

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

UNION OF THE DIVINE AND THE HUMAN IN THE EXTERNALS OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. I. E. DWINELL, SALEM, MASS.

It is the object of this Article to trace and illustrate *the mingling of the divine and the human in some of the externals of Christianity.*

Christianity does indeed, as a life in the soul, work itself out in external results, in which results and process also there is a certain blending of the divine and the human. But it is not this part of its exterior which we are to consider. In addition to these lodgements of Christianity in the domain of sense, standing between Christians and the world, there are lodgements in it, standing between them and God, channels through which he communicates spiritual good. Among these are the Sacred Scriptures, the Church, and the Sacraments. It is the vital union of the agency of God and the agency of man in the production of this section of our religion, which furnishes the object and scope of this discussion.

It may be readily admitted by all, that there is some connection between these two agencies, in the sphere contemplated; that God furnishes an element, and man an element, in these externals. At the same time, there is no very general definite conception of the way in which these diverse forces work together to secure the desired result; nor in what proportions; nor to what extent; nor where the one leaves off, and the other begins. Some give the superiority to the divine agency, and only a subordinate, mechanical agency to the human. Others reverse the order, magnifying man's part, and depreciating God's. Others conceive of them as acting side by side, conspiring to one result, but disconnected, with an unappreciable but real gulf between them; and others, as consecutive, joining together, or seeming to do

so, — for they do not absolutely touch — endwise ; the one doing its part, and abruptly terminating, and then the other taking up the work and finishing it.

The true conception, as we shall endeavor to show, is very unlike any of these. According to this, the divine and the human interpenetrate and blend dynamically, in the production of the established outward elements and facts of Christianity between God and man, but in such a way that neither loses its nature or integrity. Neither overlies or crushes the freedom of the other. Each acts, and acts freely, according to its own laws ; and yet both act together, interpenetrating but not fusing, one but two, two but one. The divine agency is everywhere present, but it does not extinguish or overshadow or crowd the human ; and the human is equally present, but it does no violence to the divine. The divine is in the human, yet is not lost in it ; the human is in the divine, yet it is still human. Their union is vital, not mechanical.

Its type is the union of the Son of God and the Son of man in Christ. He is the great fundamental, external element of Christianity between God and man ; and in him perfect and complete divinity and perfect and complete humanity, each in its integrity, meet and blend in one person. The divinity does not exclude everything corporeal, and make the life of Christ a continued theophany ; that is Docetism.¹ It does not crowd out the rational human soul ; that is Apollinarianism.² The divinity and the humanity, though side by side and joined by contact, are not separate and independent ; that is Nestorianism.³ The divinity does not absorb the humanity, so that the two, though distinct and separate in origin, are in manifestation confounded, having but one nature as well as one person ; that is Eustychianism,⁴ or the Monophysite doctrine. Nei-

¹ Neander, *Church History*, Vol. I. p. 386 ; Hase, *Church History*, § 37 ; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 98.

² Hase, § 104 ; Hagenbach, § 99.

³ Neander, Vol. II. p. 450 ; Hase, § 113 ; Hagenbach, § 100.

⁴ Neander, Vol. II. p. 506 ; Hase, § 114 ; Hagenbach, § 101.

ther does the humanity expel the divinity, and leave Christ a mere man, however miraculously endowed; that is Socinianism.¹ Nor does it, in any way, emphasize itself at the expense of the divinity, producing a doctrine lying anywhere between the wide extremes of the highest Unitarianism and the lowest Rationalism. All these errors, one after another, has the church thrown off as unscriptural and unsound, as it has steadily but slowly gravitated through the conflicts of opinion towards the true doctrine, under the influence of the Spirit, who is promised² to guide into the whole circle of gospel truth; and it rests in the position that both natures interpenetrate and coöperate, each in its integrity, in a living, personal union. The divinity and the humanity are fused into one person, not one nature, in such a way that, without substantial change, in either, of any kind, of addition or abatement, the divinity is divinity still; the humanity, humanity still.

With what propriety, therefore, are the subordinate, impersonal, external elements of Christianity, the institutions between God and men for the delivery of spiritual blessings from the former to the latter, produced in a similar way, by a vital union and coöperation of divine and human forces; each losing nothing of its identity or individuality. They are, in this respect, like their Head — and it is meet. In them, as in Christ, two diverse forces, a divine and a human, coalesce and retain their individuality, by one of those mysterious vital processes by which elements of a different kind are taken up and held together in a living union.

But there is something more than correspondence and propriety, that furnishes the ground for this mingling of the divine and the human in these outward and established elements of the gospel. The ground is deeper, and is substantially the same — with the exception of the relation of this latter to an atonement — as led to the incarnation of the Son of God. “The fact of God’s becoming man,” says Neander,³ is in order to the humanization of the divine, and the

¹ Hase, § 372; Hagenbach, § 234.

² John 16 : 13.

³ Church History, Vol. I. p. 507.

deification of the human ;” by which he evidently does not mean a result involving the loss or absorption of the properties of either the divine or the human — his whole theology precludes this supposition — but their most intimate union, under a vital bond. It is the very object of religion itself to bridge over the separation between God and man. It is evident, therefore, that, while one of the piers must be in heaven, and the other on the earth, there must be a mingling of the divine and human agencies by which the material structures are thrown over from the one to the other. There is, thus, in the highway between the parties, along which devout exercises and gracious influences are intended to travel up and down, something belonging to each of them, blended inseparably together ; a symbol of the nature of the gospel itself ; a prophecy of its results. It would be unnatural and incongruous, a procedure torn away from the analogy and fitness of things in the kingdom of God, if he should cause the organs of communication between him and men to be, either wholly the product of one of the parties, or of the two joining their efforts mechanically and separably ; so that, on the one side or the other, the communication should fall bluntly upon a channel, in origin and structure wholly unlike itself ; — the influences from God, issuing from the world of pure spirit, and abruptly striking on organs entirely human ; or the aspirations and exercises of man, impinging suddenly on media having nothing human about them, nothing to graduate and ease the transition. These externals must be born of God, that the Spirit of God may be at home on them ; of man, that he may find in them his own kindred ; of God and man, in vital concert, that there may be no difficult and abrupt transition from the part contributed by the one to that by the other, defeating or impairing either of these results.

