

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MARCH, 1850.

VOL. II.—NO. II.

WHAT IS CHURCH HISTORY?

A vindication of the idea of Historical Development. By
PHILIP SCHAF. Translated from the German. Philadelphia :
J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1846. 12 mo. pp. 128.

The subject discussed in this work is full of interest. However widely the views of individuals in regard to History may theoretically differ, its importance is practically admitted by all. It portrays man in all his struggles to solve the questions involved within his own being, and to reach the end of his creation; and contains and truly exhibits the results to which, in the different stages of this process, he has arrived. "It is, and must ever continue to be," consequently, "next to God's word, the richest source of wisdom, and the surest guide to all successful practical activity." Affect, therefore, as some may, to treat history with contempt, and to overrule at the bar of their own judgment, its solemn decisions, whenever convenient to do so, they cannot in reality despise its teachings, nor tear loose from its authority. Those who imagine themselves to be most independent in this

¹These remarks find strong corroboration in the fact, that in those theological institutions in which it is considered essential to orthodoxy to deny all real value and authority to Church History, it still is made to occupy a very important place in the course of study.

VOL. II.—NO. II.

says Bishop Percy, "in our own or any language." Beautiful indeed are the similes and antitheses with which it abounds, and its versification has all the smoothness of the times of its author, who was cotemporary and intimate with Pope; but after all, I must say, for my own part, I am just as well pleased, if not better, with the wild irregularity and varied incident of the old English ballad, notwithstanding its tail-piece, from which the first stanza of this, burnished up, to be sure, was taken; and in genuine pathos it is certainly far inferior to the modern Scottish ballad, well known in this country, on a theme somewhat similar, called *Mary's Dream* or *Sandy's Ghost*.

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

WILBERFORCE ON THE INCARNATION.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in its relation to Mankind and to the Church. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A. M., Archdeacon of the East Riding. First American from the second London Edition. Philadelphia: H. Hooker & Co., 1849, pp. 411. 12 mo.

We are not exactly prepared to pronounce this book, in the language of *some* of its admirers, the greatest theological work of the age. Our Episcopal friends are apt to be a little too fast in claiming credit in this style for the literature of their own Church, and a good deal too dull in perceiving or acknowledging the merit of any literature besides. They are quite too starched and pedantic especially, in their bearing towards the theology of Germany. It is only ridiculous however to fancy the English Church, or the Episcopal Church in America, on any sort of parallel and level, as regards theological science, with German Protestantism under its better form. There is no doubt on the English side a vast fund of traditional orthodoxy and order, which at this time particularly cannot well be held in too high account; and there are errors and heresies too in the thinking of Germany, as we all know, that need to be guarded against with the most jealous and watchful care. But mere tradition can never be made to stand in the place of thought; nor are heresies to be cured, by a declaration of war against all philosophy and science. Theology, to live, must be something more than a form of sound words. It must grapple with error, and overcome it. Its mission is to be scientific, as well as true to

the faith once delivered to the saints. In this respect, Germany with all her errors stands far in advance both of England and America. She is the land emphatically of Protestant theology. Not only is she entitled to the first rank in what regards the outward apparatus of the science, as most are now willing to admit; her primacy is equally clear in all that pertains to its true inward life and substance. We need her help not only in philology and history, but in the settlement and defence also of all christian doctrines. The theology of Germany, for years past, has been more wakeful, more profoundly earnest, more vigorously active, than that of all the world besides. The theology of this country, with all its pretension and cant, is for the most part mere schoolboy pedantry in comparison. This scientific activity may not save the German Church; at least not without help, under a different form, from some other quarter; but it cannot fail to prove at last of high consequence for the christian world. It belongs to the inmost power of Protestantism, and forms in some sense what must be considered the central stream of its life. The dangers which attend it are to be surmounted by its own resources, and not by refusing to look them in the face. If our remedy for error is to be found in mere outward authority, a faith that owns no fellowship whatever with science, it were better for us to fall back at once fully and wholly into the arms of Romanism. Admit this principle, and Protestantism stands convicted of falsehood from the start. It has no right to exist. Say that Protestantism has no power to take care of itself in following out its own law, but needs to be overruled and controlled in its course by a purely foreign authority, saying to it, Thus far shalt thou go but no farther; and we have the whole question of its legitimacy conclusively settled. It is for this reason, and in this view, that the problem of Protestantism may be said to be specially involved in the course of theological science at present in Germany. For whatever may be needed to make the Church complete in the end, it is clear that all other interests must be ruled sooner or later by the authority of ideas; theory must underlie all solid life and practice; and the heart of any movement is found consequently, where its theoretic or ideal character is made most actively the subject of thought. The question whether Protestantism has a right to exist, turns after all not so much on the practical working of Episcopacy in Great Britain, or of Puritanism in America, as it does on the results of theology in Germany. If the *idea* of the Reformation, its original and proper theory, be found unequal to the test to which it is here subjected, it is vain to imagine that it can command the

faith and homage of the world lastingly on any other ground. Let it appear that Protestant theology, under its most free and active character, not only calls forth such terrible errors as have appeared in Germany, but has no power also at the same time to overcome them by a still more vigorous vindication of the truth, and the Roman controversy, as we take it, is fairly brought to an end. If Protestantism cannot think itself out to its last consequences without landing us in rationalism and pantheism, we need no other argument to set aside its claims from the beginning. It is proved at once to be a failure under its more respectable forms, as well as under those that are openly anti-christian and false; and we are bound to save ourselves from its bad authority, not by allowing it wilfully only to a certain point, but by abjuring it altogether. It is in this view, we say, that Protestantism universally, whether the fact be perceived or not, has a deep and vital interest in the theological activity of modern Germany, notwithstanding its errors and heresies, more than in the thinking of any other part of the christian world. Let us be willing all round to do justice to its claims, and not affect to be independent of its co-operation and help. If we can go beyond its measure, well; but this we can never do, by superciliously ignoring or overlooking the whole field of inquiry here offered to our view. The questions with which this German theology is occupied, are questions that lie in the way of all true theological science, and challenge the respect of all really earnest and thoughtful minds. Nor is it easy to speak in too high terms of the learning and intellectual power, with which they are discussed. If theology exist as a science at all, at the present time, it is in Germany. We are made to smile accordingly, when we hear a single English work, like that of Wilberforce, referred to as *the* great production of the age in the department to which it belongs, without the least regard apparently to this fact. All who are acquainted with the later German theology, know that the age abounds with great productions in this form. It would be easy to name many theologians not only of equal but of superior learning, and many works also of far more thorough and complete execution, which must be allowed largely to divide at least the theological credit of the age with *Wilberforce on the Incarnation.*

We have no wish however to disparage the merits of this book. It is in truth worthy of high admiration and respect. It deserves to be welcomed as a work of thorough independent learning, which may well be taken to form something of an epoch in the history at least of English theology. We only wish that it may

be widely read and studied, both in England and in this country; for we are sure that it is suited to the wants of our reigning Christianity, whether theoretically or practically considered, and that it cannot fail to operate auspiciously, where it gains attention, in favor of truth and piety. Unfortunately it is not as well fitted as it might be for common popular use. The subject itself of which it treats, is one that lies out of the range of ordinary thought; but there is a serious fault besides, as regards popularity, in the author's method and style. It is fashionable to speak of the darkness and vagueness of German writers; and we are willing to allow that a good many of them are well entitled to such reproach; but we must say we have found it more of an effort to keep the clue of thought steadily in this English book, than to read understandingly some of the hardest German ones that come in our way. Wilberforce is for us decidedly a more *misty* writer than Dorner, for instance, or Rothe, or Daub, or even Kant himself in his Criticism of the Understanding. The difficulty with these writers generally is in the arduous character of their thought, and in this alone; whereas in the work before us it lies often to a very considerable extent in the representation of the thought. The plan of the book, as a whole, is not sufficiently clear; it is put together somewhat clumsily and awkwardly in its several parts; a sort of continual haziness surrounds the progress of its argument; the language is often careless, and lacks throughout the transparency and vivacity that are needed for full popular effect. The work, with all its merits, is decidedly heavy and hard to read. We are sorry for this; as it may prove a bar in some measure to its favorable reception, where it might otherwise have found free passport and exerted a happy influence on the side of truth. The theme with which it is occupied is one of the very highest interest, lying at the foundation of all sound theology, and carrying with it claims to attention, particularly for the present age, beyond perhaps any other that could well be named. It is handled here too, so far as actual substance is concerned, in a truly learned and masterly manner; so as to be every way worthy of coming into respectful audience and consideration with all who take pleasure in divinity, whether in the Episcopal Church or on the outside of it. At the same time, as we have had too much opportunity to know, the theme, with all its vast significance, is for a large part of our reigning religious thought by no means palatable; for the reason precisely that it runs counter to many of its traditional prejudices, and is felt to involve practical consequences in the end, which it has become a sort of settled maxim with it to resist tooth

