

all that these words were not written by the author of the book of Hebrews; they, therefore, make no claim to inspiration after the orthodox meaning of that word. We, then, or any other student of the book of Hebrews, have exactly the same right that the authors of these interpolated words had to add words for the purpose of *bringing* out the meaning of the passage, or, if you will, for making it teach *our* belief.

Evidently the authors of these three words tried to make the paragraph teach, that all men, except Jesus, are tempted and yield to temptation, but that whilst Jesus was also tempted to sin he never once yielded.

These were the dogmatic beliefs of these interpreters, and, of course, they assumed that this early Christian writer also held them, and therefore intended that this verse should teach these truths. Unfortunately, however, the words which would complete this sense were in some way, in their estimation, left out either by the original author or by the carelessness of copyists. Hence the need of *their* supplying the hiatus!

But, we ask, is there not an evident meaning to the passage without these added words? Is there no sense in the thought that Jesus was in all points tempted as we are when we are tempted to sin and do not yield to the temptation?

Of course, Christendom at once will repudiate such a commentary on the verse. For why? It is the general belief that whilst all men have fallen and do continually fall before temptation Jesus never did. Hence their *logical* conclusion is, that because Christendom believes thus and so the author of Hebrews believed the same, and so intended to write in perfect harmony with these beliefs.

And yet they who are guilty of thus tampering with the *sacred* text grow indignant when gnostics or immersionists

exercise a similar privilege! O consistency! thou art a jewel rare.

From the close consideration of this interpolation we may gather a correct idea of the vast changes which may have been made in original Scripture. When nineteenth century scholars with the eyes of all modern Christendom upon them hesitate not to sanction the reading of such important additional thoughts into a passage of Scripture, and do so conscientiously, as really serving the interests of truth and religion, need we be surprised that innumerable copyists altered words and sentences, or added them freely, to make the Scriptures orthodox, that is, harmonize with the current beliefs of their day?

From all of which we infer that a safe canon of interpretation is the following, viz., to accept with doubt every passage which harmonizes with the current theology of the times when the copy was made.

Rev. Alexander Langford, whilst composing a short treatise on Baptism, was evidently struck with the patent fact that this rule was applicable to the subject he discusses in his book, and so he fearlessly took the stand that the Bible gave ample evidence of being translated by those who had a certain cast-iron belief on this subject.

Here some will say to us, "Physician, heal thyself." Will not this rule of criticism apply to your own writings? Of course it will; for it is a poor rule which will not work both ways. And hence it is but just that we be treated to a dose of our own medicine. However, we claim this difference between ourself and those whom we criticise; we are not trying to exhumate dogmas from Scripture to command their acceptance by our readers. We are simply and only investigating the claims of the individual to full liberty to differ from all views however dogmatic or orthodox, so