

of His ordinary bearing and manner among them; while He was still the meek and gentle and lowly Jesus.

Taking these therefore as the data from which to start, it will not be difficult to establish the conclusion to the truth of which His miracles testified. He frequently asserted that He was the expected Messiah, "the One that should come," the One "whom God had sanctified and sent into the world," and He pointed to His works as a proof of it. He must have known whether or not in making these assertions He spoke the truth, for his clearness of judgment, and freedom from everything that savoured of fanaticism, were not the least remarkable traits of His character. If therefore His honesty and truthfulness were above suspicion, to what conclusion do the above considerations force us? He must have asserted what was true when He appealed to His miracles as a proof of His Divine commission, and thus His simple statement proves both the reality of the miracles performed by Him, and the truths they were intended to confirm. If Christ was not what He professed, then how is it that He wrought these works in the name of the Father? how is it that He was in everything else, true, honest, faithful, and self-denying? how is it that His enemies have never found the shadow of a ground for ascribing to Him ambition, selfishness, or unworthy motives of any other kind, in any one transaction of His life? If He was not what He professed to be, then are those who assert it, forced to the awful conclusion, that insincerity, untruthfulness, and a dishonest ambition, were the ruling motives of His life. The ingenuity and hardihood have never yet been found together, that would pervert the statements of Scripture to support such a theory. It is however the inevitable conclusion to which a denial of Christ's divinity, and miraculous power, leads. The assertion of His Messiahship was not one, to be confirmed or denied by any one act of His life, and to extend no farther. If true, it included the reason for which He came to earth, as well as every event of His history, and the end for which He lived and suffered and died. He does not hide His knowledge of the reason of His incarnation, or of the special and peculiar purpose which His life and death were to subserve. He continually asserts them. If His assertions are true then is He the Divine Saviour; if not (and may God pardon the supposition!) then do they contradict what every act of His life confirms, His honesty and truthfulness. These qualities admitted, as they are and must be by every candid reader of the Scriptures whatever the dogmas he may otherwise hold, settle conclusively the question as to the divine character of Him "who spake as never man spake."

It would thus appear that the argument for the Divine nature of Christ and the Divine character of the wonderful works which He performed, rests upon the foundation of His truthfulness and honesty. If he meant to be candidly and unequivocally understood in what He said and did, then the question is settled to every candid mind. His miracles, as they were performed, bore evidence that it was by His own inherent and original power He wrought them, as He so often asserted. Some whose character showed that they were not actuated by the Divine Spirit sometimes performed actions that excited wonder and that seemed miraculous; but such actions were wholly different from the miracles of Christ. They were but the clever tricks of legerdemain performed to catch the popular eye. The works of Christ on the other hand showed unmistakably, that it was by Divine power they were wrought, especially when viewed in connexion with the doctrines which He taught, and with His personal character. They were works that could consist only with faith in God, and holiness of character. They presume these qualities as a *sine qua non*, to their being performed. The power exercised in the performance