

tion (not necessarily final) to "tell no man of Him" be construed into a total rejection of Peter's confession, a denial of its truthfulness? Yet this our author does. History is the relation of objective fact, and cannot be at the mercy of the critic's subjectivity; if so, in the sphere of criticism, we can but meet subjectivity by subjectivity, and assert that ours is not as Dr. Martineau's, neither here, nor when he further asserts that "there lies a prior history, now lost, behind the evangelist's account, which has shaped itself during the apostolic age into conformity with Messianic ideas." It is acknowledged that the Messiahship of Jesus occupies the very foreground of the picture in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. We confess to inability in discovering a later date because of such a presentation, deeming it simpler to accept the record that Jesus did acknowledge Himself to be the Messiah, whatever heed may be eventually given to the claim.

The second canon, which deals with miraculous events as distinguished from natural causes, opens up an inviting field of inquiry, but plainly one beyond the limits of this paper, more especially as here our author's subjectivity does not so thoroughly possess him. He wisely says, "The uniformities which regulate our expectations we have got to know by induction from experience, and as they have been gathered from past facts, they are always open to control by future facts, which they are incompetent to forbid. Our stock of known laws, not being a closed circle, does not shut out an anomalous phenomenon as impossible, and entitle us to say, 'It did not happen.'" The acceptance, therefore, or rejection of the miraculous is a question of testimony, and of the competency of the witnesses, there are no *a priori* grounds against believing the miraculous. Hence the narrators of the miraculous, whether in the legends of the mediæval saints, or in the Gospels, are not to be held as untruthful, but their enthusiasm and strong ideality has led them into beliefs and statements that are illusory. That Peter, John and Paul realized a living and risen Christ as few have done, and still fewer do, we, with some sorrow, confess; but that the testimony of 1 Cor. xv. is to be so idealized as to destroy the evidence of an objective resurrection by "the