and nail in defiance of all examination. The age, however tolerant it may be in other directions, has no toleration at all generally for the idea of the *Church* or for the mystery of the *Sacraments*; and is but too ready to turn away with impatient disgust from any theological inquiry that leads this way. With all its professed love for liberty and light, it is apt here to resent everything like free investigation, and to shrink from *science* as though its presence were only suited to give pain. In such circumstances, it is to be regretted that the work before us should not have every outward advantage along with it, to assist it in commanding for its great subject the homage, which this has a right to claim, but at the same time so little power with too many to enforce. We are apprehensive that it is not reaching any such circulation, nor gaining any such earnest attention, as may be counted at all commensurate with its deserts. It seems to be received only with a sort of half-complaisance at best even in the Episcopal Church; while almost no notice whatever is taken of it among other denominations; for the simple reason perhaps that it is felt to move in a foreign sphere of thought, with which only *churchmen*, in the Episcopal sense, are regarded as having any sympathy or concern.

With all the prejudices of the age however towards the subject here brought into view, it is clear enough that this belongs notwithstanding to the proper religious life of the age itself, and that it is forcing itself more and more from all sides, in spite of prejudice, upon its consideration and regard. It is not uncommon, nor unnatural, for an idea or tendency to be at once resisted and responded to, in this way, by the life of an age, whose inmost necessity perhaps it comes both to interpret and fulfil. A new spirit of thought plainly is beginning to prevail in regard to Christ's *person*. Even in New England, theology may be seen gradually waking to an interest, which a few years since was wanting altogether, in what may be called the Christological Mystery, with more or less apprehension of its living concrete relations to the constitution of the world and the course of history. Questions which not long ago were considered fully settled, and laid away as shelf abstractions, on the hypostatical union and its practical results, are now, whether men choose to be pleased with it or not, asserting their right to be re-studied, and settled over again, with something of the same sort of interest that is given to immediately present realities of corresponding moment in the sphere of nature. It is coming to be widely felt, that theology needs a regeneration, as well as our christian life generally, and that this must turn on a clearer and more power-

ful apprehension of what is comprehended in the person of Christ himself, as the true centre and fountain at the same time of all truth and grace besides. Christology is acquiring, in this way, new significance, as a world of truth within itself, from whose bosom only, fairly entered in the first place by faith, it can ever be possible to understand either the nature of God or the nature of man. In all such tendencies and indications, come from what quarter they may, we unfeignedly rejoice. They carry in them a promise of good for the future; while they serve to reveal also the ephemeral character of what is different or contrary in the present. The fashion of our present reigning theology, with all its affected self-sufficiency, is evidently doomed to pass away. The mind of the christian world is coming to regard it more and more with misgiving and distrust; and on all sides the persuasion gains ground that the Christological Question, embracing the true idea of the Church and its relation to the Saviour's living person, is in truth the great question of the age, and carries in itself a power by which all the interests of religion are to be moulded hereafter into new shape.

We propose no formal analysis of Wilberforce on the Incarnation, nor any examination of its several parts in detail. Our object is rather to call attention to what we conceive to be the immense practical significance of the general subject with which it is occupied; which may be best done perhaps, by singling out some of the leading aspects under which it is here made to challenge our regard, and holding them up to separate contemplation, without any particular respect to the author's plan. These will be found to agree substantially with views which are presented in our own book entitled *The Mystical Presence*; and we shall be glad certainly if the high authority by which they are now endorsed in this very able and learned English work, may serve to win for them in any quarter, a more earnest consideration than they have yet been able to engage under a simply American garb.

I. The *Mediation* of Christ holds primarily and fundamentally in the constitution of his person. With our current theology this is not admitted. The Mediatorial office is taken to be a sort of outward investiture, for which it was necessary indeed that Christ should have certain previous qualifications, but which is to be regarded still in this view as holding out of his person and beyond it; like the work assigned to Moses for instance, when he was selected and appointed to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, and to give them the Law at Mount Sinai. Two parties, God and man, are thought of as in a state of variance, and

as needing reconciliation ; a certain service is required for this purpose, it may be in the way of negotiation and persuasion simply, or it may be in the way of work, obedience, sacrifice, atonement ; and to meet this requirement, under such purely outward view, Christ is regarded as assuming the character of a day's man or arbitrator, and as coming *between* the parties thus in order to bring them together. He may be considered a mere Prophet, in the Unitarian sense, who saves by his excellent doctrine and holy example ; or he may be allowed to be far more than this, a Saviour possessed of truly Divine powers, according to the orthodox faith, by the mystery of the incarnation, who takes away sin by suffering the penalty of it in his own person ; but still in either case, the thing done has its proper seat and substance in the relation of the parties concerned by itself considered, while Christ as the doer of it stands always as it were on the outside of the transaction, in the character comparatively of an instrument or servant to his own glorious work. Now every such view of redemption we hold to be more or less inadequate and false ; and it is of the utmost consequence, we think, that attention should be fully fastened on the point, for the purpose of promoting a more just apprehension of this great mystery in its true nature and power. The Mediation of Christ, we say, holds primarily and fundamentally in the constitution of his person. His Incarnation is not to be regarded as a device *in order* to his Mediation, the needful preliminary and condition of this merely as an independent and separate work ; it is itself the Mediatorial Fact, in all its height and depth, and length and breadth.

“ His name of Mediator,” says our author, “ is not bestowed by reason of any work, in which He was occasionally or partially occupied ; it sets forth that office, which resulted from the permanent union in one person of God and Man. For the benefits which He bestows upon man's nature result from his being the link which binds it to Deity. The salvation of Adam's race depends upon the influence of that higher nature, which has been introduced into it from above. This gift was first bestowed upon humanity in the Person of Christ, that from Him it might afterwards be extended in degree to all His brethren.” He is accordingly not *a* Mediator, but *the* Mediator between God and Man ; as Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 5, allows *one* only, in such way as to exclude all others. There may be a number of relative mediators between God and men, but there can be only one who is the absolute junction and union of the two parties thus distinguished. “ Christ is the real bond by which Godhead and hu-

manity are united. And this arises not from any technical and artificial appointment; He bears this name, because He is what it expresses. His title follows from His nature, as effect from cause, as consequent from antecedent. He truly is what no other is, or can be beside Him, the Pattern Man, the second Adam; therefore no other can take his place among the generations of mankind." The Mediation of Christ is his actually binding the nature of God and the nature of Man into one life, in his own person. "For this cause the Son of God consented to become the Son of Man: 'When Thou tookest upon Thee to deliver man, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb.' Moses acted as mediator, Christ became one." The Christian faith, as set forth by the universal Church from the beginning, looks first accordingly not to our Lord's acts so much as to the mystery of his personality. "It has sometimes been asked why our Lord's Atonement is not inserted in the Creed, in such express words as his Incarnation. The reason is, that our Lord's Atonement may be admitted in words, although those who use them attach no christian sense to the doctrine which they acknowledge; whereas if the doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation is once truly accepted, His Mediation follows as its necessary result. So that the Church was guided by Divine Wisdom, to make this article of our Lord's real nature the criterion of her belief, the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*: it holds a leading place in the profession which in all ages has been required at Baptism; and the early believers gave a token of their reverence, when on declaring that He 'was made man,' they were wont, with one consent, to bow the knee and worship." Christ's person is thus at once the centre and comprehension of all functions discharged on God's part towards man, or on man's part towards God. He is the sole channel of grace, and the only medium through whom our prayers can ascend acceptably to heaven. "This is the place wherein heaven and earth are connected; the bridge which joins them together. He is the *door*, the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*."—P. 170–173.

