

We are reminded just here of a circumstance which occurred on one of our fields. A minister who strongly opposed Divine Guidance as taught by us, preached one day on the baptism of the Holy Ghost. An acute listener said after the sermon he wondered what the ministers wanted them to receive the Holy Ghost for. He couldn't understand why the Holy Ghost should be received at all if he were not to be obeyed and followed into all truth.

A. TRUAX.

Courtland, Ont.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST?

THE Rev. B. Sherlock's article in the EXPOSITOR for April on "The Divinity of Christ, is it a Myth," marks a new departure in the history of the EXPOSITOR. We have looked through the magazine since its inception and we notice an entire absence of controversy to date. We have now presented for the first time in this magazine, I think, two professed "doers of the will" expressing different opinions apparently about the same matter. We are more interested in this "new departure" and what it means, than we are for the upholding of one of the sides of the Divinity controversy, which we are not sure but that we had something to do with initiating.

Since we have commenced to read the EXPOSITOR, we have frequently observed its printed platform, "Catholic in Spirit—loyal to truth—non-sectarian." Knowing the fact that the editor of this non-sectarian magazine was a Methodist minister in good standing, we watched with interest the "Evolution" of non-sectarianism through its columns, what kind of truth it was "loyal" to, what limit there was to its Catholicity, and yet the editor's ministerial standing remain intact. We confess we have been gratified beyond measure that the platform as laid down is something more real than nominal. We love reality. We hate sham. We further confess that when we saw that our own opinions were permitted to be attacked, and the "other side" was

given the same liberty that we were given, we were more than pleased. We dearly love fair play. We believe Jesus loved it too, and while the servant cannot be greater than his Lord, there is nothing said about not being able to be as He was, in fact it is enjoined upon the servant that he must be as his Lord was.

We see no reason why Rev. Mr. Sherlock should not have the liberty of his opinions and we are glad to see that the EXPOSITOR has given him the liberty of publishing them. His opinions are evidently Trinitarian. My opinions may be characterized as "limited" Trinitarian opinions, i.e. they are limited by my knowledge. They are not Dualarian neither are they Unitarian. I have reached that stage of Christian experience where I can grow out of opinions as well as grow into them.

Our invariable experience is that as old opinions disappear and a vacuum is created, God readily occupies the space created by the disappearance of the old opinions. It is astonishing with what tenacity men will hold on to the faith once delivered to the saints, when they are allowed to change the word "faith" to the words "doctrine" or "opinions." Let faith go! Maintain the true doctrine! "By faith ye are saved," is transformed by many into "by doctrine are ye saved." There are those who admit that all that is necessary to "know the doctrine," is to "do the will," who act as though they must contend earnestly for the doctrine to continue to "do the will." Is not continuance in knowledge of "doctrine" a necessary concomitant of continuance in doing the will. If to do the will is to know of the doctrine, and the will be done by the year, will not the doctrine be pure and right and true by the year.

And yet we are pleased by Rev. Mr. Sherlock's defense of the Divinity of Christ. Of course he does not touch the only question at issue, viz: the immaculate conception.

We respect honest opinions. We believe he is honest when he exalts the Bible as the "documentary standard of