

—prophecy thus not coming 'by the will of man.' At the best to what does all that Dr. Walsh can draw from these words amount? Whatever the expression mean it is confined to prophecy: it does not embrace the whole Bible, nor is any thing said of the church or any other party being empowered or appointed to give an authoritative interpretation of any part of it. Such a thing is not even hinted. Nothing is said about restricting any from the study of even a line of it—nothing to discourage the freest access to it of all. A fact is stated with respect to the 'making' of the prophecies, but it is accompanied by no whisper of denial to any of the right to seek for themselves an explanation even of them. We are told what should make us at once humble and prayerful in opening the Sacred Oracles, and should restrain us from presumptuous confidence in our views of the purport of that of which the fulfilment is still future. But we are told nothing more, and even this is addressed as much to the Church itself as to the private Christian.

As he draws nearer his close Dr. Walsh waxes still bolder. He now gives the Bible the final coup de grace. It may be sent to the trunkmaker's forthwith. He tells us that even if there had never been a New Testament, or if "all that has been written had perished," the church could 'still teach the saving truths of salvation, and securely guide her children to eternal life.' This astounding announcement he endeavours to make probable by telling us that "it was not by writing that the truths of Revelation were first made known to mankind, either under the Old or New Covenant," an assertion which he proceeds to sustain by quoting a series of illustrative proofs. "The Almighty," says he, "*spoke to man in Paradise!*" as if he could argue from Eden to the present, and from the communion of a holy creature with his Maker to the case of a revolted and sinful race! Next "*He spoke through the Prophets.*" Dr. Walsh surely forgets the common Hebrew phrase respecting revelations from God through these holy men. It is that he spoke "*by the hand of*" the prophet. He omits to tell us how often such expressions occur as "*the Lord said write the Vision*"—"the Lord said take thee a great book and write in it."—(Isaiah viii. 1, Hab. ii. 2.) He forgets how great a part of the Scripture is prophetic, and that, besides what they wrote, during all the period in which God raised up the prophets, there was a written Law—a portion of which consisted of the Tables of Testimony written on both sides by the Finger of God Himself, (Exod. xxxii. 15) and that this law was the High and only Rule of Faith and practice. As to God's "*speaking by his Son*" we have seen how little time was allowed to pass before what was thus spoken was embodied in writing under the direction of the Holy Spirit, to keep it from being corrupted. Dr. Walsh tells us that for "2400 years", from Adam to Moses, there "was no written revelation." But does he know all the details of the patriarchal dispensation? If he do, no man else does. Still as he claims it as a period in which "*the will of God was made known*" through "*oral tradition and oral teaching*" alone, we will give him the benefit of it as affording a striking proof of the worth of these highly extolled means of preserving and spreading religious truths. It would have been better for the boast of the church being able by their means alone, without any sacred writings whatever, as he maintains, to