

side of this question with restful nerves and complacency of spirit.

Bro. Truax, in his recent articles, has shown how utterly useless to us would be the life of Christ as an example if the least trace of the divine entered into the make up of Jesus provided He should have been made conscious of it after some manner unknown to us.

But then one asks, could we not get on without the example of Christ? Certainly, we reply, at least that is our opinion. Could Jesus not have imparted, we ask, these secrets of Pentecost to His disciples and then let them be our examples? To some minds, it is true, the legitimate results of such teaching concerning Christ would be astringent of absurdities. But what of that? To other minds, constituted somewhat differently, these absurdities might not appear.

Hence it must be evident to all that he who has arrived at the conclusion that any or all the modern theories or definitions of the divinity of Christ are not proved, and at the same time would teach this, his conclusion as essential truth, in that fact he would make evident to all that he himself did not illustrate the walk in the Spirit.

Apply this general truth to particular individuals and its value will at once be apprehended. Two writers in the pages of the EXPOSITOR have taken *apparently* widely different positions on the question. One brings to the fore the divinity of Christ and pours a very hail of questions, in logical sequence, on those holding the ordinary orthodox notions concerning His divinity.

Now, granted that this writer walks in the Spirit after the pattern of the teaching of the Association, then it follows as a certainty that he cannot discount the professed walk in the Spirit of the other writer, one iota, because of his different conclusions concerning the same subject. Nay, if he even should teach that these so called orthodox views concerning the divinity of Christ must necessarily hamper

or impede his walk in the Spirit, this contention on the part of the first writer alluded to, cannot but discount his own professed spiritual walk. The very right he demands to investigate fully and independently, to be a proper demand includes the right of the other to arrive at conclusions entirely different from his own, without in the slightest degree interfering with his personal walk with God.

But the converse of this proposition is also true, viz., that the latter writer in establishing to his satisfaction his theory or definition of the divinity of Christ, however it may differ from that of the first writer, cannot, as one of the results of his investigations, discount the professed walk in the Spirit of the other because of differing conclusions on this question, without in that act proving to all onlookers that he himself fails to exemplify the true walk in the Spirit. Nay, if he, too, even teaches that the other would succeed better in his spiritual walk by adopting his, the latter's views on the divinity question, even this thought entertained by him would discount his own professed experience in the minds of all.

Behold then how harmless the fact of different writers in the EXPOSITOR arriving at different conclusions on the divinity question whilst at the same time both profess to walk in the Spirit!

But possibly neither of these writers, or only one of them really walks in the Spirit. What then? Why, if these, their writings, shall help in any way to make the truth come out as it exists concerning themselves, then will the EXPOSITOR, in publishing the writings of both, prove the friend of all. Much more if both make good their claims concerning the spiritual walk will the good of all be conserved.

We are aware that many are looking for our personal views on the subject in hand, hoping for some dogmatic pronouncements, as if that would tend to calm the stormy waters of controversy. Such we trust will ever look in vain for such foolish