

faith and directory of life." When he asserts that "these documents do abundantly sustain him"—and that "these documents express the mind of God to him," we have no cause to question his statements. But will Mr. Sherlock give us the liberty of being sustained by God instead of by "documents"—of counting God true and every man a liar, even if all the saints of the Bible are included?

If I testify to a "victorious and satisfactory life" with less dogmatic knowledge about this Divinity question than he possesses, will he reject my testimony? If not, then we have the spectacle of two walking together agreed, but with contra opinions, and we are perfectly well aware that this is in the nature of a miracle in these days.

The Divinity of Christ is evidently no myth to Rev. B. Sherlock. We don't expect that he will, however, lay it down as a rule that all who walk in the Spirit must believe just as he does. If so then we only have another "new departure in an old direction," viz. "He shall guide you into all truth" except the Divinity of Jesus—in this, the Holy Ghost must be guided by man. That is we must be under law to the Spirit in everything but this Divinity of Christ doctrine.—That is "the Holy Ghost shall teach you all things" but one,—that one you must accept the doctrine of man about—the man in this particular case being the Rev. B. Sherlock. Having become a child, in our own innocent guilelessness, we fail yet to take in, how the Bible can be the "directory of life" and at the same time the Holy Ghost be the director of life—how we can be guided by the "documentary standard" and by the Holy Ghost at the same time. This looks to us as though instead of the one law of life being set forth, there is a semblance of at least two. But we are teachable. Mr. Sherlock may have some occult meaning that we are not as yet learned in. We will therefore patiently wait till the tree of knowledge expands in our case, determined that this tree shall contain only good opinions, not bad—determined that as for ourselves we shall know nothing save Jesus and Him crucified.

Since our utterances on this Divinity of Christ question we have had all sorts of conceptions formed as to what our belief was. Many know a great deal more about what our beliefs are than we do ourselves.

As a matter of fact in our unsophisticatedness we have reached the stage when we can change our opinions without losing our self respect. Growth in knowledge necessitates change of opinion. We can change our opinions a half dozen times a day now without difficulty. At the same time we find ourselves changing opinions less frequently now, largely because we don't form so many as we used to. We have not changed our opinions recently on the Divinity question—neither do we expect to.

Mr. Sherlock's position appears to be thus: Jesus used language that was "ill-timed and dangerous if it was not absolutely impious," if He did not teach that He was Divine—"that he had an identity of nature and dignity with God." He quotes the standard passages, "In the beginning was the word, and the word was God," and "The word was made flesh and dwelt among us." He also quotes Coleridge whom he calls "celebrated," as saying, that "If a lawyer would interpret British Statutes as we interpret these verses, he would be promptly expelled from any British court."

This is argument in favor of the literal interpretation of the Scriptures with a vengeance. We presume Rev. Mr. Sherlock has literally fulfilled that Scripture where it says, "if thine eye offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee"—also that other Scripture written by his favorite "saint," "If I then the Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet, for I have given you an example that ye should also do as I have done unto you."

By what right does the Rev. Mr. S. insist on me interpreting John's words "the word was God and became flesh" as meaning that Jesus was "immaculately conceived," until he has fulfilled these other words of the same Jesus written by the same "saint"