; that He was no less the central figure of its priestly and sacrificial ritual than He was of its history and prophecy. The book, it would seem was meant for Jewish Christians in danger of apostacy because of their Jewish surroundings. By a masterly argument, in harmony with the teachings of the whole New Testament, the writer shows that the goal of the old dispensation could only be reached by faithfulness to Jesus Christ. He alone had provided the true rest of which that of Canaan had been but the shadow.

Hence, it cannot well be disputed that any scheme of criticism whose direct teaching or whose general tendency is to antagonize and to discredit these representations of our Lord and his apostles is inimical in its influence to the entire system of Christian doctrine. Its evil effects do not stop with the Old Testament. They are not confined to any one doctrine of the New. They have a direct bearing and a most unfavorable bearing on such teachings of the New Testament, for example, as that concerning the divine Providence and the kingdom of God on earth; concerning sin and redemption as set forth in the epistle to the Romans; concerning the person of the Redeemer, His Deity, His everlasting priesthood, His incarnation in order to redemption, His historical and His spiritual relations to His people. If such criticism be correct, we see no way of escaping the conclusion that many beliefs hitherto considered to be fundamental to Christianity must be false.

It has been asserted, it is true, by some that whatever may be the results of Old Testament criticism, no real harm will come to the teachings of our Lord. It has been said that we have no special need any longer of those parts of the Old Testament involved in critical discussions, and that we can get along without them. Such persons must be poorly informed, or very unthinking. They do not tell us how we can "get along" without them, or what their idea of "getting along" may be as it concerns the Kingdom of God on earth. A man has been known to "get along" with his arms and legs gone, without eyes, with a part of his skull shot away; but it was an existence that was hardly worthy of the name of life. The New Testament, without

* Gardiner, *The Old and New Testaments in their Mutual Relations*, New York, 1885, p. 4.