

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 14. — OCTOBER, 1890.

I. CHRIST AND HIS MIRACLES.

“His glory consists, not in being banished from history; we render him a truer worship by showing that all history is incomprehensible without him.”—
RENAN.

It may be said, without disparagement of the labors of able men, that our learned treatises on the person of Christ and on his miracles fail to exhibit in a satisfactory manner a certain necessary relation between them, apart from which neither can be clearly apprehended. The confusion that attends, even to the present day, the discussion of these subjects is evidence of something wrong in our conception and method of dealing with them.

There is a troublesome feeling in many minds that the best and final word respecting the divinity of Jesus and the place and value of miracles remains to be spoken, and that, when it is spoken, it will discover a new line of thought touching the relation of the two things. It would be sheer egotism for a paper like this to propose more than a suggestion, when one takes into consideration the magnitude of the two-fold subject, and of the literature already extant; but it ought to be possible to set forth in brief, yet clear and satisfactory form the main features of a doctrine which, to our thinking, promises so much to faith in its conflict with science and philosophy.

It may be assumed that the deity of Christ is one of the best established doctrines of Christianity, in so far as the consensus of faith is able to secure a dogma. While it involves the profoundest mystery of religion, and rises beyond intellectual apprehension, it is yet in its relations seen to be indispensable. The religious

General Assembly because it does not please the Board that is investigated.

In conclusion, allow me to say that the special committee, fully understanding their responsibility to the Head of the church, are prepared now, or at any other time, before any committee, session, Presbytery or Assembly, to furnish absolute and indisputable proof of every statement in their report, only asking that the official reports of the Board shall be taken as telling the truth; and we are willing to rest our reputations as honest, truth-telling men and officers of the church upon the verdict.

Pardon the length of my communication, and believe me, I remain,
 Most fraternally, H. E. SIMMONS, *Chairman, etc.*

DR. HOYT'S REPLY.

In reply to the above, I am a member of the Board, but not of its business committee, whose matters are at issue.

The special committee was not continued, except that it might appear as a body before the new committee and answer for its report.

There was no such conference between the two committees as was intended by the General Assembly. The three hundred and fifty pages of stenography contained the report of a debate between the two committees.

The General Assembly required a joint report. There was no joint report, but merely an *ex parte* statement by the special committee.

The special committee did not lay before the business committee the facts, but only their inferences; that is, they gave estimates, but not the specifications on which they were based.

The nameless bidders at lower prices may have been men of straw and the bids hypothetical. The special committee failed to show that responsible parties offered better terms.

Dr. Agnew demonstrated to the Assembly, by a comparison of its books with those of several large publishers, that those of the Board were better and cheaper.

The special committee made an active, partisan propaganda among the members of the Assembly, by button-holing them, circulating their report, and insinuating charges. No more flagrant attempt was ever made to influence the members of a court in advance of the public hearing.

T. A. HOYT.