

(2. Mark)

upon the names of the men to whom they are attributed. If it could be proved that St. Matthew did not write the Second Gospel, we should still hold it to be inspired. But—not to lay stress upon the fact which I have adverted to already, that this new investigation does not produce a solitary fresh proof or plea—an almost fatal defect justifies a very light estimate of its real worth. The criticism is exclusively negative. Not the slightest notice is vouchsafed to the evidence in favour of the genuineness and authenticity of the historic portions of the New Testament and the Pauline letters. The difficulties connected with the rise and progress of Christianity, if our Lord did not rise from the dead, are not even heard of. The Fourth Gospel is pronounced a pure fabrication—a Life of Christ written with a deliberate theological motive, the author imputing to Jesus words and deeds which he never so much as imagined that it was possible that He spake and did. But the insoluble moral problem, how such a forger could utter holier and nobler sentiments than, *ex hypothesi*, the real Jesus ever gave expression to, is left unstated and unattacked. The means by which the Church was induced to receive so palpable a manufacture as genuine memoir from the pen of St. John are indicated nowhere. Omissions, of which these are merely samples, render the reasoning obviously incomplete.

There is much to be said on behalf the reversal of the usual order of “natural” and “revealed” religion, provided that we do not thereby assume that religion cannot be *revealed* by any other mode than intuition. Yet, after all, “natural” may just as well be understood to denote that religion which is *natural* to man apart from verbal communications from God as that which is taught through the study of the material universe. In that case “natural” religion includes the elements which Dr. Martineau denominates “revealed.” Be this as it may, the ingenious device by which all other *revealed* religion is stigmatized as “apocalyptic” and discredited *in limine* is cleverly misleading. It goes far towards assuming the entire matter in dispute, which is whether God *can* give a direct revelation of Himself through man to man, or whether the