The ground of this union, therefore, is in the nature and object of religion itself, which is, to unite God and man.

There is an additional reason for this union. It lies in the effectiveness of the instrumentalities. There must be a divine element in them to win respect, confidence, rev-

erence, and secure permanence. If only man appeared in their production, they could have no hold on the heart of the race. We could see in them no binding force, no authority, no special advantage. They would be simply towers which men have erected towards heaven, the tops of which we could see, and should see that they do not lodge in it. We should spurn them, and laugh at the folly of those hoping to ascend thither in that way. The consequence would be, each would erect his own tower; and though we, standing under it, might not see its top, others would, and would pass it by. We should say: We want something to be the organs, and give assurance of the presence, of a Power able to raise us above ourselves naturally, to a better estate; these are man's creations, playthings; we cannot trust our immortal hopes to them; away with them.

Equally necessary is a human element to awaken sympathy, and attract. The weak, shy, perverse faith of man would be slow indeed to approach God over organs wholly unhuman and uncongenial. It needs to be drawn "with cords of a *man*, with bands of love."¹ Men would not contemplate passing abruptly from human to divine instrumentalities, without a chill and a shudder. If the bridge between God and them confronted them with a dazzling divine end, few would have the boldness to place their feet on it, or approach it. A human look is necessary to win, and a real human element to retain sympathy.

These two elements must blend together and be inseparable, else the purpose for which they exist will be defeated. The divine will be repulsive, the human without authority; and men will separate them, throwing away the human as spurious, an addition, a worthless fabrication, and shunning the divine as bald, cold, awful. They must both intertwine, and interpenetrate, and grow together in the product, as the different elements in a living organism lap around and embrace one another, and are inseparable save by its destruction. The one is necessary to give character,

¹ Hosea 11: 4.

the other attraction; and as character without attraction is ineffective, so is attraction without character. And when both blend in these externals, causing them to be at once truly divine and truly human, they are influential,—commanding respect and winning. They are of men, and men can approach them; but they cannot trifle with them, for they are seen to be of God also. They are of God, and men reverence them; for they are of men also.

Thus, to make these elements of Christianity designed for its conservation and diffusion effective, this union is necessary.

It is evident from what has been said, that any misconception or misplacement of the relation of the two agencies employed in their production, must be attended with fatal consequences. And one of the permanent problems for solution is their right adjustment and equilibrium in faith and practice. If undue emphasis is laid on either side, the delicate balance which God intended to be maintained between them is disturbed; and as most persons seem to be constituted with an inability to grasp equally both poles of a dual fact, this tendency is constantly occurring; few have that largeness of faith and comprehension which enables them to do equal justice to both sides. A similar divergence from the centre is observable here, as in relation to the doctrines of grace. We have, in these externals of Christianity, a Calvinism and an Arminianism, Augustinism and Pelagianism, Divinism and Rationalism, Fanaticism and Indifferentism. Some crowd out the divine element, and leave only a hollow, unsubstantial human residue; that is Rationalism. Others expel the human, and leave only the divine, which they almost worship,—as the Ephesians did the image of Diana, which they alleged “fell down from Jupiter;”¹ that is Divinism. Between these there are intermediate shades of opinion of almost every hue. All persons, however, are not consistent with themselves. Some maintain the just balance in relation to the

¹ Acts 19: 35.

word of God, and disturb it in the church. Some magnify the divine element too much in the church and the sacraments, and curtail it unduly in the scriptures. Some claim too much for God in baptism, and not enough in the Supper. Others preserve the proper wedlock in the scriptures and the church, and effect a divorce by carrying the human relatively too far in all beyond it. And others jostle the just equipoise in each of the externals, but in no two in a similar manner, or to the same extent.

It is the peculiarity of the view we present, that it preserves throughout the just balance and coördination of the two. It crowds neither; it honors both. It regards each as a positive, free, self-moving agency, and the two, while such, as coalescing, vitally and dynamically, in securing the desired result.

And this view, while true in itself, and on *à priori* grounds, we regard as having additional confirmation, when we come to apply it and test it in detail, by bringing it to each of these objective facts of Christianity, both from the many corroborations it at once receives, and the many difficulties of which it at once relieves us. A true theory elucidates facts, while at the same time it is confirmed by them, and thus proves itself, and is proved: like a light among reflectors, gives light and receives it.

It is now our purpose to take this light, and with it examine, somewhat rapidly, and only so far as the claims of the subject in hand demand, the relation of these two agencies in Sacred Scripture, the Church, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

The agency by which the scriptures were produced is called Inspiration. Our attention, therefore, is confined to this subject. The term *Revelation*, is used to designate the disclosures made by the divine mind directly to the mind of man. Inspiration is that infallible agency by which matters contained in the revelations, or historical facts, or

the knowledge and judgments of the sacred writers, were embodied in language.¹ The exact function of inspiration, in relation to the scriptures, may be conceived of in this way: There were many revelations to individual minds, many historical facts, and much human knowledge, which God desired to have gathered up and embodied in a written, divinely authenticated, and infallible record for the religious instruction and direction of the race; and inspiration was the peculiar instrumentality devised and employed for effecting it.

Now, what are the agencies that enter into that instrumentality and how do they do it?

There must be a divine agency to determine the selection and guide the record, else the result could have no divine authority; and there could be no written word of God; and the end, which makes a revelation from God to man a moral necessity and a certainty, would be defeated. Moreover, the sacred writers claim this divine authority for their teachings, and bear witness to the truth of this claim in the case of one another; and as we know, both from internal and external evidence, that they were good men and competent witnesses, their testimony cannot be impeached. We adduce another proof, Christian consciousness, and emphasize it as being absolutely conclusive. Christians in all ages, who have the greatest sympathy and susceptibility for revealed truth, have had, in the self-evidencing light of the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, a clear intuition of a divine element in them. They, in whom the

¹ This distinction agrees with that made by Lee, in his valuable and scholarly work on Inspiration: "By Revelation I understand a direct communication from God to man, either of such knowledge as man could not of himself attain to, because its subject-matter transcends human sagacity or human reason (such, for example, were the prophetic announcements of the future, and the peculiar doctrines of Christianity), or which (although it might have been attained in the ordinary way) was not, in point of fact, from whatever cause, known to the person who received the Revelation. By Inspiration, on the other hand, I understand that actuating energy of the Holy Spirit, in whatever degree or manner it may have been exercised, guided by which the human agents chosen by God have officially proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible."—Lecture I. pp. 40–41.

faculty correlate and responsive to God has been awakened and restored to its normal action, recognize the unmistakable voice of God. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with" their "spirit." This is the testimony of Christian consciousness, the intuition of the church in all ages; and this evidence is as germane here, as that of astronomers in relation to any fact in astronomy, or of philosophers in philosophy, even though they should be equally unanimous.

