

"O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them ~~all~~ in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." This makes absolutely clear the attitude of the Lord toward the Old Testament. He considered it to be a revelation which would be carefully studied and from which facts could be gleaned even about events which would occur long after the time of those who wrote. He considered it to be a revelation from God the Creator of the universe.

This idea of revelation seems to some people to be a medieval concept out of .

touch with modern, scientific attitudes. Let us examine it a bit. It is my contention not only that there is nothing unscientific about revelation, but that revelation is a vital and necessary element in all scientific progress.

Let us make clear at this point what we mean by revelation. I am not using the word in the sense simply of divine revelation. Revelation is a communication from one personality to another. The difference between divine revelation and human revelation is simply a matter of its source. There is, of course, trustworthiness to divine revelation far beyond what could ever be associated with a mere human source. My present thought is of revelation itself, not simply of divine revelation.

There is no scientist who has not secured three fourths of his information in any field of science revelation. If he started in to make all the experiments, he would never get far enough in a lifetime to make more than a small fraction of the advance that has already been made. He gets communication from others. He finds out what they observed and what they have learned. Revelation is a constant part of the acquisition of knowledge in any science. The greatest scientist gets at least three fourths of his information from revelation. The average