It makes all the difference in the world for our theology, whether the Christian Salvation be apprehended as a living fact thus starting in the person of Christ, or as an arrangement or economy simply in the Divine Mind which Christ came into the world to serve in an outward and instrumental way. Every evangelical doctrine becomes different, as seen either from the one of these points of view or from the other. It is not enough that the articles of our faith may carry in any case separately an orthodox sound; all depends on the order in which they are

bound together, the principle from which they proceed, their interior genealogy and connection as parts of a common whole. The most orthodox formula may be full of heresy, if abstracted from the real ground of Christianity, and made to stand before us as a naked word or thought in some other form. The true order of the Christian faith is given in the Creed. All rests on the mystery of the Incarnation. *That* is itself Christianity, the true idea of the Gospel, the new world of grace and truth, in which the discord of sin, the vanity of nature, the reign of death, are brought forever to an end. Here is an order of life which was not in the world before, the Word made Flesh, God and Man brought into living union in the person of Jesus Christ, as the nucleus and fountain of salvation for the race. He is the Mediator, because God and Man are thus in a real way joined together and made one in his person. The primary force of his character in this view, the power which belongs to him to make reconciliation and atonement, lies in the fact that the parties between whom he mediates are in truth united first of all in the very constitution of his own life. He is in this way the actual *medium* of their conjunction. The mission of salvation which he came to fulfil was not indeed at once completed by the mystery of the hypostatical union; his Mediatorship involved a history, a work, the execution of prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices, a life of suffering and trial, the atonement, the resurrection, the sitting at the right hand of God, from whence he shall come to judge the world; but all this only as the proper and necessary result of the first mystery itself, the entrance of the Divine Word in a living way into the sphere of our fallen Humanity. This brought heaven and earth together in the very heart or centre of the world's life, and carried in itself the guaranty that all which was required to make the union permanent and complete should in due order be triumphantly accomplished. Conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, Jesus Christ must necessarily suffer also and die, but only that by doing so he might conquer death, and bring in everlasting righteousness and immortal life for the nature he came to redeem and save. Forth from this sublime Fact proceeds the presence of the Holy Ghost, the power of a new creation in the world, the mystery of the Church, one, holy and catholic, and the whole process of salvation from the remission of sins in baptism on to the resurrection of the last day. The sense of Christ's Person, as the true bond that reconciles God and Man, brings along with it all this faith; and no article, we repeat it, deserves to be considered part of the Christian Creed, which comes not to be of

force in this order and on this ground. The early Church stood here on the true foundation. The Creed, as held from the beginning, forms the true and only legitimate basis of Christian orthodoxy. It needs, in this view, no condescending indulgence, no apology, no qualification, no surreptitious foisting of a new and better sense into its ancient phraseology. Any modern system which finds this necessary, however creditable and plausible it may appear in other respects, stands convicted by the very fact of being itself in a false position. No doctrine can be valid and worthy of trust in the world that comes from Christ, which is not inwardly rooted in the Christological mystery of the old Creed. As an *abstraction*, a thing of mere thought and notion, supposed to hold in the relations of God and man out of Christ, and beyond the power of the concrete Fact embodied in his person, all pretended orthodoxy is reduced at last to a mere empty sham. Even as it regards the nature of God or the nature of man separately taken, our faith and science become truly *christian*, only when they are conditioned by a lively apprehension of what has come to pass in Christ. Where sympathy with the Creed is dull, and inward sense for its grandeur gone, there may still be much talk of God's attributes and works in a different view, of election and reprobation, of man's natural depravity, of justification by faith, regeneration, and other such high evangelical themes; but there can be no really sound and vigorous theology at any point. We will not hear, in such case, those who pretend to plant themselves on the authority of the *Bible*, while they are guilty of such palpable falling away from the mind of the Church in the age when the New Testament was formed; for the very point here to be settled, is the true sense and meaning of the Bible; and what we maintain is, that the early Church is more to be trusted than they are, in regard to what constitutes the primary conception of Christianity, which must serve as a rule to guide us in the proper study of the Scriptures. The Bible rests on Christ. Light is not more necessary for seeing the world, than the idea of Christ is for reading the true mind of God in his written word. The indwelling Creed, in this view, must underlie our use of the Bible, if it is to be at all just and safe. To say otherwise, is to subordinate the Bible to that which is *not* original Christianity, the thinking of this man or that, or the thinking of a sect in no union with the Fact of the Christian faith as it stood in the beginning; and surely when it comes to this, there ought to be no great difficulty, one would think, in deciding which alternative it is the part of wisdom, not to say faith, to choose. However grating it may sound

to some ears, the truth needs to be loudly and constantly repeated: The Bible is not the *principle* of Christianity, neither its origin, nor its fountain, nor its foundation. For the opposite imagination is not by any means an innocent or powerless error. It strikes at the essence of Christianity, which is neither doctrine nor law but living grace, and tends to resolve it into a mere abstraction, a theory, that has its being in the world in men's thoughts mainly, and not in any more substantial form; which, carried out to its legitimate end, is just what we are to understand by Rationalism. It is of the utmost account to see, on the contrary, that the principle of Christianity is the Lord Jesus Christ himself, the Word made Flesh, the Christological Fact underlying, as in the Creed, the new heavens and the new earth. With the sense of this old faith in the mind, no difficulty whatever is found in recognizing it as the true voice also of the Bible. It springs into view from all sides; and the only wonder is, how it should be possible for any, under the power of the uncatholic theory, *not* to perceive and acknowledge its force. Christ is always, in the New Testament, the sum and substance of his own salvation; the way, the truth, the life; the divine *καταλλαγή*, reconciliation or atonement, in whom God appears reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor. v. 18, 19); the victory over death and hell; the true ladder of Jacob's vision, by which the heavens are brought into perpetual free and open communion with the earth. He is the Peace of the world, the deepest and last sense of Man's life, by which all its other discords are harmonized, in the deep toned diapason of its real union with God.

II. This conception implies that the sense and power of Man's life universally considered come to view only in Christ; on which account the mystery of the incarnation, as revealed in his person, is no isolated portent or prodigy, but a fact that holds in strict *organic and historical continuity and unity with the life of the human world as a whole*. In no other view can the mystery be regarded as real. Christ is indeed the entrance of a *new* life into the world, the Word clothing itself with flesh; but he is this, at the same time, in the way of an actual, and not simply apparent, entrance into the world. He was no theophany, but a real and proper man, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. In this character however he could not be merely a common man, one of the race as it stood before. Such a supposition would belie the other side of his being. As the beginning of a new and higher creation, his entrance into the world must be of universal force, a fact of force for humanity in its collective view.

In no other way can the mystery be apprehended as real. Make Christ either a common man, sharing humanity with Moses, David, Peter and Paul, or in lieu of this a man wholly on the outside of this humanity as it belongs to others; and in both cases the conception of his Mediatorial character is gone, lost in Ebionitism on the one side or lost in fantastic Gnosticism on the other. The person of Christ, as Mediator, is of universal human significance and force. So the Scriptures teach when they call him the *Second Adam*; a title plainly implying that he is to be regarded in some way as the root of the race, in a deeper sense even than this can be affirmed of the First Adam. It is accordingly a vast mistake, contradicting alike the letter and the spirit of the Gospel, and leading to consequences of enormous mischief, when the Christian Salvation is taken to be in its primary purpose and plan for a part of the race only, a certain number of individuals as such, and not for Humanity as a whole. It must terminate on individuals indeed, and this involves an "election of grace;" but like all *Life*, it is universal before it becomes thus particular and single, and the single christian is saved only by receiving it into himself under this character. To conceive of Christ's redemption as having regard, either to all men numerically and outwardly considered, according to the Pelagian theory, or to a given number only in the same outward view, according to at least one kind of Calvinism, involves in the end the same error; this namely, that Christ did not really assume our human nature at all, in his Mediatorial life, but only stood on the outside of it, and wrought a work beyond it, in the semblance of our common manhood, for the benefit of such as are brought individually and separately to avail themselves of his grace. This is to make Christ a mere instrument or means, for the accomplishment of an end which is supposed to have its existence and necessity under a wholly different form; than which it is hard to conceive of anything more derogatory to the true dignity of his person. Gloriously above all this is the form under which he appears in the Gospel. He is himself there the Salvation of the world, not simply as a true mediation between heaven and earth is reached in his own life separately considered, but as this life also, on its human side, is found to be the comprehension in truth of Man's life as a whole, the actual lifting up of our fallen nature from the ruins of the fall, and its full investiture with all the glory and honor for which it was originally formed. Humanity, as a single universal fact, is redeemed in Christ, truly and really, without regard to other men, any farther than as they are made to partake of this redemption by being brought into living union with his person.

Archdeacon Wilberforce puts himself to some trouble, to show that there is such a thing as *human nature* objectively considered, in distinction from the mere thought or notion of a certain multitude of men regarded as having a common character.