There is evidently a human agency also. This is apparent in the whole costume of scripture; the individuality of each of the writers; the correspondence of his style with his character, culture, and circumstances. This is also seen in the fact that God employed men at all; for, if the object were not to employ them as *men*, but to use them mechanically, he might just as well have made anything else his machine, or given the Bible already made: it would have been no greater miracle, and would not have arrested and suspended man's freedom, which God always respects. Moreover, the writers often speak in their own name, refer to matters of private interest, and in many ways leave the impression that they desire us to understand that they wrote freely.

Now, on these two classes of facts have arisen two opposite theories of inspiration: those who start from the agency of God, and reason from that towards the agency of man, following the logical consequences, leave it little more than the form of anything human. Justin Martyr seems to have held this view. He represents inspired men as having nothing to do but to present themselves, in a pure state, to the energy of the Divine Spirit, in order that that, descending as a divine plectrum from heaven, just like the instrument with which a harp or lyre is played, may use them, and disclose to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things.¹ Gausen sums up his theory in this way: "Such, then, is the

¹ His words are: 'Ἄλλὰ καθαρὸς ἑαυτοῦς τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος παρασχῆν ἐνεργείᾳ, ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατὶν πλῆκτρον, ὥσπερ ὄργανον κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας, τοῖς δικαίοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύψῃ γνώσιν. Cohort. ad Graec. § 8; History of Doctrines, § 32, note 4.

word of God. It is God speaking in man, God speaking by man, God speaking as man, God speaking for man." To the same school belong Calamy and Haldane, and all whose views, consistently and philosophically carried out, result in a *mechanical*, verbal inspiration.

Those, on the other hand, who give more prominence to the facts showing the agency of man, reach various conclusions of an opposite character, just in proportion as they magnify the human data, and overlook or suppress the divine. They may believe, with Henderson,¹ that there are different degrees of inspiration, the Spirit doing only what was necessary to make a divinely authoritative record, and leaving the rest to man, — such as the use of historical matters, and the choice of words ; or, with Kant,² that parts of scripture only are inspired, those in accordance with the pure *moral ideas of the practical reason* ; or, with Schleiermacher and that school,³ that the writers were inspired subjectively only, and wrote in the same way, and under the same general influences of the Spirit, as they performed other religious duties, — inspiration, in the words of Morell,⁴ simply being " a higher potency of a certain form of consciousness, which every man, to some degree, possesses ;" or, with Paulus and Eichhorn,⁵ that they mistook and recorded their impressions and their subjective states for objective facts, and that the divine and miraculous element of the record is purely imaginary ; or, with Baur, Weisse, and Strauss,⁶ that in accordance with the habits and wants of the age, they clothed their religious teachings in myths, and that the historical element, the objective facts of scripture, are a human fabrication, — affirming with Strauss,⁷ that " the divine cannot have taken place in such a way — or that which has so taken place cannot have been divine."

But when we plant ourselves on both of these classes of

¹ Kitto, Art. Inspiration, by Dr. Woods.

² Davidson, Sacred Herm. pp. 193, 7 ; and Knapp's Th. p. 70.

³ Morell, Phil. of Rel. Chap. VI.

⁴ Phil. of Rel. p. 159.

⁵ Davidson, Sacred Herm. pp. 197, 9.

⁶ Idem, pp. 206, 17.

⁷ Idem, p. 214.

facts, and do equal justice to the divine and the human agency; when we conceive of them as interpenetrating and coöacting freely, and each in obedience to its own laws; as being taken up, each in its individuality, to that living, personal unity, analogous to the union of God and man in the person of Christ — we avoid both of these extremes, and the dilemma of tending to the one or the other, or of being logically inconsistent; and have a theory which meets all the exigencies of the case, and honors all the facts. "According to this theory," says Lee,¹ its most earnest and successful advocate, "the Holy Ghost employs men's faculties in conformity with their natural laws; and at the same time, animating, guiding, moulding them so as to accomplish the divine purpose; just as in nature, the principle of life, when annexed to certain portions of matter, exhibits its vital energy in accordance with conditions which that matter imposes; while it governs and directs, at the same time, the organism with which it is combined." Thus the Spirit of God and the spirit of man wrought together and jointly, in the whole process of making the sacred record, alike, whether the subject-matter of the record was made known to the sacred writers by revelation, historical accounts, tradition, personal observation, or experience. Although the operation of the Holy Spirit is objective, and different in kind from his ordinary influence in the heart, yet it does not act exteriorly and mechanically, in prompting, restraining, and guiding the spirit of man, but in vital and dynamic union with it; so that we may say, not in the *formal* sense in which Gaussen uses the words, but in their highest and most real import: "It is God who speaks to us, but it is also man; it is man, but it is also God."² The divine penetrates and informs the human, and directs it to its own ends; and the human, following its own laws and preferences, and the circumstances about it, writes as if it were alone. And this coöperation, from the very nature of the union of the two agencies, must continue throughout the process, from

¹ The Inspiration of Scripture, pp. 141, 2.

² Kitto, Art. on Inspiration, by Dr. Woods.

the conception of the subject, and the selection of the materials, to their arrangement and expression — even to the choice of the words; leaving us, in this high and vital sense, with an inspiration not only plenary, but also verbal.

This theory, it is believed, explains the diverse human and divine aspects of scripture. It takes up the half-truths on which the partial theories are based, gives them their full value, and restores them to their natural relations. It leaves in our possession an authoritative word of God; and while inspired from within outwards to the very surface, yet kindred and genial and attractive. It furnishes, through the principle of adaptation, which it maintains the Holy Spirit adopts towards the inspired writers, an easy explanation for the progress in the revelation of truth; and also for the diversities and apparent discrepancies in their accounts of the same things. It has fewer objections than any other theory; none that are fatal; none that are not inherent in a written revelation designed to have practical power among men.

