

the first thing we stumble on, when we come to these "sins of a deeper dye" is a rather dishonest artifice on the part of "Vindex" himself, where he quotes me as attributing to him language which I did not attribute to him at all, but in which I simply sought to express the construction which I thought might logically be placed on one of his positions. It was for "Vindex" to accept that construction or not, as he pleased: it was *not* for him to turn round and say that I had in terms, attributed that construction of his position *to him*. Anybody with a spark of intelligence in such matters can see the point.

But was my construction of his position really a fair one and logically sound? I think it was. "Vindex" says, on the other hand, that what he really stated was "the very reverse" of my interpretation of it. Let us examine the point. Here are my words:

"As a preliminary to discussing the sudden collapse of the walls of Jericho, and other incidents of a like nature, my critic would wish to go into the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus, holding, apparently, that the former fact would become more probable, if the latter could be proved. It is doubtful how far this is wise policy. To tell people beforehand that, if they once admit the Resurrection, they will be forever estopped from questioning any marvel, however grotesque, that may be asserted to stand in any kind of relation to it, is perhaps not the best way to secure a perfectly unprejudiced consideration of such evidence as may be adducible for the central miracle."

Now "Vindex" does not in the least deny having put forward the miracle of the Resurrection as something which ought to be discussed, or enquired into, as a preliminary to examining the evidence for such narratives as that of the fall of Jericho. I ask, therefore, any man of common sense and common honesty, what this could possibly be supposed to mean, except that, if the miracle of the resurrection were once proved, he would proceed to show such an organic connection between that miracle and those of the Old Testament generally, that the latter would have to be believed on the authority, and for the sake of the former. The acceptance, therefore, of the central miracle would, *when its*