

God spake by the Prophets; but it was "the Spirit of Christ which was in them." (1 Pet. i: 11).

Our Lord declares that "He is the Light of the World," and that as well before as after the Incarnation. As He said, "Whosoever I am in the world, I am the Light of the world." (John ix: 1-5). The declaration points back, as Bishop Westcott notes, to the manifold revelations of the Old Testament through the Patriarchs, in the Law and in the Prophets. He was the Light that illumined every prophet and teacher of the Old Dispensation. He was the Mediator through whom the Old Testament as well as the New, was given. There never was there never could be, any revelation of the Father except through the Son. The office of Revealer belongs to Him as Son. It is inherent in His Person.

Now, if the Lord's relations to the Old Testament be so vital, so fundamental, so bound up both with its origin and its subject; and if, as even the opponents admit, He believed in and affirmed its historicity and its Divine authority, is it possible to believe that He was mistaken, that He spoke in ignorance of His real origin and character? Are we not "bound to accept the language of the Bible?" Bishop Stubbs has said, "to accept the language of our Lord in reference to the Old Testament Scriptures as beyond appeal?"* And, if we refuse to accept it, what credence can be given to our Lord's words on any other subject? If our Lord was ignorant in regard to the former revelations contained in the Old Testament, what guarantee have we for His claims to be the Revealer of the Father? The New Testament are not vitiated by the same ignorance.

*Bishop of Oxford's Second Charge, 1893.