THE CHURCH:

While we must distinguish, as an ideal conception, between those who are spiritually united to Christ and serve him, and those who profess his name before men, and may for convenience call the former the *invisible* and the latter the *visible* church, yet we must remember that the two are in fact inseparable; that, taken as a whole, the invisible church does not and cannot exist without visibility, nor the visible without invisibility.¹ Hence, in our remarks, we shall speak of the real, concrete, objective church, involving both the visible and the invisible, as in fact there is no other on earth.

It is a noticeable circumstance that, while "Christ, during his ministry on earth, laid the foundation of the outward structure of the church,"² he nowhere prescribes or intimates

¹ Says Kurtz, Sacred History, § 191, Obs.: "While this distinction is made, the fact ought, under no circumstances, to be overlooked, that the invisible church has no existence without the visible church, and that it is not separate from, or above the latter, but exists in it, and in it alone."

² Neander, Planting and Training, p. 1.

its form or organization. This indicates, very significantly, his intention that two elements, a human and a divine, should enter into its organism.

By looking at the church, as it first issued from the hands of the apostles, as an outward institution — the only light in which we are viewing it — and as it exists now, we are struck with the prominence of the human element. From the first, individual Christians, prompted by the church-spirit in them, associated together, and drew around them, freely, and as their own wants and circumstances suggested, the organization of a church. The organization was not a prescription, but an outgrowth, standing in living and organic relations to the religious community, and varying its forms and its methods, in different places and times, as the free life of Christians and their necessities demanded. Even archbishop Whately remarks :¹ “ While, by the inspiration of Him who knew what was in man, they [the apostles] delineated those Christian principles which man could not have devised for himself, each church has been left, by the same divine foresight, to make the application of those principles in its symbols, its forms of worship, and its ecclesiastical regulations ; and, while steering its course by the chart and compass which his holy Word supplies, to regulate for itself the sails and rudder, according to the winds and currents it may meet with.” Hence the outward diversity which now everywhere exists between particular churches, in structure, forms, methods, — the result of the designed free and spontaneous action of the human element.

This element crowds on the notice. But there is another, deeper and equally essential to the production of the church. It is the presence and activity of the Spirit of Christ. The apostle Paul brings it out very clearly. The church is the *body* of Christ, he is *in* it. He is “ Head over all things to the church, which is his *body*, the *fulness* of Him that filleth all in all.”² “ *In*” him “ all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple *in* the Lord.”³ Hav-

¹ Annotations on Bacon's Essays. Es. III. p. 26.

² Eph. 1 : 22, 23.

³ Eph. 2 : 22.

ing, in another place, compared his relation to it to the divine idea of the marriage institution, by which "they two shall be one flesh," the apostle adds: "This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church."¹

This underlying, encircling, divine element, is not to be confounded, however, with that presence of Christ in the hearts of individual believers, by which he bestows spiritual blessings on them according to their *personal* wants, though founded upon this. It is that peculiar *social* operation of his, by which, going beyond their individual and personal wants, he acts on them as a *community*, awakening in them a religious community-feeling, a church-impulse; drawing them together by spiritual cords and attractions; endowing each according to the wants of the whole; supplying in these the deficiencies in those; and effecting, by the varied distribution of his gifts, and the mutual interdependence of his people, a real though not a formal unity. He is, indeed, in individuals, as units, and in their disconnection; he is also in communities, animating and guiding their social life. It is this pervading presence of his in them, that causes them to be his "one body." And it is this diffused agency of Christ, which furnishes the divine element necessary in constituting the church. And, further, after the organization is completed, there can be no church without membership, without men; that furnishes a permanent human element; nor without the Spirit of Christ in them; that furnishes a permanent divine element.

There are thus two agencies, that of man, and that of Christ. But these two must coöperate, causing the result to be their joint act, else there can be no true church of Christ. The Lord must be its builder; man must be its builder also. And so intimately must the streams of their united energy flow together, that you cannot separate them and say: This is man's work with nothing of Christ in it; or, This is Christ's with nothing of man. The church is a divine institution, and a human institution; but with the divinity and hu-

¹ Eph. 4: 16.

manity blending together. If the act of man were not prompted, or appropriated and sustained, by that of Christ, there would be only a human *society*. If there were only the act of Christ, the church would be a phantom; it could have no concrete form or existence. These two agencies, in their vital union are thus described by the apostle:¹ "*from whom* [Christ] the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which *every joint supplieth*, according to the *effectual working in the measure of every part*, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." He is the source, the prompting and guiding spirit; his people the executive actors; but if they put themselves under his guidance, he does not leave them to do any part of the work alone, but is with them prompting and directing still, even to the minutest details. The church organization, in so far as it grows up naturally from the church-impulse awakened and guided by Christ, is thus, whatever its form, all alive with divinity, divinity embodied in humanity. Hence all churches, however diverse their organizations, in so far as they have been true to the spirit of Christ, are divinely authenticated, even in their form, and to its minutiae.

It is true, this ideal is only in part realized in any case, because all Christian communities, like all individual Christians, are but imperfectly responsive to the promptings of Jesus; and this is so, because it does not consist with the divine purpose, that Christians should be at once perfect, or the church infallible. Yet, in every true church, the ideal is proximately reached, and the human and divine are so interwoven, even in the outmost exterior, that you cannot separate them, without disintegrating and destroying the fabric.

This theory commends itself alike by the consequences it avoids, and those which result from it.

It saves from the abhorrent logical conclusion of those who press the divine so far as to suppose that Christ prescribed the outward form of the church, that there is no other church than the one having that form, and that there is no

¹ Eph. 5: 32.

salvation except in outward connection with that. Cyprian developed this theory fully.¹ He even denies that one "can be a martyr, who is not in the church. Such an one may be slain, he cannot be crowned."² Augustine says: "No one will be able to have Christ the Head, unless he has been in his body, which is the church."³ And this is the present doctrine of the papacy. It saves us, also, from the more moderate notions of high-churchmen, in whatever denomination found, who regard the church as the only way of access to Christ, instead of Christ as the only way of entrance to the church; and who think that the church is so saturated with the divine, that grace gushes out to the physical touch, and accompanies outward connection with it. And, on the other hand, it arrests and prevents the destructive result to which Pelagians,⁴ Socinians,⁵ Unitarians, and Rationalists have generally come, who have magnified the human agency and denied the divine; and having broken up the foundations of the church, converted it to a *society*, without character, or respect, or influence.

