

to these questions we do not find it necessary to give a decided yes or no answer. For, we remark, we do not deem it necessary to have positive views concerning the matter ourselves, or press them upon others. But we do propose to examine both sides of the question to see if the foundation of this deliverance is so solid that it ought to be trusted to hold up safely the mighty structure which has been built with its aid.

Upon what then does its truthfulness as a doctrine rest? Let us minutely examine, believing that he who would put the slightest obstacle in the way of such honest and truth loving examination must be in that act simply prompted by superstition or bigotry, or both.

Instinctively we turn to the Bible for proof. And we find all the proof known in the first parts of the two gospels, Matthew and Luke. In these two places it is distinctly and clearly stated as true to facts. Now, granted the absolute truthfulness of every word or even every paragraph in the New Testament Scriptures, and the proof must be satisfactory to all.

But upon what does the truthfulness of these beginnings of the two gospels depend? This is a question which few will face long enough to investigate. A very superficial glance at these two productions will separate the parts which tell of the life of Christ before His baptism from those parts which refer to his life then and afterwards.

In the case of Matthew, admitting the truthfulness of the tradition which makes him the author of the whole gospel, still it is evident that, whilst in the bulk of his gospel, he tells what he saw and knew by personal contact with Christ, concerning the other part he necessarily tells what he heard from others. That there is an important distinction to be noted here all must admit. Hence we maintain on the strength of this fact, that proving the unreliability of the first part would not necessarily discount the rest.

In a recent article we referred to

the history of the wars of Cæsar in Gaul as written by himself, and showed that what he wrote about the animals of Germany, from hear say, does not make incorrect what he wrote as an eye witness. It so happens that some of his hear-say stories are not true to facts. But then it is also true that what he wrote as the outcome of personal observation is, in the main, true to facts. The same criticism, if applied to Matthew, may have a similar result, viz., discredit the hear-say story and establish that which was known to him from personal observation.

And the same may be said concerning Luke's gospel. However, with respect to this latter historian, we draw attention to the fact that the hear-say part and that which he had much greater opportunity to verify are separated very distinctly the one from the other. In fact, it will be noticed that there are two distinct commencements to his gospel, a fact which might easily awaken the suspicion that he was not the writer of both parts. Moreover, in this connection, we would also draw attention to his reference in the books of the Acts, to this, his Gospel. His words are "The former treatise have I made O Theophilus concerning all that Jesus *began* both to do and teach, until the day in which he was received up." This reference certainly better characterizes his Gospel from the second beginning, than the whole as it now stands, and tends to strengthen the suspicion, that, like the last paragraph of Mark's Gospel, it is an interpolation.

Again, both Matthew and Luke, in the possibly apocryphal parts, are made to trace the genealogy of Jesus to Joseph, the husband of Mary, and yet at the same time declare that Jesus was not the son of Joseph.

As an offset to this, however, it is asserted by some that one genealogy is made to include Mary and the other Joseph. But, even granted this, nevertheless, one may well criticise the manner by which it