

that more especially as affecting the channels through which our knowledge of the facts of the life of Christ is derived, and the trustworthiness of that testimony upon which alone we can venture to receive a Divine revelation. The Jewish law (Deut. xvii. 6) provided that at the mouth of two or three witnesses he that was worthy of death should be put to death, but that at the mouth of one witness he should not be put to death. In matters of history, however, we are at times dependent upon the testimony of only one witness. As far as I know, there are many things which we accept implicitly upon the testimony, for instance, of Cæsar alone. I suppose we have no other testimony but his for the astounding fact that he built a bridge across the Rhine in ten days, and demolished it again after eighteen; that he built a fleet in thirty days; that he led his army over the Cevennes in six feet of snow, and the like. No one discredits these things as facts, and yet we have no second or third witness to confirm them. In themselves they are well-nigh incredible; and notwithstanding this, we accept them as undoubted facts of history upon the mere word of Cæsar. It is evident, therefore, that historical facts demand less testimony for their reality than the law demands in matters of life and death. Provided that the character of the witness is satisfactory, it is difficult to say what statement might not be accepted. We believe the word of Cæsar because it is his word, even though the nature of the statement is such as to stagger and perplex our powers of belief, and to baffle our understanding. In this case, however, the fact, though incredible, is not unnatural or supernatural. Had Cæsar told us he had seen a dead man raised to life, should we or should we not believe him? He has not told us so, and therefore we cannot say. When, however, we come to the Gospel history, it is exactly this that we do meet with. Are we or are we not to believe it? This must, one would think, depend as before upon the character of the witnesses. Only in this case instead of one witness we have several. The extraordinary character of the facts testified to naturally demands a stronger array of testimony, and we have it. Is it or is it not adequate? How are