But, while it avoids the destructive consequences in these opposite directions, and embraces what of truth there is underlying them, it at the same time explains the diversities of the particular churches, and throws around them the bond of a common unity. It regards them, in their relation to one another, much like the different books of scripture in relation to the whole canon, and their diversities like the diversities in the style of the sacred writers. It makes of *many members one body*. It secures the result of which Lord Bacon speaks:⁶ "As it is noted by one of the Fathers, Christ's coat indeed had no seam, but the church's vesture was of divers colors; whereupon he saith, 'In veste varietas sit, scissura non sit,'—they be two things, unity and uniformity." It makes room for all true churches, all in which "the word of God is purely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to the institution of

¹ Neander, Ch. Hist. I. p. 210.

² Idem, § 135, (5).

⁵ Idem, § 254, (2).

² Hag. Hist. of Doc. § 71, (3).

⁴ Idem, § 135, (1).

⁶ Essay on Unity in Religion.

Christ,"¹ in the one brotherhood of the members of his body. It enlarges Christian charity, raises our view of the cause of Christ to a higher point than that of our denomination or church, and causes us to see them, as he does, as one whole, supplementing the deficiencies of one another, and moving on in their different paths, giving and receiving reciprocal moulding influences meanwhile, towards one grand millennial result. And it gives us a church beautiful and attractive, and at the same time dignified and invested with divinity, worthy of being the Bride of Christ, that *Mother* church, which, in virtue of the fact that it is the great organ through which God dispenses spiritual blessings to the world, justifies the description of it by Calvin:² "There is no other way of entrance into life, unless we are conceived by her, born of her, nourished at her breast, and continually preserved under her care and government, till we are divested of this mortal flesh, and become like the angels."

BAPTISM.

There is in this sacrament evidently something human, and something divine. At least, there is a human element in the baptismal act, and a divine in the institution of the rite, and in accepting and blessing its observance. But do these two lie over against each other in this way,—the divine quite off on one side, and the human on the other? Is their only correlation that of antecedence and consequence, or cause and effect, or, *you do this and I will do that*? Do they act in essentially different spheres, and only come in contact on the margins? Or is the divine in the human, and the human with the divine, at every step of the baptismal transaction? Is this involution not physical or mechanical, but spiritual and necessary, in every instance of true baptism? Are the two so intermixed and blended,—the divine being let down into the human, and the human taken up into the divine,—that though each loses nothing

¹ Calvin, *Institutes*, B. IV. Ch. I. 9.

² *Institutes*, B. IV. Ch. I. 4.

of its own nature, there is virtually but one baptismal energy? This is what we maintain.

Baptism is the consecration of one to the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, by the use of water.¹ Now

¹ In the last October number of this Journal was an Article, headed "Baptism a Symbol of the Commencement of the New Life," suggested by one in the previous January number, in which the view of the import of baptism which we here state was maintained. We add a few words in reply. As, however, the writer does not base his theory immediately on any portion of scripture, but assumes it, thinking that it furnishes an easy explanation for all the facts on the subject; and as he does not refer directly to the scriptural, historical and other arguments with which we maintained that consecration is the predominant idea of this rite—especially the irresistible exegetical force of *εις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, in the baptismal formula, the fundamental passage on this subject, as pointing to the end or object to which the person is set apart by baptism, though admitting this as a subordinate idea—but is content to reason more generally; it will not be necessary to notice his Article further than to show how he has succeeded in the specific object he has undertaken. The mind of the writer evidently has two different ideas before it, which it does not clearly discriminate between. It hovers obscurely around both, in the premises, reasoning as if they were one and the same; but in the conclusion—or, which is the same thing, the original position—separates between them. His position is that baptism "is intended to symbolize the commencement of the new Christian life;" his arguments only go to show that it symbolizes the *new Christian life itself*. This incoherence runs through the Article. Thus the first argument, that the magnitude of the change in conversion deserves an appropriate rite to celebrate it, does not show that that rite should be a symbol of the change as an *act* or *transition*, but of the change as a *result*, of the changed state. There is nothing in Christianity that would lead it to raise a monument to the transitional process. And the ceremony with which "a servant of a foreign potentate" renounces his allegiance, does not *symbolize*, though it may designate in point of time, the *commencement* of his new citizenship, but his *new citizenship*. Its *import* reaches into the future, and is not limited to the present or past, though its *use* may be at the beginning of the new allegiance. This creeping in of the *new life*, in the place of the *commencement* of it, appears on almost every page in specific statements. Thus, Christian baptism "symbolized the more thorough and radical cleansing which the Holy Ghost should effect." "We baptize into a life of obedience to the Father, of faith in the Son, and of sanctification by the Spirit." "Baptism (that is, the purification which it celebrates)," etc. etc. Now this divergence of the reasons from the position neutralizes the argument, and damages the two principal inferences. The first inference is that baptism "should be coincident in time with the occurrence of the moral change which it symbolizes; and in default of this, that the two should be separated by as brief an interval as possible." But as the arguments only show that baptism points to the new life, and not to the beginning of it, this inference falls. The second is that there is "a beautiful significance," in the mode of baptism by immersion, "if it be a rite of inauguration." But the arguments would only

no real consecration can be made without the Spirit of God cworking with the spirit of him who makes it. Nor can it be made without faith, and faith cannot be exercised apart from the presence and help of Him who is its author and finisher. Again, it is the result of true baptism to change the *status* of the subject in relation to the kingdom of God. It brings him — whether an adult, who in this sacrament surrenders himself to God, or a child, that is surrendered by its responsible representatives — into real external covenant-relations to God. God throws around the person the folds of his covenant, by which he promises to be in a special sense a God to him. But this cannot take place unless the transaction itself be a covenant one, one in which both of the covenanting parties participate; and no one can thus in reality contract with God without his help. God must certainly *work in* him here, “to will and to do of his good pleasure,” as well as elsewhere.¹ Thus man, God helping him, takes hold on God; and God, man seeing and believing in him, enters into man; and by both, in this spiritual union, the transaction is completed. Throughout the whole of it the two agencies interpenetrate. It is a divine-human transaction. There is the free faith and surrender of man, inwrought and sustained by the divine energy, and the free acceptance of the consecration and establishment of the covenant, by God, desired and appropriated by man.

