and malice denounced Him as a blasphemous pretender.

Although manifold views have been advanced concerning Christ, they may all be classified under one of these opinions. Some have asserted that the Lord Jesus was simply man; others again that he was divine—that His humanity was unreal—that his bodily form was but a shadow.

And there is still a third view, which is the belief the Christian Church, and which was clearly taught by Christ Himself—that He was God as well as man—that He was one with the Father—the Saviour of mankind—and the judge who will yet summon the whole human race before the tribunal of eternal justice, and utter the sentence fraught with endless bliss or woe to every soul.

Need we wonder that man in his feeble efforts to comprehend the mysteries of the God-head-in attempting to solve the mystery of mysteries, God in buman form incarnate, should have signally failed and have arrived at results as far opposed as it was possible to entertain? Is not man himself fearfully and wonderfully made? How much has the research of ages left unknown concerning the buman organism? Is not the union of mind and body as great a mystery to-day as it was in the dawn of Philosophy? Have we not in our own time schools of thought wholly at variance as to the essence of mind?

And if our knowledge of man is limited and imperfect; how much more so our knowledge of God; and how prope must the human understanding be to err when it attempts to deal with the mystery of the person of Jesus Christ which embraces the deity and humanity—the inexplicable union represented by the God-man?

Human thought when trusting to its own illumination has ended by ignoring the humanity or Divinity of the Saviour's person. These are old errors, and to them all subsequent erroneons views can be reduced, although they may differ as to their mode of expression.

Modern objections against the humanity or Divinity of our Lord do not materially differ from either one of those false opinions which prevailed far back in the history of the Christian Church.

The arguments now advanced may be more subtle—more seductive and characteristic of the age in which they are urged; but on close examination it will be found that they are based upon the radical error that the Lord Jesus was purely and exclusively human.

Few, even of the boldest of infidel writers have ventured to deny the existence of the man Christ Jesus; although they have reverted to many ingenious devices to reduce Him to the rank of a purely human being. As a man they have paid the highest tribute to His moral excellence—have admitted His unequal greatness—His stainless character, but would fain rob Him of His Divinity.

Among the opponents of Christianity who could lay claim to high intellectual distinction, but one alone was so daring and infatuated as to relegate the historical narrative of the life and character of the Lord Jesus to the mythical domain.

But is there not a consistency in his bold sceptionsm, even though it would sap the foundation of all historical narrative, that is wanting in that infidelity which so far respects the testimony of former ages that it admits the reality of the personage of the Lord Jesus, but regards Him only as a moralist of unequalled purity, and worthy of the highest veneration?

How those who profess to be honestly in search of truth, who claim to be candid in their investigations and really desirous of arriving at conclusions based upon incontrevertible testimony, can go