

the pen of inspiration no where tells us that the betrayal and death of that Son of David in its attendant facts and circumstances, are contributory to the pre-representation, otherwise lacking in respect of those essential features, *and the reason for reticence therein is obvious; but sir, the handwriting is on the wall, and he who runs may read. If nothing were signified, nothing were told. The betrayal of the Son of David by a brother in Israel, and the talk of silver—the crown of thorns—the hanging from the tree—the soldier's piercing his side, are those facts and incidents to go for nothing?*

"Speaking of Jesus as respects His regard for Mary His mother and its manifestation, it is but just — it is altogether important—to take two or three things into consideration. There was need of great circumspection on Christs' part that His words and His course generally in respect of Mary should tend to rebuke and to check, rather than develope and strengthen, the tendency to confound Mary the mother of Jesus with Mary the disciple. Mary herself had need to be rebuked, need to be addressed 'Woman' by Christ once and again to enable her to keep up the distinction—to compel her to discriminate between Jesus her *son* and Jesus her LORD and MASTER. Again, let us remember that the filial relation Jesus sustained to Mary though far from unimportant was of small account compared with His relations to her—to the human family—to the world as the SAVIOUR and the REDEEMER—that the duties and obligations involved in these relations were correspondingly greater and more onerous, the fact of their discharge and the manner and method of the doing, more entitled to public record. Indeed