As such, as the united and inseparable act of God and man, as an actual blending of human and divine agency in putting one in external covenant-relations to God, — in the state of being actually consecrated to him, — baptism has real virtue, inherent and positive influence. And as such, its efficacy does not exist in it as an *opus operatum*, or

show this “beautiful significance,” in case the rite were one of purification, not inauguration. If it only points to inauguration, or the beginning of the Christian life, and not to purification, a result of its beginning, and its standing quality, immersion, even in the mind of the writer, should be no more significant than sprinkling.

¹ Phil. 2 : 13. Compare Augustine's proposition : “Sine Illo vel operante ut velimus, vel co-operante cum volumus, ad bona pietatis opera nihil volumus.”—De Gra. et Lib. Arbit. § 33 I. X. p. 735.

mechanical, ecclesiastical act, but in the genuine, human and divine elements entering into it.

Now, those who tear these elements apart, land in practical error, or absurdity. The Fathers generally fastened on the agency of God, and often gave only a mechanical part to man. If the external act was performed in due ecclesiastical order, it was regenerative. Chrysostom, as we see by a Latin translation of his works, says: ¹ "Per rem, nempe sensibilem aquam, donum confertur." Augustine maintained ² that "baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation." High-churchmen, in the Papal, Lutheran, and English churches, perpetuate this doctrine in various modified or unmodified forms, in modern times. Luther even, though giving so much prominence to faith as the only condition of justification, ascribed, in his usual bold, figurative, sensuous words, a kind of divino-physical virtue to this sacrament: "The blood of Christ is so intimately mingled with the water of baptism, that we should neither regard it as merely clean water, but look upon it as water beautifully colored and reddened with the precious rose-colored blood of our dear Saviour."³ All such tendencies generate superstition, false confidence, deceitful hope.

And as we saw in relation to the church, that one form of the supra-divine tendency was manifested in believing that Christ has prescribed a rigid and inflexible church-organization, and in unchurching all who are not connected with that; so here another form of pressing the divine at the expense of the human, is seen in those who think he has fixed the form of baptism, instead of having left it to the free life of his people to mould and adapt it to their circumstances and wants, under the direction of his Spirit; and who require all to adopt their form, else deny their baptism. This, however, is not made a *principle*; they are not consistent with themselves; for they admit of and practise,

¹ Opera, T. 5. 1079. a. Comp. Idem, T. 2. 611. b: "Qui enim baptizatur in nomine Christi, utrumque baptismum habet, et aquæ et spiritus: quia Christus spiritus erat, et corpus suscepit, ut et spirituale et coporale baptismum daret."

² Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, § 137, (6).

³ Idem, § 269. (5).

themselves, all manner of minor deviations from their ideal mode, — which is irreconcilable with having the principle of a fixed form. They in fact, in their own practice, adopt the principle of deviations, while towards others, who do not come within the range of their deviations, they hold the denominational tenet of one mode. Denominationally, therefore, they act on the principle of deviations, and the principle of no deviations; and as these principles annihilate each other, their action is based on no principle, but on arbitrary opinion and rule.

Those, on the other hand, who give undue prominence to the agency of man, see no more efficacy in this ordinance than results from a conscientious endeavor to obey any other command of God. There is no peculiar energy or blessing of God manifested in it. The gift results purely from the faith, in no measure from the baptismal institution. Baptism may be a means of grace, but it is no more so than anything else involving the same amount of faith. It has no special divine depth of meaning. Socinians, Unitarians, and Rationalists adopt this view; and virtually drive God from the ordinance, and convert it to a mere ceremony. It must be confessed, also, that there is a tendency among evangelical Christians, in modern times, to divorce these two elements, by making the human the condition, and the divine the consequence. The result is, the rite degenerates into a mere act of obedience, a means of grace, on a level with ordinary Christian duties and observances; and the prominence which Christ and the apostles gave it is an unaccountable mystery, and the speedy development of baptismal regeneration, in the primitive church, an inexplicable problem in history.

The dynamic theory, according to which there is a spiritual coöperation of God and man, avoids these one-sided tendencies. It shuns the rock, on the one hand, that there is any inherent virtue in the baptismal act itself, only as it is jointly animated by the Spirit of God and the spirit of man; and hence does not oblige those adopting it, like the advocates of baptismal regeneration, in order to explain the case of those

baptized persons who subsequently show no signs of spiritual life, to resort to the absurd fetch and after-thought, first, of a sleep, and then of a syncope, and then of the death and final extirpation of the imparted, regenerate principle:¹ and the whirlpool, on the other hand, that there is no virtue in it whatever, save as an act of obedience and faith. It furnishes a reasonable and safe ground for the belief in its efficacy — the concurrence in it of divine and human activity — an efficacy which is not regenerative or saving, but which consists in the individual being truly consecrated to God, and put into actual external covenant-relations to him. It explains scripture and history. It harmonizes with the great doctrines of the gospel, and with the facts of Christian experience. And it justifies its institution, and the place it was designed to hold in the observances of the church.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The supper, whatever particular view is taken of it, stands in some kind of relation to the death of Christ, and the objects for which that death occurred. The death of Christ has made positive spiritual blessings possible for man, though it has not put him in possession of them; and man needs those blessings. How shall the two be brought together — the supply and the want, the purchased good and the needy soul? By what instrumentality, or through what channel, shall the benefits of redemption reach man? Now the supper stands in some way between these two, as one of the organs of transmission. So far all agree. But in what way does it fulfil this office? Is it a simple *memorial*? Is it a picturesque and demonstrative exhibition, by means of *symbols*, to enliven faith, and nothing more? Is the spiritual blessing *physically incorporated* with the bread and the wine, so that in receiving the one the other also is received? Or are the material elements changed in their nature, and, while retaining their former appearance and sensible qualities, actu-

¹ Kurtz, § 189, and § 189, Obs. 4.

ally converted into the body and blood of Christ, with all its atoning and saving efficacy? Or further, intermediate between these extremes, is there, in the right observance of the supper, a *real* — not corporeal, or physical, or mechanical. — but a *real, spiritual* meeting of the benefits of Christ's death and the soul of man?

