

most if not all the reputed facts of the early history of Rome, does not only, not make doubtful the above facts, but tends to establish their truthfulness, need we any other kind of proofs for the truthfulness of sacred history? When a matter can, by such proofs, be made absolutely certain in secular history, why should we call for additional proofs to establish the facts in Biblical history, nay, should we not rather deprecate such a call for additional proofs as suspicious, or at all events unreasonable and prefer to have the reputed facts of sacred history stand or fall by precisely the same examination that other historical facts are rejected or established?

We maintain, then, that not only is there no difference in the kind of arguments which go to establish the facts of Bible history, but that it is in the best interests of all concerned that there should be no difference.

Before the exhaustive examination which establishes the real facts of history and rejects as mythical all claims concerning the verbal or general inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures, after the modern orthodox ideas of such inspiration, are found to be absolutely without foundation, and therefore it is natural that theologians, of the special pleading sort, are unwilling to submit their inspiration dogmas to such all-sided examination. This has been their attitude to such criticism thus far, and doubtless will be in the future. But this unwillingness on their part to submit their theories to all-sided examination is one of the proofs of the theoretical nature of their creeds about inspiration.

But we maintain that the essential facts of Christianity are but the more firmly established the more exhaustive the examination they are subjected to.

The details of this examination we shall not attempt to even mention in this article, simply stating that the facts which even pronounced opponents of Christianity accept as established beyond a doubt, are quite sufficient to support the

the whole structure of Scriptural Christianity, so that, even the enemies of the Pentecostal Gospel being judges, the foundation of our faith in Christ Jesus is established beyond dispute.

But whilst this is true, we are aware that the foundations of many of the creeds which are presumably founded on Christ and His teachings are not beyond dispute, for many, if not all of them, require certain doubtful matters to be established as facts else they fall to the ground, and so they cannot withstand modern investigation.

This being the case, it is certain that their defenders before the swelling tide of modern research, in place of becoming more liberal, will become more and more narrow and bigotted, and tend more and more to substitute bare assertions and anathemas for careful, exhaustive research. Let him who doubts this our conclusion, observe honestly, and without prejudice, and time will convince.

EXPOSITION.

"I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again."—JESUS.

THE orthodox, *i. e.*, the unpentecostal explanation of this passage is, that Christ, in His conscious might, as differing from all men and being in very deed the Almighty, could deal with His human life just as He could deal with the planet Jupiter—blot it out of existence and restore it again at will. According to this exposition of the passage there is not, there cannot be, the slightest similarity between this experience of Jesus Christ and any possible experience in us. Why then burden the page with such a manifest truism, we may well ask? Certainly a being possessing Almighty, independent power can do anything conceivable. Does not, we ask, such explanation of the words of Jesus make them virtually burden the page—a blemish rather than an embellishment?

Suppose we look for some explanation which will not land us into such absurdity. The above exegesis naturally leaves out