

and judicial a spirit as possible to consider the contention as to whether the claims for Christ's divinity can possibly rest upon these things. And as all cannot be treated of in a single article, we take up first the "miracles."

And as the miracle that gave evidence of greatest power was undoubtedly the raising of the dead, we remark, that if this be considered as evidence that Jesus was divine, then, by the same reasoning, we must conclude that the disciples were divine, for Jesus, on commissioning the disciples, said, "Go—preach—Heal the sick—raise the dead." And the record is that not only did Jesus raise the widow's son, Jairus' daughter and Lazarus, but that Peter raised Dorcas and Paul raised Eutychus. Now, if the evidence of Christ's divinity consists in the raising of the dead, there is just as good ground for the contention that Peter and Paul were divine as they certainly raised the dead, if the record is to be believed.

But in examining the record concerning the "raising of the dead," we were surprised to find that only Matthew, out of the four evangelists, records that Christ instructed his disciples to raise the dead. Mark, Luke and John are silent as to this command. And then, as we have no record as to any of the disciples except Peter obeying the command, it necessarily follows that the contention of the Roman Catholic church that Peter represented Jesus has some foundation. He certainly represented Jesus in the matter of raising the dead.

But where did Paul get his authority to raise Eutychus? Paul was not one of the twelve neither was he one of the seventy.

And may it not be possible that many more dead were raised than the record states?

We presume that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and the Apostle Paul only recorded such incidents as in their judgment were necessary to prove the truth of Christianity being what they claimed, viz., the best form of religion extant.

Then as to healing the sick, while Jesus certainly healed Peter's wife's mother, the nobleman's son, the leper, the paralytic, the infirm man, the man with the withered hand, the centurion's servant, the demoniacs, the blind man, the Syrophenician woman's daughter, the deaf and dumb man, the ten lepers and many others, is it not a fact that Peter healed the man at the "Beautiful gate" of the temple who had been lame from his mother's womb? And did not Philip heal many that were palsied and lame?

Did not Peter heal Aeneas who had kept his bed eight years?

Did not Paul heal a certain man impotent in his feet, a cripple from his mother's womb who never had walked?

Did not Paul heal himself when bitten by the viper at Melita?

And were there not special miracles performed by Paul "insomuch that unto the sick were carried away from Paul's body handkerchiefs or aprons and diseases departed from them"?

And what about the miraculous power by which Paul smote Elymas the sorcerer blind?

If healing the sick is any evidence of Christ's divinity of birth or that he was in anywise different from other men, then by cold logic is not the same healing of the sick by Peter, Philip and Paul, evidence of their divinity of birth? Why is not the same contention made for their immaculate conception as for that of Jesus?

We are not attacking Christianity. We never had as unbounded confidence in Christianity as we have at this moment. A Christianity that will not bear the glitter of day upon its every vestige, we characterize as spurious. A Christianity that shrinks and shivers—that frets and fumes at honest examination has nothing to do with Jesus. As Jesus asked doubting Thomas to examine the wounds on his body, so would he have all the evidences on which his religion is based submitted to the keenest scrutiny.