To answer these questions, we must consider the nature and relation of the agencies necessary to its right observance.

Here also the human agency is prominent, and first strikes attention. There is the procuring of the bread and the "cup," the giving of thanks, the breaking of the bread, the distribution of the elements, the partaking of them, and the choice of the time, way, and circumstances; these externals, at least, being purely human.

But no less real and essential is the divine agency. It is seen in the institution of this sacrament, in the right preparation of those who partake of it, and in the assistance granted them while in the act. And here we adduce, in proof, a remark of our Saviour, which we think may have been hitherto generally misunderstood. At the conclusion of the supper, having given the cup to the disciples, he says: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it *new with you* in my Father's kingdom."¹ Christ evidently did not himself partake of the bread or cup used at the institution of the supper. The remark: "This is my body," and "This is my blood," makes the supposition too violent. Besides, we are expressly told that he gave each "to the *disciples*." Nor are we to expect that he designed ever to partake of the sacramental emblems, in his own person. Now, if we understand by the expression, "in my Father's kingdom," what the expression, "in the kingdom," — which is the one employed by Mark,² in the corresponding passage — often means, viz. the kingdom of God on earth, then the meaning is clear; and Christ informs his disciples that he will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine until, in virtue of his spiritual union with them, he drinks it in a new way, *with them*, in that kingdom which

¹ Matt. 26: 29.

² 14: 25.

was not to be fully come till after his death. Here, then, through this union of Christ *in* and *with* his disciples when they partake of the elements of the supper — a union so intimate that he acts *with* them; justifying even the remark, “*I drink it new with you,*” we see the presence of a divine agency, as well as of the human, in the proper observance of this sacrament.

Nay, more: this passage shows us that these two agencies are taken up into a living coöperation,¹—the disciples acting with Christ, and Christ acting in them; or, as he himself expresses it:¹ “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth *in me* and *I in him.*” Their act alone would be bald, frigid, unspiritual; his alone, spiritual, unproductive, without body. But the two, penetrating, completing, and sustaining each other — their wills and spiritual energy coinciding with his — supply all the conditions of the right observance of the supper.

We are now prepared to return to the question: In what relation does such observance stand to the benefits of Christ’s death, and the need of man?

We explain the matter thus: When the Christian, pervaded with the spirit of Jesus, partakes of the emblems, the possible blessings procured by the death of Christ, pardon, justification, sanctification, spiritual life, are, to an extent, actually transferred to his soul, in and with the partaking of the elements, and thus made his. There is, then, in the supper, an actual participation of the benefits of the atonement, resulting from the observance itself, not merely from the faith called into exercise by it, though conditioned on faith. The emblems, when thus received, are one of the special channels through which God communicates the purchase made by the sacrifice of Christ; the medium of an actual transmission; a bridge on which those spiritual blessings descend to the soul; a point where the redemption of Christ and the want of man meet. The apostle emphasizes this design and effect of the sacrament:² “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not

¹ John 6: 56.

² 1 Cor. 10: 16.

the communion" (*κοινωνία*, the *participation*)¹ "of the *blood* of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the *body* of Christ?" And when one, thus exercising his own free faith, and filled with Christ's presence, commemorates his death, the act of partaking of the elements becomes like an actual eating of the body and drinking of the blood; and to such the bread and the cup, as one of the means of putting them in possession of the advantages of the great Sacrifice, illustrate and verify the compact and profound words of Jesus at the institution of the rite:² "This *is* my body," and "This *is* my blood."

The view here presented is in substantial agreement with that of the church of England, as stated in the 28th Article, and also with that of Calvin. The doctrine of the former is this: The supper "is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. . . . The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith." . . . "By which," says bishop Burnet,³ summing up his own view of this Article, "we assert a *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ; but not of his body as it is now glorified in heaven, but of his body as it was broken on the cross, when his blood was shed and separated from it: That is, his Death, with the Merit and Effects of it, are offered in this Sacrament, to all worthy Believers." Calvin says:⁴ "I grant, indeed, that the breaking of the bread is symbolical, and not the substance itself; yet, this being admitted, from the exhibition of the symbol we may justly infer the exhibition of the substance; for, unless any one would call God a deceiver, he can never presume to affirm that he sets before us an empty sign.

¹ Bengel in loc. says: "He who drinks of this cup is a partaker of the blood of Christ. . . . The highest degree of reality is implied."

² Matt. 26: 26, 28.

³ Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 397.

⁴ Institutes, B. IV. Chap. XVII. 10.

Therefore if, by the breaking of the bread, the Lord truly represents the participation of his body, it ought not to be doubted that he truly presents and communicates it. And it must always be a rule with believers, whenever they see the signs instituted by the Lord, to assure and persuade themselves that they are also accompanied with the truth of the thing signified. For to what end would the Lord deliver into our hands the symbol of his body, except to assure us of a real participation of it? If it be true that the visible sign is given to us to seal the donation of the invisible substance, we ought to entertain a confident assurance, that, in receiving the symbol of his body, we at the same time truly receive the body itself."

Our position in relation to the union of the divine and the human in the supper—according to which they not only blend, in the act of partaking of the elements, but also in that act bring the advantages of the atonement and the needy soul into a living, spiritual connection—will receive additional confirmation by glancing at the entire insufficiency or falseness of all theories leaning to the one or the other of these two agencies. The extreme, on the divine side, is the theory of the Roman church, which denies the reality of the bread and the wine, asserting that they are converted to the actual body and blood of Christ, retaining only the hollow and delusive form of their previous nature. The divine wholly absorbs or crowds out the human in the elements, and is physically transferred to the recipient by the outward act of consuming them.

This theory is so clearly and fearlessly presented in what is commonly called *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, that we transfer the passage: "The Catholic church firmly believes, and openly professes, that in this sacrament the words of consecration accomplish three things: first, that the true and real body of Christ, the same that was born of the virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is rendered present in the holy eucharist. Secondly, that however repugnant it may appear to the dictates of the senses, no substance of the elements remains in the sacra-

ment. Thirdly, a natural consequence of the two preceding, and one which the words of consecration also express, that the accidents which present themselves to the eyes, or other senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner, without a subject. The accidents of bread and wine we see, but they inhere in no substance, and exist independent of any. The substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, that they altogether cease to be the substance of bread and wine."

