

Revelation teaches more, and on higher evidence, than reason. If it did not, it would be wholly useless and superfluous. If it added nothing to what we knew before, it could do us no good. Reason teaches the *probability* of a future life ; but the assurance of Christ, and his own resurrection, make it certain. But it is only by the use of reason that we can ever arrive at the well-grounded conviction, that Christ ever uttered such an assurance, or ever rose from the dead. It is only by the use of reason that the accounts of the supernatural events recorded in the New Testament can be separated and distinguished from the thousand other accounts of supernatural events which have been handed down to us from the past. Accordingly, every book that has ever been written on the evidences of Christianity is a recital of the *reasons* we have for believing the supernatural accounts of the Old and New Testament, and rejecting all others. These books are addressed to the reasoning faculty of man. If the reasoning is not satisfactory, the revelation has no authority. We go farther, and say, that it is reason only which can give us confidence in a revelation, even when we are convinced that one has been made. The truth of revelation, even when it is made, depends upon the veracity of God, — upon the question whether it is probable that he would or would not deceive us. The probability that he would not deceive us depends entirely upon the fact, whether he be a good being. And the only evidence we have that he is a good being is the predominance of good over evil in his works, or of happiness over misery in the creatures he has made. The representation is not *true*, then, that Unitarians set up reason in opposition to Scripture, and in opposition to faith. They make use of