“The objection brought against the actual existence of human nature is, that being only an abstraction formed by ourselves from a variety of examples, there can be no *real thing* intended by it; to give it actual existence is supposed to be the error of the Realists, who attributed an objective existence to those universal conceptions, which were only the creatures of their own minds. Hence, the reality of human nature, as a thing existing in the external world, is denied, because to assert reality for the idea of it in our own minds, would be contrary to the theory of Nominalism, which prevails in logic. But this is to abuse the principles of Nominalism on one side, as the opposite principle of Realism has been abused on the other. That many objects can be united by our classing them under a common idea, does not give them any real objective union; but neither does it take that union away, provided that by other means it can be shown to exist. Yet this is the argument of those who, on principles of Nominalism, deny the objective existence of human nature. They pass over the distinction between such classifications as men make for themselves by an inward act of reasoning, and such as have been provided in the external world by God’s Providence. The one are only our own internal acts; the other have an external existence. The error of the Realists was encouraged, according to Archbishop Whately, by observation of those organized beings, which are bound together by the unalterable laws of nature. That in these cases there existed a real, though unknown bond, which maintained the perpetuity of the class, led men to attribute an objective existence to their own abstractions. But if no real connexion had united these external objects, the sight of them would not have led any one astray. When we class together philosophers or physicians, we bestow a common name upon those who are associated by their dispositions or employments. There is no connexion between them, distinct from the thoughts and actions to which the individuals described choose to addict themselves. There is a real similarity in their doings, supposing the class to be happily designated; but it is a similarity only, and at their will they may cease to resemble one another. It would be a vicious Realism, therefore, to assert the existence of an objective connexion among these parties, because we can embrace them under a common idea; but it would be an equally vicious Nominalism to deny an objective reality, where an inherent law prevents the possibility of such re-arrangement, and confines individuals to the peculiar classes to which they severally belong. The first would

be to claim for our own mind the power of making its inward ideas into external realities; the second would be to deny the existence of external realities, because we have not the power of making them. We have no right, therefore, to deny the existence of a common nature in those who are derived from a common origin; whose union does not depend upon their voluntary combination, and cannot be dissolved by their own will."—*P.* 48–50.

With some, all this may be set down as so much mysticism and transcendentalism. They go on the common sense view, which turns the world into a sand-heap. We agree however fully with Stahl, as quoted *p.* 52. "The more superficial a man is, the more isolated will every thing seem to him, for on the surface all things are detached. In mankind, in the nation, even in the family, he will see nothing but individuals, whose actions are altogether distinct. The deeper a man is, the more conscious will he be of those inward principles of unity, which radiate from the centre. Even the love of our neighbour is only a deep feeling of this unity, for a man does not love those to whom he does not perceive and feel himself bound. Unless sin could come through one, and through one atonement, there could be no understanding the command to love our neighbour."

Such a collective existence in the case of our race, not the aggregate of its individual lives but the underlying substance in which all these are one, is everywhere assumed in the Bible, as a fact entering into the whole history of religion. The race starts in Adam. It is recapitulated again, or gathered into a new centre and head, in Christ.

"This is the fact declared, when it is stated that Christ took man's nature: it implies the reality of a common humanity, and His perfect and entire entrance into its ranks, Thus did He assume a common relation to all mankind. This is why the existence of human nature is a thing too precious to be surrendered to the subtleties of logic, because upon its existence depends that real manhood of Christ which renders Him a co-partner with ourselves. And upon the reality of this fact is built that peculiar connexion between God and man, which is expressed by the term Mediation. It looks to an actual alteration in the condition of mankind, through the admission of a member into its ranks, in whom and through whom it attained an unprecedented elevation. Unless we discern this real impulse which was bestowed upon humanity, the doctrines of Atonement and Sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology. That 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' implies an actual acceptance of the

children of men, on account of the merits of one of their race ; as well as an actual change in the race itself through the entrance of its nobler associate. The work of man's redemption and renewal is a real work, performed by real agents. It is not only that the Almighty was pleased to save appearances, if we may so express it, by conceding to the representations of a third party, what He did not choose otherwise to yield or to acknowledge (as Queen Philippa prevailed over her harsher husband, Edward ;) but Christ's Incarnation was a step in the mighty purposes of the Most High, whereby all the relations of heaven and earth were truly affected. To deny, as is done by Bishop Hampden, 'that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done,' would be to resolve this real series of acts into a mere technical juggle. But to the reality of this work, the existence of that common nature is indispensable, whereby 'as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He Himself took part of the same.' Else, how would the perfect assumption of humanity have consisted with His retaining that divine personality, which it was impossible that He should surrender? Since it was no new person which He took, it can only have been the substratum in which personality has its existence. For His Incarnation was not the 'conversion of Godhead into flesh, but the taking of the manhood into God.' Or how could He have entered into a common relation to mankind in general, unless there had existed a common nature as the medium of union? This nature, which exists only in individual persons, He took for the earthly clothing of that divine personality, in which He must ever continue to exist."—P. 55-56.

The universalness of Christ's life does not consist in the assumption of the lives of all men into himself, but in the assumption of that living law or power, which, whether in Adam alone or in all his posterity, forms at once the entire fact of Humanity, irrespectively of the particular human existences in which it may appear. These are always a finite *All* ; the other is a boundless *Whole* ; two conceptions, which are as wide as the poles apart. Christ, in this view, is organically and historically joined, we say, with the universal life of Man, as its only true ground, and centre, and end. The child, it is sometimes said, is father to the man ; inasmuch as the first foreshadows the coming of the second ; although, in truth, that which is second here, when we look to inward reality, must be counted first. It is only in full manhood, that the tendencies and powers of childhood are made complete at last, through the actualization of their own sense. Analogous with this is the relation of our general human nature to the coming of Christ. It looks to this event from the beginning, as the proper completion of its own

meaning; and in such view may be regarded as opening the way for it in the order of time; although as regards the order of actual being the mystery of the incarnation must be considered first, as that which lies at the ground of our whole human life in its true form. Christ thus is the deepest sense, the most urgent want of humanity, as it stood previously to his coming, or still stands where his coming is not owned. The universal constitution of the world looks towards him as its necessary centre. All the lines of history converge towards him as their necessary end. He is the "desire of all nations," the dream of the Gentile as well as the hope of the Jew. If there be any wholeness in our human life whatever, any rational unity in history, and if the incarnation be at the same time a real putting on of humanity, a real entrance of the Word into the process of our existence, and not a mere Gnostic vision or Hindoo avatar instead, how is it possible to escape the truth of this proposition? Those who seek to cut off Christ from all organic, inwardly historical connection with the world in its natural form, as though his credit must be endangered by his being made to appear a true *birth* of mankind, the veritable *seed* of the woman which should bruise the serpent's head, know not surely what they are about. As an abstraction, in no natural union with the life of Man universally considered, how could his pretensions ever be legitimated or made sure?

III. The *Humanity* of Christ is the repository and medium of salvation for the rest of mankind. The truth of this proposition flows inevitably, from what has been already said of his Mediatorial nature, and its relation to the universal or whole life of the race. Christ has redeemed the world, or the nature of Man as fallen in Adam, by so taking it into union with his own higher nature as to deliver it from the curse and power of sin; meeting the usurpation of this false principle with firm resistance from the start; triumphantly repelling its assaults; and in the end leading captivity captive, by carrying his man's nature itself, through the portals of the resurrection, to the right hand of God in glory. The process holds primarily altogether in his own person. In his own person, however, as the Second Adam, the bearer and root of our whole human nature, now lifted thus into actual union with the Godhead, and so made answerable to its true idea, as we find this labored after by its whole creation from the beginning. Thus perfected, he has become the captain and author of salvation for others, Heb. ii. 10, v. 9; and through his glorification, the way is open for the Spirit to carry forward the work of Christianity in the hearts and lives of his people

John, vii. 39. Such is the order of the Creed; Manhood glorified first in Christ, then by the Spirit in the Church, which is his Body, the true fulness or completion of his life in the world. The beginning of the new creation then, the primary and original seat of our actual salvation, is the *Human Nature* of Christ; for this is the real ground and foundation of the universal conception of Humanity in its highest form, the central orb through relation to which only this can ever change its character from darkness to light. True, the power of Christ to save rests in his person as a whole and falls back specially on his Divinity; it is the life of the WORD which becomes the light of men. But it is this Life still only as it "comes into the world," and appears clothed in the habiliments of *flesh*; and so we say the Flesh of Christ, or the Word which has come in the Flesh, and not the Word out of the Flesh, is the door or fountain by which the whole grace of the Gospel comes to its revelation in the world. Starting in eternity, it finds here the only outlet for its entrance into time. As an accomplished fact upon the earth, in living union with Man's life, and not a mere decree or thought in the mind of God, the entire Gospel begins in Christ, and proclaims itself as something to be seen, felt and handled, (1 John, i. 1-3,) in the power of his true Man's nature. Whatever of power there is in Christ for salvation, it is lodged for the use of the world in his FLESH, as the necessary medium of communication with the human race, the one only bond of his brotherhood and fellowship with those he came to save. To imagine any saving union possible with Christ apart from his Flesh, aside from that glorified Humanity by which only his Mediation stands in real contact with the world, is virtually to deny the mystery of the Incarnation itself, by making it to be of no meaning or force. It is the mark of Antichrist, we are told 1 John iv. 1-3, to place the coming of Christ *out of the flesh*.

