

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 26.—April, 1886.

I.

THE SILENCE OF SCRIPTURE A PROOF OF
ITS DIVINE ORIGIN.

SILENCE is sometimes big with testimony. Evidence does not all get syllabled in speech. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language." The praise does not get spoken audibly to the ear of men; but the swinging worlds are forever testifying to the "eternal power and divinity" of Him who fashioned them in the past, and holds them still in his resistless and measureless leash. All the starry hosts of the sky are "moving their rounds in silent rhythm and inaudible song."

Robert Hall has a sermon on the text: "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing,"* in which he says it is difficult to determine whether the glory of God appears more in what He displays or in what He conceals. "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." Hiding, while yet revealing, He, in the very revelation, has given proof of the divinity that shaped it by the silences that thunder along the sacred text.

It would ill befit silence to claim for it everywhere the place of "Sir Oracle." Silence is not always a pearl of great price. It is not a pearl of any price when enforced by ignorance. It must be "cunning in dumbness"—not dumb from mere stupidity. Its worth lies in its withholding speech with a purpose, and for some high end. When it is of necessity, because of the utter paucity of its own

* Works of Robert Hall, London, 1845, vol. vi.

II.

ON THE UNITIES OF MEDIATION.

THE word, mediation, describes more exactly and comprehensively than any other theological term the complete or entire mission and work of the Messiah. The kindred word, reconciliation, conveys a more limited conception of the mediatorial activity,—it points rather to the reconciling experience and its fruits than to the comprehending process of which that experience is the consummation. Such terms as advocacy and intercession are in like manner limited to the description of certain specific forms or aspects of the one inclusive mediatorship. The familiar words, redemption and salvation, set forth rather the results of this mediation, as seen either in the ransom of the sinner from his captivity under the law, or in his restoration from the sore disease of sin. Mediation is the term which best incorporates that aggregated process of gracious interposition on the part of the Son of God which began with the *kenosis* and the incarnation, was carried on continuously at every stage in His earthly ministries, came to its highest temporal issue at the cross and the sepulchre, and is still going on, both in intercessory form and in kingly administration, amid the glories of His heavenly state.

The Westminster Confession (ch. viii.) thus represents God the Father as choosing and ordaining His eternal Son to be in this comprehensive sense the Mediator between Himself and man; and it proceeds to describe Him in this relation as prophet, priest, and king, the head and saviour of His Church, the heir of all things and judge of the world. The Larger Catechism (36–42) also describes Christ as the Mediator whose catholic mission it was to reconcile God to man, and to save His people from their sins; and who to this end was set apart and fully furnished with all ability to execute the offices of prophet, priest, and king of His Church. It is true that in the Shorter Catechism (20–23) the word, Redeemer, is for some reason substituted for the broader term, and redemption and salvation are used instead of mediation as descriptive of the Messianic work. But in general the Westminster Symbols adhere to what was the controlling usage of both creeds and theologians during the century preced-

ing their formation. While in some of the Protestant Confessions * the title, Mediator, is employed in a narrower sense, as the equivalent of advocate or intercessor, referring specifically to that part of the mediatorial service which is still going forward before the throne of the Father, the more frequent meaning of the title is the broader one already outlined. The First Helvetic Confession (art. xi.), the Second Helvetic Confession (cap. iv. 4), the Heidelberg Catechism (quest. 15), the Canons of Dort (art. vii.), and the Irish Articles (82), agree with the comprehensive proposition of the Scotch Confession of 1560: "It behooved that the Sonne of God suld descend unto us, and tak himselfe a bodie of our bodie, flesh of our flesh and bone of our bones, and so become the Mediator betweene God and man, giving power to so many as beleeve in Him, to be the sonnes of God." Calvin employs this title in the same broad sense, as may be seen in the chapter (Institutes, Book ii. ch. xix.) on the union of the two natures in the one person of the Mediator, and in the following chapter on the distribution of the mediatorship into the three offices or functions—prophet, priest, and king.

