

act on our part. For the very fact that such desire has place in their minds is proof to us, as it ought to be to them, that after all they are hero worshippers, and have not learned to worship God in spirit and in truth. These are the parties we would rather do what we may to keep unsettled, until they find their settlement in God alone.

The personal views of Bro's Woodsworth, Dickenson, Sherlock or Truax on the question of the divinity of Christ do not weigh one hair in our estimate of their spirituality. Certainly we do dogmatize on the fact that if they do not share this thought with us that then their spirituality may well be called in question. Moreover we hesitate not to say that the fact of such a lack on their part, if it exists, will not be long in declaring itself to every member of the Association who is spiritual. Not that it shall declare itself in some subtle form that only the spiritual can discover it, but also in such form as will make it manifest to all when viewed from the standpoint of common honesty.

When discussing the subject of the atonement we gave forth the only, to us, thinkable way to make the modern definitions concerning Christ's divinity harmonize with his life as a genuine, healthy example for us all. This was, that whatever knowledge He obtained concerning His divinity must have come to him as a distinct, personal revelation, after precisely the same pattern that the prophets before Him received their revelations and His followers after Him receive our revelations. This thought is in harmony with any conceivable definition of divinity, as far as power or equality with the Father is concerned, provided always that He, Jesus, was shut up absolutely to the walk in the Spirit just as we are.

But this restriction on His part we maintain is particularly taught by Himself where He declares that He always did the will of the Father. Do we stand or fall by any particular definition of His divinity

at this point? We certainly do not, for the best of all reasons, to wit, ignorance. And yet we claim to be a follower of Jesus Christ in the complete sense of the expression. Should we now be placed side by side with Peter and John in their following of Him in the days of His flesh, we would yield ourselves up absolutely to be guided and taught by Him just as we do now to be taught by the Holy Ghost. There is no reserve in our consecration to Christ, and this loyalty to Him we show by our obedience to the Holy Ghost to whom He has committed us in His Gospel, nor can we imagine this our attitude to Him being changed in the slightest degree by the establishment or destruction, on paper or in the brain of man, of any of the many definitions of His divinity which now abound.

WHAT OF HIS HUMANITY.

ON this part of the subject but little need be said, seeing that all are, in creed at least, agreed that He was really and truly a man. Of course there are differing shades of meaning given to the thought by differing theologians, but thus far no one has raised the heresy cry against any for being extreme in teaching the fact of the perfect humanity of the founder of Christianity.

However, even this side of the subject could easily be pursued far enough to raise the cry of alarm did we deem it necessary. For example, would it entirely destroy His example for us if, before he was baptized of John in Jordan and therefore before the Holy Ghost came upon Him, He had entertained doubts as to His Messiahship, and then learned obedience to the heavenly call by the things which he suffered because of these doubts or even possibly acts of disobedience. For we remark that doubt and disobedience are classed alike in the Bible. And we might further ask, How could He learn obedi-