This idea meets us everywhere in the ancient Church. "The mixture of Christ's bodily substance with ours," says Hooker, is a thing which the ancient Fathers disclaim. Yet the mixture of his flesh with ours they speak of, to signify what our very bodies, through mystical conjunction, receive from that vital efficiency which we know to be his; and from bodily mixtures they borrow divers similitudes, rather to declare the truth, than the manner of coherence between his sacred and the sanctified bodies of saints," *Eccl. Pol. V. 56, 9*. So with the Church of the Reformation, the sense of the same mystery, as set forth in the Creed, wrought powerfully on all sides. Luther's faith and zeal here are well known. Calvin, in his way, is no less strong.

With all his opposition to a crass Capernaïtic view of Christ's flesh, he insists continually on the great idea, that the Christian Salvation starts from the Humanity of Christ in a real way, and that we participate in it only by entering really into the new order of life of which this is the fountain and seat. His language on this subject has been pronounced mystical and unmeaning; but it is so only for those who have become estranged, in their thinking, from the true and proper sense of the mystery with which it is concerned. In itself it is uncommonly lucid and clear, and admirably answerable to the form under which the subject meets us in the Gospel. The Word is the source of life; to recover man, this has entered into union with his nature by becoming flesh; *in which form alone*, Christ is now the author of salvation to all who believe in his name. "The very flesh in which he dwells is made to be vivific for us, that we may be nourished by it to immortality. I am the living head, he says, which came down from heaven; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world (John vi. 48, 51). In these words he teaches, not simply that he is Life, as the Everlasting Word descending to us from heaven, but that in thus descending he has infused this virtue also into the flesh with which he clothed himself, in order that life might flow over to us from it continually." Calvin speaks, of course, not of Christ's flesh materially considered, but of his real human nature, through which only it is possible for this same nature in other men to be raised from death to immortality. The vivification of humanity begins in *his* manhood. His flesh is truly thus *life-giving*, not as the origin of life, but as its necessary and only medium for our fallen race. The manhood of Christ is the reservoir or depository in which all grace dwells first, (the Spirit without measure,) for the use of the whole world besides. "Christi CARO instar fontis est divitis et inexhausti, quæ vitam a divinitate in seipsam scaturientem ad nos transfundit." It would be hard to express the same thought more beautifully, or more clearly, in the same compass.

"Any school," Wilberforce tells us, "which denies the humanity of the Mediator to be the medium through which divine gifts are communicated to mankind, (and such is the error of all Rationalists,) is theologically allied either to Nestorianism or to Deism, in which Nestorianism results."—P. 154.

IV. The participation of Christ's benefits, in the case of his people, turns on a *real communication with his human nature* in the way of life. This is the idea of the "mystical union;" which all evangelical christians are willing to admit; while they

are too prone however, in many cases, to make it of no force, by carefully excluding from it the very mystery from which it draws its name. Because it holds only through the Spirit or Holy Ghost, they will have it that it is altogether spiritual, in such sense as to have no relation to Christ's manhood whatever; pleasing themselves, under this name, with the fancy of a life union with Christ in his divine nature, as though this only might be regarded as the fountain of such high grace in a separate and independent view. But this would imply the very consequence from which they pretend to shrink, without reason, on the other side, an actual partnership of believers with Christ in the awful mystery of the incarnation itself; for what less is it, if every single christian be joined in the way of real life directly with the Word absolutely taken, and not with the Word only *through* the flesh which it has already assumed in Christ. There is but one Incarnation, (*one* Mediator between God and man, the *Man* Christ Jesus,) but he is of such constitution, carrying our universal nature in his person, that all men may be joined with God also through him, by receiving into themselves the power of his life. This implies in their case no hypostatical union with Deity, no new theanthropy in the sense of Christ's person; but just the reverse; since the only medium of union with the Godhead is Christ's manhood, as something that must necessarily intervene between the Divine Word and all other men.

The law of such relation is by no means confined to this case; but finds analogies and exemplifications throughout the universal economy of our life; only we have here the absolute truth of what in all other cases comes before us relatively only and in the way of remote approximation. Men never stand separately, and with fully co-ordinate personality, in the union of society; but always in organic groups that cluster around some common centre, and find support in this as the bond or medium of communion with a life that is higher and more general than their own. Every *hero*, in the broad sense of this word as denoting one who is qualified and called to go before others in the mission of Humanity, stands actually between those who follow him and the superior world from which this mission proceeds; he is for them the real organ of its revelation; and through him, at the same time, they gain strength and power to master it as their own, although without such central support this would be wholly impossible. In this case the personality of every follower is completed, like that of the leader himself, by union with the higher life which fills his soul; but this only, let it be observed, not by taking his place as the primary organ of such communi-

cation, but by acknowledging rather his central position, and leaning upon him as the necessary medium of the benefit thus gained. Such is the universal law of our life. And what does it teach? Clearly this, that our human personality can never become absolutely complete, till it comes to be joined in a real way at last with the life of God itself, which alone needs no ground beyond itself; and that such conjunction requires, (not a general deification of the race as the Hegelians dream,) but a Central Person, in whom Divinity may be actually united with Humanity, and who may be qualified thus to communicate the fellowship of the "divine nature" mediately to all who trust in his name. This is just the mystery which meets us in Christ. In him alone among men dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and we are complete in him, as the head of all principality and power (Col. ii. 9, 10). Christ's person is the bearer of our persons. We are complete, as regards intelligence and will, only as we live not by and from ourselves, but through faith in him, as the centre and end of our whole existence.

There is no room then to object to the idea of the mystical union as now stated, that it implies a continuation of the hypostatical mystery over into the life of the Church. The ancients do indeed speak at times of our being deified in Christ, as sharers of his nature; but they mean not by this, of course, any deification aside from Christ himself. Through the medium of his humanity, it is the privilege of believers, without losing their own separate individuality, to fall in on the fulness of his person as the true central ground of their own lives, and thus to participate in the grace of which he alone is the repository and fountain, and which is accessible to others only as they are joined to him in this way.

"The union of mankind with Christ is not a mere imitation—the following a good model—the fixing our thoughts upon One who has shown in the clearest manner, how God may be served and men benefitted—it is an actual and real union, whereby all renewed men are joined to the second, as they were by nature to the first Adam. This union cannot be explained away in the kingdom of grace, unless it is first explained away in the kingdom of nature. Unless 'sin standeth' only 'in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk' holiness must involve not the mere imitation; but the putting on, of the man Christ Jesus. By what means the relation is maintained, is in each case an inexplicable mystery; the natural alliance which takes place by descent being not less wonderful than that supernatural alliance which is brought by the regeneration. To analyze the law of family affinity is as much be-

yond our powers, as to understand how 'as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' The first is that transmission of the nature of our common ancestor which causes us to be what we are; the second is that spiritual Presence of the manhood of Christ, by union with which we become what it is given to us to be. The one of these is in Holy Writ set against the other, 'for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' As the one has its influence both on soul and body, so has the other."
—P. 229-230.

V. As the medium of such living grace the *Human Nature* of Christ, and not simply his Divinity, is actively *present* always in the world. The Mediation of the Saviour, since his Ascension, holds towards God in his Intercession, while towards man it may be summed up in the single term of his *Presence*. This was his great promise, on going away: "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you." The promise plainly regards the restoration of what was about to be lost, the presence of our Lord, namely, according to his human nature; only under a new and higher form. In this view, it is a spiritual and not a carnal presence; a presence accomplished not in the way of place and material contact, but by the intervention of the Holy Ghost; while however, as regards efficiency and force, it is not for this reason less real, but rather we may say more real, than it could be in any other way. On this subject take the following extract.

