

Now if this writer held the present orthodox views concerning Christ, it is passing strange that he should bring out so clearly and definitely this part of the subject, and in no place make full explanation so as to reconcile difficulties.

Indeed, in one place he but complicates the difficulty in place of attempting to clear it up. For when discoursing about Melchisedec he remarks: "But without any dispute the less is blessed of the better (greater)."

It is evident therefore to us that he by no means attempts to explain fully his views upon the whole question of Christ's divinity and humanity, and so we are warranted in concluding that, like as with all others who have failed to be taught by the Holy Ghost as the one and *only* teacher for the individual, there was no clear-cut thought of it in his mind.

For we remark here, that there cannot be a clear apprehension of this subject when the only method of its solution is overlooked. This our contention is not only established by the definite teaching of Jesus; but is also confirmed by the universal haze which shrouds all legalistic writings on the subject.

If one will but read this epistle backwards he will find in the last chapters the presence of that legalism which must at once dismiss from his mind all hope of finding correct reasoning or statement concerning the nature of Christ's humanity and divinity. We therefore continue our researches, or criticisms, not as looking for the clear teachings of Jesus Christ in the epistle, but rather to compare it with other legalistic writings; and that we may be more fully established in the truth, that he, who rejects, or ignores, or overlooks Christ's directions concerning the method of learning of him, must of necessity be at sea concerning the whole matter.

Jesus said to his disciples "In that day (Pentecost) ye shall know that I am in the

Father and ye in me and I in you." That is, they could only know of these mysteries from the Holy Ghost, and, moreover, it is evident to us that their continued knowledge was connected with continuous walk in the Spirit. For any man therefore to clothe another, though it were Paul, or even Christ himself, with power to explain this spiritual knowledge as a dogma to be intellectually apprehended and believed in, is to depart from the spirit and letter of Christ's teaching, and so to court the regions of cloud-land.

We note this necessary indistinctness in this writer at many other points besides the ones mentioned. For example, in dealing with that strange individual, who suddenly meets us in the history of Abraham, he evidently betrays a taint of credulity when he talks of him as, "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life."

The writings of Clement were rejected as uncanonical because tainted with credulity concerning the Phoenix legend. But we think that if one breaks away from superstitious reverence for the opinions of *The Fathers* he will have some difficulty in deciding which is the greater instance of credulity.

We imagine the holy horror of many legalistic Christians, if they should read the above paragraph, a holy horror exactly similar to that of an orthodox heathen who beholds a heretic aim a blow at his sacred idol! Think you, the horror stricken one would stay to reason or examine the credentials of his idol? Nay, verily, he *knows* his idol is all right and so he must needs show his loyalty thereto by going for the sacrilegious wretch who would dare play the iconoclast before him.

What puzzles conscientious theologians have got into over this same ancient priest with a long name! We used to follow their winding arguments and con-