In more recent usage the theological term, atonement, though not sustained by either confessional or Scriptural warrant, has largely taken the place of the other and more inclusive word. Whatever may be the reason for the fact, it is the atonement wrought by Christ, rather than His mediation comprehensively considered, which is most discussed and emphasized in modern theology. Yet the word, atonement, strictly speaking, includes only so much of the Messianic mediation as involves the element of vicarious suffering,—eminently the final act of mediatorial sacrifice on Calvary. It points specifically to the humiliation and the trials which the Mediator endured in the discharge of His great mission ; to the pains which He took upon Himself throughout the task of our deliverance ; and particularly to the struggle in Gethsemane, the agonies of the cross, the cruel death and the descent into the grave, with their peculiar bearings upon the forgiveness of our sins at the tribunal of divine justice, and our legal restoration before God. Viewed as an act, it is thus a part, a central and momentous part indeed, of the comprehending work of mediation ; and its effects or issues as such blend harmoniously with those secured through the mediatorial activity in all the other related spheres. While in its nature the atonement is expiatory and redemptive, and while in form it is legal and substitutional, in its operation we see vicarious suffering ever combining both with active obedience and with the prophetic and the

* Conf. Fid. Gall., xix. ; Conf. Belg., xxvi.

kingly ministries of Jesus, in the composite work of reconciliation. In a word, the atonement as an act is never independent of, but is rather organically included in, the broader act of mediation: Christ the priest, and Christ the prophet and the king, are all one and the same Mediator. We may therefore justly place the older term, adopted by the earlier Protestantism as a Biblical antithesis to the priestly assumptions of Rome, and made venerable by large confessional usage, even above the precious term, atonement, with its natural correlate in reconciliation or propitiation, as more adequately descriptive of all that our Lord became, did, suffered, accomplished in order to human salvation.*

Employing the historical word, Mediation, in this comprehensive sense, the writer desires in this article strongly to emphasize the importance of maintaining, alike in our theology and in spiritual experience, such a single, generic, unifying conception of the mission and work of the Messiah as is contained in this term. If indeed the theanthropic Mediator thus stands between God and man as our Symbols portray Him, teacher and lord as well as sacrifice,—head of the holy order of prophets in both the revealing and the exemplifying of divine truth,—king of kings in His supremacy over the world, and already enthroned as monarch in the affection and loyalty of His own people,—while by His offering of Himself in their behalf, He also atones for sin and secures their forensic reconciliation with God, is it not vital that we should habitually study His mediatorial work in this composite and aggregated form—apprehending that work in its divine unity, as well as in its impressive complexities and distributions? There can be little question among critical students of the development of evangelical thought since the sixteenth century, that the process of analyzing this one and sole mediation into diversified parts, offices, ministries, as if it could be adequately described through such logical dissection,—of setting forth the mediatorship of Christ in its varieties rather than its unity, and pressing out some portion or aspect of it at the sacrifice of others equally vital,—of assigning special efficacy

* “He who prepares so great a salvation necessarily stands in a relation both to God and to humanity, which can scarcely be better indicated than by the name of Mediator—*μεσίτης*—a truly Pauline name.”—Van Oosterzee, *Christ. Dogm.*, sec. cxiv.

“By His mediatorial acts, we mean everything that Christ did and suffered in the whole course of His obedience unto death.”—Ridgeley, *Body of Div.*, Quest. 46–48.

“His mediatorial work, which includes all He did and is still doing for the salvation of men, is the work not of His human to the exclusion of His divine nature, nor of the latter to the exclusion of the former. It is the work of the *θεανθρωπος*.”—Hodge, *Syst. Theol.* ii. 458. In the context this author seems to limit mediation to reconciliation or propitiation, and the function of the Mediator chiefly to vicarious suffering.

to one function or another, and tracing out the specific benefits which may accrue to believers from the discharge of this or that function, has been carried on in recent times to great and even dangerous extremes. Has not the garment of the Lord, which the Roman soldiery would not rend, been too often, through such technical analysis, through undue emphasizing of metaphor and illustration, through excessive division and dispartation, been despoiled of its divine oneness, and presented to faith no longer as a glorious whole, but rather as a series of tabulated parts and fragments? Has it not been too frequently forgotten by the theologians that, while in all such aggregating processes something may be gained in the line of distinctness and discrimination, much is always and of necessity lost in the direction of breadth, comprehensiveness, and convincing power? It may be admitted that these highly specialized conceptions of the one Messianic work, born of the scientific spirit, have proven at times of signal value, both as defences of the Biblical truth against logical forms of error, and to some extent as helps to spiritual apprehension of the complex mystery of redemption. Yet, so far as they tend to dislocate the several elements and factors in the one redemptive process, or in the least to impair the fundamental sense of unity in that sublime process, can it be doubted that they injure seriously both our theology and our experience as believers? If what is here written shall furnish any measure of protection against such a liability, or shall afford even the humblest possible contribution toward the unification of Christian thought around this central topic of the Gospel, the hope that inspires this article will have gained an abundant reward.