"Neither is this Presence merely that He is an object to men's thoughts, as Jerusalem was present to David from the land of Hermon. The reality of Christ's presence depends on Himself, not on those He visits. It had been an unmeaning promise to His disciples, that His Presence should return to them through the power of the Holy Ghost, had He designed only that through the exertion of their mental faculties they might think of Him who was departed. In this sense how is Christ present more than any Angel in light? We are speaking not of men's actings towards Him, but of His actings towards them, since His Ascension into heaven. As He acts *for* them by intercession with the Father, so are we assured that He acts *towards* them by His Presence with power. What is meant by His office as Mediator, unless through the annexation of the Divine to the Human nature, the latter has in itself some real influence independently of our thoughts? And this is the answer to the assertion, that since a body must either be present in any place, or not present in it, therefore Christ's body must either be materially present in the consecrated elements at the Holy Eucharist, or that we must allow that His Presence is merely figura-

tive. Doubtless it were so, if His body were a human body alone ; but because He is Divine also, it has likewise that other medium of communication which does not depend upon local contiguity, but upon spiritual power. Even the sun, because its influence is more wide than its actual limits, while it is at rest in its place in the sky, is present upon earth by the effluence of its beams. But that Sacred Manhood which was created for the service of the Mediator between God and men, in which were stored up the 'treasures of wisdom and knowledge,' that from it 'grace and truth' might flow forth into the whole race of man, has a real medium of presence through the Deity which is joined to it : so that it can be in all places and with all persons—not figuratively, but in truth—not by material contact, but by spiritual power. And while its material place is among the armies of heaven, its spiritual presence is among the inhabitants of the earth, when, how, and wheresoever is pleasing to its own gracious will."—*P.* 221–222.

The Mediation of Christ, then, is not something past and gone, nor yet something that lies wholly beyond the actual order of the world, with which we are to communicate only in the way of memory or thought ; it lives always, with perennial force, in the actual Presence of Christ's Manhood in the world. This thought reigns throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews. His *one* sacrifice is once for all, not as a transient event, but as an ever during fact in the power of his indissoluble Mediatorial life. His intercession is going forward *now* in real union with the daily course of the world, as truly as the sun enters into the same economy from day to day. "Our Lord's acts of Mediation towards men, as well as his Intercession with the Father, are a present fact in the world of life, and not a mere fictitious representation. To be accounted the bond of union between different natures is to discharge the part of a Mediator ; to be their real bond of union is to *be* one. Christ did not undertake this office as a legal fiction ; he is the 'One Mediator,' because in him Godhead and Manhood were really united. And if he has still the same character, it must be in fact and not in name—Godhead and Manhood must still be connected by his actual intervention. While he is one by nature with the Everlasting Father, he must be one also by grace with those inferior members to whom he has vouchsafed to become Head, that he might be the 'Saviour of the body.' For the gifts of grace do not become less necessary through the lapse of ages : every generation of Adam's children has equal need of that external principle of supernatural renewal, which flows from the humanity of the Son of God into his brethren. The acts of his human, must

continue therefore as certainly as those of his Divine nature, and consequently that Presence of his manhood, whereby 'we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.'—If Christ be still Mediator, there must be the perpetual presence among us of his man's nature, whereby he who is one with the Father becomes one also with his brethren."—*P.* 238–239. To separate the action of Christ in the world now from his man's nature, and to refer it only to his Divinity, is just to say that he no longer *acts* as a man at all, in other words is no longer really man, as in the days of humiliation. "And what then must be thought of that body which suffered on the Cross, but that either it was a created substance, invested by God's mercy with more than mortal power and goodness, that it might accomplish that sacrifice which was needed for mankind—which is the Arian hypothesis; or else that the Father of all displayed himself in man's form by a transient and occasional manifestation, and (that work being over) has again retreated into the abyss of his unapproachable Godhead"—which is the more subtle heresy of Sabellius. The Incarnation cannot be held as real, if the being and working of the Mediator in the world be not apprehended as the presence in it still of the living power of his true Human Life. This should be plain to all.

VI. Christ's Presence in the world is in and by his mystical body, the *Church*. As a real human presence, carrying in itself the power of a new life for the race in general, it is no abstraction or object of thought merely, but a glorious living Reality, continuously at work, in an organic and historical way, in the world's constitution. Christ communicates himself to his people, and lives in them, not by isolated favor in each case, but collectively. His relation is at once to the whole family of the redeemed, and single christians accordingly have part in him only as they are comprehended at the same time in this whole. To be in Christ, is to be a member also necessarily of his mystical body, as dependence on a natural centre implies comprehension in the universal orb or sphere holding in the same relation. This is the idea of the Church. It comes from within and not from without. It grows out of the mystery of the Incarnation, apprehended as an abiding fact, and comes before us in the Creed accordingly, not as a notion or speculation merely, but as **an article of faith**. So too it has its attributes from itself and not from abroad. It is by an *a priori* necessity, it claims to be one, holy, and catholic. To deny or question this necessity is at once a heresy, which strikes in the end at the very foundation of Christianity itself. "That the Church is one body results

from organization, not from enactment," much less from human policy and agreement. "Neither is the profession of the Church's unity the mere admission of an external appearance, but the belief of an inward verity;" facts may or may not accord with it at any given time, but it still remains unalterably certain in its own nature, until Christianity itself be found to be false. Christ's *one* mediation, as related to men and reaching them through his glorified humanity, always present for this purpose in the world by the Spirit, is carried forward through the intervention of the Church, his Body Mystical, the fulness of what he is otherwise by distinction only in its single members. The Church, in this view, does indeed stand between Christ and the believer, but only as the body of a living man is between one of his limbs and the living soul by which it is quickened and moved.

VII. The idea of the Church, as thus standing between Christ and single christians, implies of necessity visible *organization*, common *worship*, a regular public *ministry* and *ritual*, and to crown all especially grace-bearing *sacraments*. To question this, is to give up to the same extent the sense of Christ's Mediation as a perennial fact, now and always taking effect upon the economy of the world through the Church as his mystical body. Let it be felt that the Incarnation is a mystery not simply past, and not simply beyond the world, but at this time in full force for the world, carrying in itself the whole value of Christ's sacrifice and resurrection as an undying "ONCE FOR ALL"—the true conception of the Mediatorial Supremacy, as the real headship of Christ's manhood over all in behalf of the Church and for its salvation; let it be felt, at the same time, that this mystery touches men in and by the Church, which itself is made to challenge their faith for this reason as something supernatural and divine; and it becomes at once impossible to resist the feeling, that the "powers of the world to come" are actually at hand in its functions and services, with the same objective reality that attaches to the powers of nature under their own form and in their own place. To see no more in the ministry and offices of the Church, in this view, than a power of mere outward declaration and testimony, such as we might have in any secular school, betrays a rationalistic habit of mind, which only needs to be set free from the indolence of uninquiring tradition, that it may be led to deny altogether that Christ has ever or at all come in the flesh.

It sounds well, and falls in well too with *natural* reason and popular sense, to magnify what is called spiritual religion as compared with a religion of outward ordinances and forms, and

to make Christianity turn on individual exercises transacted directly with God, in the sanctuary of the mind, aside from all regard to sacramental or other intervening media. But it ought to be borne in mind, that Christianity is not mere nature, and that to throw ourselves here on simply natural conceptions and impulses is in truth to substitute for it another theory of religion altogether. It comes to us as a system of redemption and salvation by a Mediator. It is throughout a mediatorial economy. The grace it reveals, is offered in Christ, not from a different quarter. It is offered in Christ again as Man; by the intervention of his flesh; through the door of his humanity, in the most real and true way. Under this form it is not something to be thought of merely, with however much devotion, on the part of the believer; the case calls for an actual participation in its life and power. Christianity is so constituted accordingly as to be dependent always on means, which have for their object this union and communion in a real way. Salvation in these circumstances is still a personal and inward or spiritual interest; *mere* relations and forms save no man; but it is made to hang on the medium of a special economy in the Church as the mystical body of Christ, serving to bind the subject in living union with his natural flesh or humanity; which is embraced and rested upon by faith accordingly for this purpose. Not to acknowledge this, but to insist on having access to God independently of any such special economy, by virtue simply of the relation in which all souls stand to him as the "Father of the spirits of all flesh," is not Christianity but Rationalism under the christian name.