The objection to this theory is twofold, and may be briefly stated. It is contradictory to the whole spirit of the teachings of the gospel in reference to the conditions on which grace is conferred; and it makes God lie to us through the senses, in order to transfer a blessing to our spirits — in such a way, moreover, as to overthrow the spirituality of religion.

The Lutheran is a milder theory. According to this, in and with the visible sign, which retains intact all its natural properties, the body and blood of Jesus is corporeally present. The two are inseparably and objectively united, irrespective of the will of the partaker. In the words of Kurtz,¹ an advocate of this doctrine: "That which is heavenly is received, both by the believer and by the unbeliever, *in, with,* and *under* the terrestrial elements." The objection here is, that, while it admits the most intimate blending of the heavenly and earthly in the elements, the union is arrested there; in partaking of them, the two are widely divorced: the divine is held off at a distance from the human, and made to operate independently of man — yea, when he only mechanically receives them — though it is alleged that it will act to his disadvantage and condemnation, unless he believes.² It is thus at war with the very genius of Christianity, in binding the reception of the gift of God to an outward act, to work either life or death; whereas Christianity ascribes such a result only to the highest freedom and agency of man. It violates, too, the teaching of the apostle in this passage: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eat-

¹ Sac. Hist. § 190, Obs.

² Idem, § 188, Obs. 3.

eth and drinketh damnation to himself, not *discerning* (*διακρίνω*) the Lord's body."¹ For it is evident here, that the judgment spoken of does not come from the malign effect of the presence of the body of Christ, unworthily and physically received in the elements, nor from not discerning that the Lord's body is truly in them; for such a perception is beyond the possibilities of human "discernment," and hence cannot be required; but from not discerning it *anywhere*, from want of spiritual apprehension of Christ as the atoning sacrifice, and faith in him as such. The whole sin is evidently the want of a spiritual and possible discernment and trust, not of an impossible discernment.

The extreme, on the human side, is the view of those who deny the divinity and atonement of Christ. In their case the supper becomes absolutely robbed of meaning. Nay, worse: it calls on us to celebrate, not the birth, but the *death* of Him whose only benefits to the race were by his life and example! to celebrate the very event which arrested the only stream of good which was flowing from him! It goes so far in crowding out the divine, that it both logically and historically destroys the human also, and the supper ceases to be observed.

The more moderate theory on this side, and the one extensively adopted by Protestants, is that advocated by Zwingli. Those adopting it so draw apart the human and the divine as to hold that the bread and the wine are mere symbols or signs of the body and blood of Christ. The supper is a demonstrative memorial, addressed to the senses and the imagination, designed, by reproducing to the thought the scenes of Calvary, to aid faith in fastening on the atoning Sacrifice, and promote Christian growth; and it is nothing more than this. The whole benefit comes from the spiritual exercises, which indeed may mount somewhat higher by climbing on this trellis; but there is no peculiar and independent good gushing into the soul from the supper itself, rightly observed. And the objection to this, as the ex-

¹ 1 Cor. 11 : 29.

clusive theory, is, that it is superficial and barren. It does not exhaust the words of Christ at the institution of the sacrament: "my body . . . my blood;" nor the remarkable words with which he had foreshadowed it; such as "who-so eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life;"¹ nor the description of it by Paul: "The communion of the blood of the body of Christ." It destroys everything peculiar and distinctive in the design of the supper; makes its import and object the same in kind as those of a sermon commemorating the death of Christ, with this inferiority, however, that, whereas the sermon sets it forth with lively and intelligible words, the supper speaks only in mute symbols. It fails to furnish an adequate reason for its appointment, and the prominence given it in the scriptures and the apostolic churches; leaves Christians with the half-conscious thought or feeling that usage makes more of it than experience derives from it as a mere remembrancer; and while, by diverting thought and faith from its higher to its lower uses, it diminishes those uses, it at the same time often awakens in communicants a painful sense that they have not partaken worthily, or that they were mistaken in their estimate of its benefits. It attaches great importance to its observance, and yet eviscerates it of its meaning, thereby plunging those adopting it into a felt or unfelt contradiction.

All these partial theories, therefore, fail. Only that one which gives equal integrity to the divine and the human elements, and which regards them as meeting and acting in vital union; which represents the faith of the believer as fastening directly on Christ, and Christ as entering into the heart and stimulating the faith of the believer, while partaking of the elements, and which brings the advantages of the atonement into the actual possession of the believer, in that act, — can meet all the necessities of the case; and this one, we believe, does. It gives character, profound meaning, to the eucharist. It honors its institution, and prominent observance, and the scriptural references to it. It does not

¹ John 6 : 54.

trifle with Christians by putting in their hands a dumb show of Christ's death, a pictorial representation of it by means of symbols, and little more. It takes up this view but adds to it. It presents to them a transaction pregnant with spiritual life, actually communicating the advantages of Christ's death. But it does not undermine virtue or the spirituality of religion. It requires the free, spiritual activity of man, and does not hold the blessing in outward union with the elements, to be received by any who partake of them, but in receiving them with a spirit in inward union with the Spirit of Christ. It exalts the divine, but does not foster superstition, and an outward observance of the rite, and a false confidence in its mechanical efficacy. It exalts the human, but does not detract from the efficacy or worth of the sacrament. It exalts the human and the divine, the divine and the human, in living and inseparable union, and thus honors morals while it promotes religion.

ARTICLE III.

THE ETERNAL LIFE AND PRIESTHOOD OF MELCHISEDEK.¹

[Condensed from the German of Auberlen.]

BY REV. HENRY A. SAWTELLE, M. A., LIMERICK, ME.

Introduction; Historical Notice of Opinions.

The declarations concerning Melchisedek, in the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, have afforded interpreters much difficulty. Particularly has this been the case with the third and eighth verses. The peculiarity in the latter verse is, that the Priest-king of Salem, in the char-

¹ The original Article may be found in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1857, pp. 453—504. Its author is Carl August Auberlen, Dr. Phil., Licentiate and Professor *Extraordinarius* of Theology in Basil.