

point of view is far superior to that taught elsewhere. We rest this proposition upon direct testimony from their own lips. Then Strauss, while most bitter in his opposition to the dogmatic and historical Christianity of the Church, asserts firmly that Christ and Christianity is the very highest moral ideal to which the world can ever hope to attain. (*Soliloquies, part II, sect. 27-30.*) And Renan, while fearlessly affirming that Strauss is mistaken in his theory of the compilation of the Gospels, agrees with him in his testimony in favour of the parity and superiority of the moral lessons and principles taught in them. He is, in fact, an enthusiastic admirer of the lofty, manly, self-denying virtue, and honest patriotism inculcated by the life of Jesus. This, too, is the tone adopted by the famous authors of "*Recent Inquiries in Theology*," and by the Bishop of Natal. They are all conscientiously religious, more pious in their own estimation than those who justly seek, as we think, to exclude them from the office of the Christian ministry. They cling most tenaciously and with feelings of highest admiration to the good and pure morality of the New Testament. Now, this is a great concession on their part—it affords the very best answer we can desire to the profane sarcasm and horrid buffoonery of Voltaire, Paine, Hume, and others of that class. Those who now side with them against God's word refuse to defend their coarseness and profanity.

I mention another, and a far more important concession now made by many of the opponents of the Bible; they are constrained to accept the *evidence of testimony as upon the whole reliable*. When a company of men confessedly sane, and honest, not ruled by self-interest or any improper motive, are cognizant of simple matter of fact, and testify unitedly and repeatedly respecting such matter of fact, and even submit to suffer great inconvenience and loss rather than abandon their testimony, such evidence the present foes of Divine truth are disposed to accept as reliable. Thus they have fallen from the position taken by Hume and his disciples—they have made a great and most valuable admission, which enables us to establish beyond the possibility of doubt, the birth, the miracles, the teachings, the crucifixion, the resurrection, and ascension of our Redeemer; and having established this much we feel no alarm respecting the Pentateuch and the other books of the Old Testament. Thus granting, as they do, that the Bible has gained possession of the popular mind of Britain and America, that it cannot be shown to disseminate or inculcate injurious principles; that its morality and ethics are far superior, upon the whole, to any thing ever offered to the world; and that the evidence of testimony in its favour is reliable, do not the antagonists of the Bible seem overcome? In truth, their position in the present aspect of religious discussion and controversy may be presented in this form: Collecting all the internal and external evidences in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of the Book on the one hand, and all the objections and difficulties which its opponents feel able to offer, on the other, and leaving them to indicate a conclusion based upon these premises, they are constrained to confess that the Bible and Christianity are *great facts*, obliged to yield that the Book is supernatural if not Divine in its origin. Are we therefore all agreed respecting it? By no means. Those men raise another and most grave question. How is this Book to be understood? What is its meaning? How much truth does it contain? If given