"To assert the truth of Christ's presence — the reality of that union which binds the whole mystic body of His Church to the manhood of the Incarnate Word—is to maintain the reality of His Mediation, and the absolute necessity of that bond by which heaven and earth are united. For it is a necessary result of the cardinal truth of the Christian system—the truth, *i. e.*, that all gifts and blessings are introduced into our race through the intervention of that nobler member, who connects it with the Almighty. And herein is the Christian scheme of Mediation opposed to that theory of Rationalism, which rests upon the capacities of nature. The principle of Rationalism is, that man's improvement may be effected through those gifts which God bestowed upon him by creation, inasmuch as sufficient means of intercourse with the Supreme Spirit were provided by the law of his nature. Whereas the Church deals with man as a fallen race, whose original means of intercourse with God have been obstructed, and which needs a new and supernatural channel for the entrance of heavenly gifts. And this chan-

nel has been provided through the Man Jesus Christ. In His person did Godhead enter manhood, that through this one perfect type of humanity, it might 'leaven the whole lump.' Thus does the law of grace supersede the law of nature. If man had never fallen, to inherit the nature of the first Adam had been a sufficient means of communion with God. But because the natural means of communication have been cut off, that supernatural union is requisite which we obtain by participating the nature of the second Adam. Now, it is for the diffusion of this renewed and renewing manhood, that those media have been provided, whereby the Son of Man communicates Himself to His brethren. All the ordinances of the Church, its hallowed things, places, and persons—its worship and sacraments—are a series of instruments whereby the sanctified manhood of the Mediator diffuses itself as a life-giving seed through the mass of humanity. Thus does He continue to effect that work through His man's nature, which He avowed to be the very object of His earthly being: 'For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' And for this office are external media as requisite, as were body and limbs to the truth of His human being. As He could not be a man without that substantial existence which revealed Him to the senses of mankind, so He could not be the Head of the Body Mystical, without the use of those actual media of intercourse, whereby He unites His living members to Himself."—*P.* 249-251.

There is no opposition between Christ and the Church, or between individual piety on the one hand and sacramental grace on the other; but just the reverse. Christ becomes full only in and by the Church; and personal experience is made solid and real, only as it rests on grace offered and appropriated from abroad. "To maintain that the outward means of grace, whereby we are united to the manhood of Christ, are not less necessary than those emotions of our own which have their seat within, is not to put the Church instead of Christ, but to protest against men's putting themselves in the place of their Redeemer. To speak of inward seriousness as necessary, is only to testify the truth of each man's separate responsibility; but to speak of it as superseding outward means, is to do away with the office of the 'One Mediator.' The individual life of each man's spirit, as opposed to the carelessness of a thoughtless walk, is the very treading down of Satan under our feet; but to contrast it with the value of Gospel ordinances, is to deny Christ, to depose him from his office of a Mediator, and to set up idols of intercession in our own hearts."—*P.* 270.

With this view of the significance of christian worship generally, the peculiar sense and power of the holy sacraments are

apprehended as a necessary consequence, the rejection of which must do violence to the whole Creed. They are "not only badges of profession" but also "certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace." They exhibit objectively the realities they represent. So we have it asserted very distinctly in the New Testament. Such was the faith, from the beginning, of the universal ancient Church. Such also is the original Protestant faith, as held by the two great confessions, Lutheran and Reformed, on the Continent, as well as by the Episcopal Church in England. Our author closes his view of this subject with the following paragraph, which we commend specially to the consideration of all *evangelical* skeptics, who make a merit of sneering at the idea of sacramental grace, whether in the case of baptism or in the case of the Lord's supper, as though it were the same thing with the "opus operatum" itself in the worst sense of Rome.

"It remains only to recall that which has been already stated, as applicable to both the sacred ordinances which have been considered. The reality of both of them has been maintained: it has been affirmed that Baptism is not merely the expression of a charitable hope; that the Lord's supper is not a bare act of pious recollection. The essential principle of each of them has been shown to be union with the perfect manhood of Christ Our Lord. Let it be remembered only in conclusion, that to deny their reality is to assail the great principle of the Mediation of Christ. For the Doctrine of Our Lord's Mediation does not rest only on the Divine power of Christ, as a partaker in the nature of self-existent Godhead; it implies also that, by associating man's nature to His own, He has made created being the channel of His gifts. Now, as the media through which these gifts are dispensed to His brethren; as the ramifications, whereby His Divine nature distributes itself on the right hand and the left, these two Sacraments go together—their importance is equal—their effect alike—and to disparage them is to derogate from that principle of action which the wisdom of God has seen fitting to adopt. Every attempt to explain them away, every contrivance for extenuating the real import of what they effect, is a virtual detracting from the reality of that objective and actual influence, which Christ the Mediator is pleased to exert. Its tendency is to resolve His actions into a metaphor, and His existence into a figure of speech. His specific and personal agency as the Eternal Son, who in the fulness of time conjoined Himself to man's nature for the recovery of a fallen race, is merged in the general action of that ultimate Spirit, whom none but Atheists professedly reject. For the real objection against the Sacramental system does not arise from any deficiency in its Scriptural authority,

which has been shown to be ample, but from the abstract improbability that external ordinances can be the means of obtaining internal gifts. Now, this improbability rests on the circumstance that the *natural* mean of connexion with God is the intercourse of mind with mind, and consequently that the intercourse through Sacraments is *supernatural*. The connexion with God, *i. e.* which man received by creation, and which Rationalism affirms to be sufficient for his wants, is more compatible with men's natural position, than that new system of Mediation which has been revealed in the Gospel. But let the doctrine of mediation be admitted, and it ceases to be an argument against the Sacramental system that it does not accord with that scheme of nature, which the Gospel professes to supersede. And the Rationalistic argument against these means of grace, is of equal avail against that whole scheme of Mediation upon which they are dependent. If the natural intercourse of mind with the unembodied mind of the Creator supersedes the necessity of Sacramental ordinances, does it not supersede equally the humanity of Christ? If man has still that immediate communion with God, of which Scripture affirms that the Fall deprived him, what need is there of a Mediator between them? Thus does the objection mount up from earth to heaven—from Christ feeding men below through Sacraments, to Christ mediating above by His Atonement and Intercession. For 'if we have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if we tell you of heavenly things?' If the Sacraments be thus emptied of their meaning, it is because the present actings of Christ as the Son of Man are not appreciated; and the purposes of His Incarnation are forgotten. And this forgetfulness again may be traced to unbelief in that real diversity of Persons in the Blessed Trinity, in which all creaturely existence has its ultimate root. Thus does a practical Sabellianism respecting Christ's Person coincide with that Rationalistic theory, by which the reality of His Sacraments is disputed. And their surrender is fatal to the true Doctrine concerning Himself, even as the true doctrine of His nature sets the importance of these instruments in a proper light."—P. 346–348.

Archdeacon Wilberforce is of course a High Churchman, and his whole work is designed to be in favor of Episcopacy as established in the Church of England. At the same time however, he knows very well how to distinguish between the form of Christianity in this view and its true interior life and substance. There are two sorts of high churchmanship. One starts with a certain system of outward order, as though it were the first thing, the main thing, settled and sure by divine appointment in and of itself, and made to inclose thus externally all truth besides as its necessary boundary and hedge. In this way, too often, we

find Episcopalians laying all stress on their favorite system, as of divine right and obligation apart from its own contents altogether ; as though Christ had been pleased to provide by such an outward institute in the first place for the safe-keeping of his truth and grace, and it were possible now by simply historical evidence, or in the way of ecclesiastical tradition, to make sure of this always as the necessary condition and medium of reaching what lies beyond. Episcopacy, with this way of thinking, is taken to be the primary interest of Christianity, an indispensable stepping stone at least, or threshold, to all that constitutes its interior sanctuary. It is to be accepted first as the necessary inclosure and platform of the Church. Vast pains are taken to establish its claims in this abstract view, on grounds and reasons that have nothing to do whatever with the inward constitution of Christianity itself ; and vast affectation follows, in parading such merely outward prerogative as a substitute for everything else, and a sufficient apology for overlooking and despising all earnest thought under a different form. This is pedantry, and so far as it prevails tends naturally and of right to bring the Church theory, with which it is associated, into discredit and contempt. But there is another way of holding and asserting the claims of the Church. It is to begin, not with the circumference of Christianity, but with its centre, the mystery of the Incarnation as we find it set forth in the Creed, and so to proceed to what flows from this for faith by necessary consequence and derivation. In this way the *idea* of the Church comes first ; and what its actualization may be found to comprehend subsequently, is apprehended and accepted in such living inward connection, not as something external to the proper christian life, but as the very form and expression of this life itself. It is in this order, that Archdeacon Wilberforce presses the claims of his subject. He sees the danger of substituting the Church as a formal system in place of its Head, and finds the only right security against it in the sense of their inward relation to each other as it springs from the christological fact itself.

