

perform supernatural works—not more in attestation of his mission as God's ambassador and revealer, than as the proper and fitting setting of the crown of moral glory with which his own proper Godsonship had already encircled his head. We believe him, first for his words, which reveal to us his character; and we believe his works as the secondary evidence of that great doctrine which we have already received,—that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God.

Christ, then, when truly seen, known with the feeling and heart, becomes to the Christian his own evidence. I say *seen*—rather than affirmed as the result of any logical process. Indeed they who trust alone to a verbal and constricted logic will never know Christ, or only at a great distance. Logic and reason are greatly lauded by the sceptical school—and justly too;—but some other fine faculties of our nature are too much despised in weighing religious questions. Perhaps the sceptic will smile when we quote Paul, that “with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” What have the heart and feeling to do with evidence? it has been said. Ah, it is a miserably dry barren logic that tries to deal with moral questions without them! It is like the tap root of the tree proposing to do without the million fibres which search after all nourishments bringing them up for the use of the root, which is thus but as the channel through which the juices pass, to the elaboration of bud and leaf—flower and fruit. Upon the state of the fibre as much as on that of the root is the health of the tree dependent; and upon the state of the feeling, as much as on that of the reason, are true judgments and healthy conclusions in the moral world founded. A man of dull feeling, hard heart, and depraved moral sentiments, will as much miss a true apprehension of the character of Jesus Christ, as though reason were unsated and lunacy were ascendant. Indeed, our perception of Christ's character is dependent on our whole being—on our capacity as reasoners, and on our character as men. What is Jesus to each man but his *ideals* of Jesus? What is any man to us

but our *ideas* of him? The Jesus of the Gospels is one, but the Jesus of each person is many. There will be a general similitude in the images within the souls of his many worshippers, but each man will give him a subjective colouring from the character of his own reason and heart. There are, no doubt, great specific types of opinion regarding him, differing widely, not merely as the leaves of the same tree differ, but as the bramble from the pine. There is the low humanitarian view, like ivy creeping along the earth, taking hold of Christ as though he were some ancient tower to be adorned with the graceful foliage of sentiment and compliment, but as belonging essentially to the decaying past. Then there is the view of the Arian, clinging with its tendrils to his superhumanity, and drawing its nourishment from the Divine unigenitus; and there is the still higher Trinitarian view, which beside all that, lays hold on Him with its hopes and worship as very God of very God, although within the limits of the human. In these great types of belief there is vast variety, correspondent with the clearness of the perceptions of those who hold them, setting at defiance the definitions of Athanasius. But as there is a true type of the tree or of man, to which each individual more or less conforms, and yet is not absolutely alike, so there is the true type or idea of Christ, to which all men's souls which are made strong in reason, and pure in heart, tend to conform,—that is to say, who are *regenerate*, for what is regeneracy in its effects but the restoration of our whole being to strength of reason, to purity of nature, to holiness of purpose and life—the spirit of God having used the truth for this very end, that the *Man* of God *might be made perfect*. Of course sanctification implies that the capacity for truth and for righteousness requires still further to be enlarged and filled up, leaving room for differences of opinion of Christ. Nor should there be any attempt to force men to the adoption of opinions which may have closer conformity to the objective truth than those to which they have already attained. By our confessions and our catechisms, and our teach-