

because His pre-existence is denied, have doubtless been brought on by the incomplete way in which the orthodoxy of times past had understood the important fact of the appearance of Jesus Christ. The person of the Man-God was described in such a manner that the Divine attributes which He was supposed to have retained as a man interfered every instant with the free expansion and the full exercise of His humanity. Now the tendency of this age is directed in all spheres toward the human. Humanism is somewhat the religion of our time. This watchword has its good and its evil side. It is not surprising that many thinkers, reduced by incomplete formulas either to accept the God in Jesus and to reject the man, or to accept the man and to deny the God, have preferred the latter.

This problem is of a scientific rather than of a religious kind; it is, perhaps, the most difficult of all theological problems, for it aims to reconcile the two characteristic elements of the person of Christ, which seem to exclude each other. However, it is not lawful for the Church which Christ has established to sacrifice His humanity to His divinity, as the old school unwittingly did; or His divinity to His humanity, as the new school knowingly does. Why, the reality of His humanity is proved by the whole history of Jesus and by His own words, "Now you seek to kill Me, a man that hath told you the truth" (John viii. 40). "Go to My brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father" (John xx. 17). From similar utterances the beloved disciple has drawn this sublime expression, "And the Word was made flesh" (John i. 14). In pursuance of such testimonies Paul has been able to say, ". . . much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by *one man*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many" (Rom. v. 15). Hence the Docetæ of the early centuries were mistaken who made out that the humanity of Jesus was a mere appearance; but they are not less in error—the modern thinkers—who teach that the human person of Jesus, in nowise different from ours, had no pre-existence. He who said, "Before Abraham was, I am," has attributed to Himself a superiority over us which differs from His holiness or His mission, and a divinity different from that which He is thought to have obtained after His resurrection. One cannot become God; or, if it is possible in mythology, it is not so in Bible monotheism. When John said, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," he said it as one who had himself been a hearer of Jesus, and not as a disciple of Plato; and when Paul wrote, "Who, being in the form of God, . . . made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," he wrote it after he had received "the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6), when he was caught up into paradise, and "heard unspeakable words, which it is not possible for a man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 4).

What does it matter if our formulas are nothing but stammering in the presence of these facts of salvation? Our duty, in facing negations of the