“ So long as the Church is regarded as an external system, based on certain laws and administered by certain leaders, it can never fail to enlist a measure of that party spirit which belongs to man's nature, and thus to draw away attention from the holy purposes for which it was instituted. The only safeguard against this danger is the due subordination of its external frame-work to its internal principle ; and the constant recognition that its life depends, not on the gifts of government, but on the gifts of grace. If the es-

sence of the Church's existence be that certain men have a right to rule, and teach, and minister, whether they be chosen by the free voice of the congregation, imposed by government, or delegated by the Apostles, there is such large opening for cabal and dispute, that love and peace and Christ's presence will soon be lost in the din of party strife. The Presbyterian platform offers as good footing to the spirit of partisanship as the system of Episcopacy; and the Pilgrim Fathers of Massachusetts were as ready to persecute as Boniface or Hildebrand. But let the essence of the Church's existence be felt to be Christ's presence—let it be remembered that His manhood is the true seed of the renewed race, and that through spiritual presence it bestows its life-giving power on all the members of His mystic body—let every other question be dependent upon these—let them take their place, as of subordinate importance, and as merely contributing to this great result—and what room is there for discord between Christ and the Church, when the Church is Christ Himself manifest in His mystic body? 'For no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church.' The theorist may be unvisited by the sun's warmth while he discusses its nature, or the poet while he describes its brilliancy; but how can we loose sight of his glorious beams by going forth to walk in the sunshine? And so long as this Divine principle is kept fully in view, it can hardly fail to soften and elevate those whom it influences. So that if the harshness of party-spirit be not cured, it may at least be abated."—P. 268-269.

High Churchmanship, in this view, is everywhere entitled to respect. The Creed owns it in distinct terms, and it meets us from all sides in the faith of the early Church; to such an extent indeed that without it there can be no power to understand or appreciate this faith fully in any direction. The inferences which some feel authorised to draw from the idea of the Church in favor of Episcopacy, or farther still in favor of Romanism, are another thing. We have nothing to do with them here, in the way either of favor or opposition. They are at all events not what can be considered first and foremost, either as to evidence or importance, in this great question of the Church. There is a wide field of theological truth beyond them, and back of them in the order of faith, which it is quite possible for us to enter and possess intelligently before coming to their settlement and resolution at all, and which indeed we *must* possess with such preliminary occupation, in order to be at all qualified for this secondary work. For what is a man's faith worth in Episcopacy for instance, as a divine institution, who has not in the first place, as the root and ground of this a firm faith in the idea of "one, holy, catholic Church" as necessarily flowing from the

idea of the Incarnation, and whose mind is not led from this centre out to the other supposed necessary peripheral interest of Christianity, rather than in the reverse order from what is the circumference merely to the centre? And so on the other hand what is a man's rejection of Episcopacy worth, or his rejection we may add of Romanism itself, if it be not supported from behind by any true acknowledgment of the mystery of Christ and his Church, as we find it proclaimed from the beginning in the universal christian Creed? A controversy about Episcopacy between those who have not in their minds the sense of the Church as a divine mystery in the world, under the form of an *a priori* necessity starting in Christ, must ever be a waste of words more or less, on both sides. As such an *a priori* object of faith, then, the idea of the Church offers wide scope for contemplation and inquiry back of this controversy altogether; and in the circumstances of the present time especially, it is of the utmost account that this preliminary ground should be properly regarded and fairly taken into use under its separate character, without embarrassment from any such relations, which after all are of secondary rather than primary account, and even if taken in this view to be absolutely necessary, must still be held to be so in the way of derivation only from what goes before and not as its ground and cause. We like this book of Wilberforce on this account. However much it may aim to serve the cause of Episcopacy, that is not made the front at all of its argument. It starts with the beginning, and not with what at best should be counted only as the end. It plants itself on deeper ground, and throws itself back on the substance of Christianity as something older than Episcopacy, something that must of necessity underlie all its pretensions and claims, if they are to be found in any case worthy of respect. It is an argument for the idea of the Church, as founded on the glorious mystery of the Word made flesh and its perennial force in the world, which all who call themselves christians are bound to own and confess, whether such acknowledgment be felt to involve Episcopal conclusions or not. We may resist these, if it seem fit, and yet allow in full the force of what is involved in the idea of the Church as their supposed foundation. The inquiry here offered to our view, though in Episcopal hands, belongs in truth to Christianity in its most comprehensive character and form; all denominations, that have not formally or informally renounced the Apostles' Creed, may meet here as on common territory; for the question of the Church, as an article of faith, is one in which they are all alike bound to take interest, whatever may be their difference of view in regard to the outward form and order of the Church.

This deserves to be well understood and considered. The question with which we are first concerned in this great case, has nothing to do directly with Episcopacy or any other outward constitution as such; it regards the being of the Church, and its primary attributes, as an article of faith, in the sense of the ancient world. Is the faith of the ancient Church on this subject, as we find it uttered among the supposed fundamentals of the Creed, to be accepted as something still in force, or is it to be rejected as an empty dream and idle superstition? Is the Holy Catholic Church, as it once filled the soul of Christendom, a "figment," or is it still as in the beginning a divine fact on which men are required to lean as the very "pillar and ground of the truth" that starts in Christ? The misery of much of our modern religion is, not just that it differs from this or that particular form of church life, which may be supposed to have distinguished the early Church, but that the Church itself is taken to be a wholly different thing. It is notorious that the Church, according to the universal sense of the ancient christian world, was held to be the repository actually of superhuman powers among men, the medium not metaphorically but really and truly of grace lodged in its very constitution, from Christ its head, for the salvation of sinners. In such view only was it regarded as an object of *faith*. It was identified with the idea of Christ's Mediation, as a perennial fact in the world. The foundation of the christian life was held to be objectively at hand in its institutions, for the use of all who might lay hold of it by their means. Prophetical and priestly functions were felt to belong to it, as the Body of Christ. Its sacraments were regarded as vehicles, by the Spirit, of the high and solemn realities they were framed to represent. The idea of a mystical supernatural force going along with the activity of the Church, was acknowledged in every sort of way on all sides. All this is notorious; and it is just as notorious, on the other hand, that for much of our modern evangelical thinking this whole conception of the Church has gone entirely out of authority and date. A painful chasm holds here between much of our modern religious habit and the religion of the ancient Church. It becomes accordingly a great question, and the *first* we need to settle in relation to ecclesiastical order, (without clear and full answer to which it is vain to agitate any other questions in regard to it,) whether in this issue the ancient faith, or the modern variation now noticed, is to be taken as the true sense of Christianity. Church or No-church; that is the point which first requires to be settled. And to do this, it is not necessary to proceed empirically, or in other words to be ruled by mere out-

ward observation. Back of all *Lo here*, or *Lo there*, in this case, is the necessary constitution of the Church itself as an article, not of sight, but of faith. That starts in Christ; and according to the view we have of Christ, in the end, will be and must be our view also of the Church. We come to the true conception of the Church through a true and sound Christology, (as in the Creed,) and in no other way.

J. W. N.

MEMORIALS OF JOHN BARTRAM AND HUMPHRY MARSHALL.

Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall. By William Darlington, M. D., L. L. D. etc., with illustrations.—pp. 585. Lindsay and Blakiston, Philadelphia.—1849.

To rescue from oblivion the existing memorials of John Bartram, founder of the celebrated garden, near Philadelphia, which bears his name, and Humphry Marshall, author of the "*Arbustum Americanum*," the first treatise on plants ever written and published by an American,—men of Quaker descent and of native Pennsylvanian growth, who, while our country was yet new and filled with hostile savage tribes, while the study of Natural History, even in Europe, was yet in its infancy, before the star of Linnæus had risen to its full height, with no advantages of education beyond those afforded by the common school, which, at that day, must have been few indeed, and without the aids of fortune, led by natural taste, ventured forth into the wilderness, to explore and gather the vegetable treasures of so vast a region, travelling by manifold journeys, unprotected amid a thousand dangers, along the whole eastern slope of the Alleghenies, from the shores of the St. Lawrence to the swamps and everglades of Florida,—was a task that no one could execute half so well as the learned editor of the "*Reliquiæ Baldwinianæ*." He deserves the hearty thanks of "the lovers of Botany, on both sides of the Atlantic," to whom he has been pleased to dedicate this superb volume.

The value of the work is greatly enhanced by an article on the progress of the Science on this continent, judicious notes, and biographical sketches of Bartram, Marshall, and their botanical contemporaries. But it owes its bulk to letters to and from distinguished naturalists and philosophers at home and abroad,