

godliness with contentment is great gain.

It seems that "discreet silence" was maintained regarding how far "psychological development proceeded into Jesus' life."

We wonder why in this connection the Conference did not enter upon a study of the "greater things" that "ye" shall do. It is evident that Jesus himself thought he had not exhausted the possibilities of the human. But of course in the realm of mystery plain statements of Jesus count for nothing.

Then it certainly is an "interesting" admission, when from such an orthodox source it should be stated and called a "fact" that Jesus' spiritual life was maintained through prayer, by faith, and by means of the word and Spirit of God, *as ours*. We certainly don't feel inclined to cavil at this admission, except to say that the instances of prayer recorded are not numerous.

In answer to the question "but how represent the person" of Jesus, we have to say in all seriousness there is only one way of representing his person and that is to live the life that he lived—to be as he was—to be one of the brethren that he was the first born of, to be like him here—to please the Father just as he pleased the Father—to do the will of the Father as he did the will of the Father.

Anything else than this would mis-represent him. And surely there is no one wicked enough to seek to mis-represent Christ and yet lay claim to the name Christian?

"Every theory of representing Jesus up to date has contradictions in it." Are their contradictions necessary? We would like, but expect to wait sometime, for an authoritative answer to this question from some representative orthodox source.

Then the *apparent* conclusion reached is that the problem as to the relation between the humanity and divinity of Christ is an insoluble one, and that we must walk by faith. This is the old stereotyped conclusion. Now we protest against such a

parody on faith. True we are to walk by faith, but faith has "evidence," and men are not expected to swallow unsovable mysteries by faith. Abraham by faith did a reasonable thing; God told him to take Isaac to the mount. He did so. By faith, Noah obeyed God in building the Ark. It was a reasonable thing to obey God. It is always a reasonable thing to obey God. It is a simple thing to obey God—just as simple as Christianity—in fact, a wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein.

Through faith kingdoms have been subdued, righteousness wrought, promises obtained, lions' mouths stopped, the power of fire quenched, the edge of the sword escaped. By faith, men were stoned, sawn asunder, went about in sheep skins, in goat skins, wandered in deserts, mountains and caves. And all these things were reasonable things to do. But that God would lay down a rule as binding as a law of the Medes and Persians and insist that everybody should accept an admitted unsolvable mystery, and expect them to walk by faith in this mystery, not knowing what the solution of the mystery is, we utterly repudiate. God is a righteous God.

H. DICKENSON.

We pour into his bosom all our care,  
And tell to him our heart's desire;  
And then He giveth patience just to wait and wait.

But all our restlessness is stilled,  
And we are given the sweet assurance that our heart's desire shall be fulfilled.

—Selected.

By any shore or mount or sea,  
Where faith and hope and love abide,  
And self is lost in sacrifice,  
There the celestial gates swing wide.  
And heaven descends to human eyes;  
There Christ the Lord is born again;  
There is his new nativity.

—Edna Dean Proctor.