I. Such unification must proceed at the outset from a correct conception of *the Trinity as related to the process of salvation*. While on one side we may properly contemplate the several persons or hypostases of the Godhead in their separate relations to that process, and while especially we may refer the work of mediation to the second subsistence,—to use the favorite phrase of Calvin,—we are never to forget that the entire mediatorial scheme has its origin and its development as a gracious provision wholly within the circumference of the one divine Being. It is not a scheme devised by one among the several personalities within this triune Being, apart from the others—a scheme in which only some portion or segment of the composite Godhead is directly engaged. It rather proceeds immediately from the bosom of the complete Deity : Father and Son and Holy Ghost, though standing in different relations to it, being alike concerned in its inception and its prosecution. In other words, the essential unity of the divine Being here as everywhere underlies the

trinity exhibited in the divine Persons ; and the several Persons are here as elsewhere to be contemplated, not simply in their separateness or their special *propria* or peculiarities, but even more carefully in their vital conjunction within the one, comprehending, perfect God. And the parts which these subsistences may severally act in the grand drama of redemption are in like manner to be studied in their unities even more than in their contrasts ; and the blessed result is one in which, from its beginnings in the divine decree to its actual consummation in the heavenly estate, Father and Son and Holy Ghost must be viewed as inseparably conjoined.

This vital unity of the Godhead in the work of mediation finds one marked illustration in the joint purpose from which that mediation as a gracious process sprang. It is true that this work is especially assigned in Scripture to the second Person in the Deity ; but it is also true that, in the phrase of our Confession, it pleased God the Father to choose and ordain His only begotten Son to be the Mediator between God and man. While the gracious office is filled by the Son, the gracious purpose out of which the appointment to that office arose is found rather in the mind of the Father. As John has stated the relation, God the Father so loved the world, that He devised the method of redemption, and in due time gave the Son to the sacred task of human restoration. In like manner the Spirit is represented by our Lord Himself as proceeding from the Father, in holy concurrence with the Son, in order to make the work of mediation successful to the extent of the paternal purpose. And the salvation of believers, while it is sometimes referred either to the regenerative ministries of the Spirit, or to the redemptive sacrifice of Jesus as its originating cause, is traced back still more frequently and impressively to the love, the choice, the mediating scheme originating within the personality of the Father. The general fact thus is that the purpose of mediation is referable not to any one of the divine personalities separately, but to all conjointly ; and that we actually see not one or two, but all of these blessed Persons engaged together, both in devising the plan of human redemption, and in assuming as by mutual agreement their several parts and functions in the sublime mediatorial scheme.

What is true of the purpose in which mediation has its origin, is no less true of the divine feelings which were the originating source of such mediation, and are so gloriously manifested in it. We are largely accustomed to analyze the various feelings, such as justice and love, revealed in the work of mediation ; and, assigning these to the several personalities, to regard the Father, for illustration, as the representative of justice, while the Son is viewed as the embodi-

ment and representative of love. Some warrant for such a distribution may be found in the Scripture, and there are directions in which the analysis may be helpful in theology. Yet it should never be forgotten that, as an ultimate fact, the Father is no less loving than the Son, and the Son is no less just, and no less loyal to the claims of justice, than the Father :—that, in a word, all the feelings of all the personalities of the Godhead are substantially one and the same, throughout that great process of mediation in which they are by joint purpose engaged together. That there should be any play of diverse, dissonant, conflicting emotions within the serene consciousness of the one perfect and blessed Deity, whom we adore as the source of our salvation, to such an extent as to set one of the divine personalities over against another in conscious antagonism of feeling, is a supposition for which the Word of God furnishes no sufficient foundation.

It is at this point that we discover the proper meaning of the theological, rather than confessional or biblical, phrase, the covenant of redemption. That phrase in ordinary acceptation implies not merely that one Person in the Godhead is objective to another,—the object of the thoughts and affections and acts of another, but also that one may enter into contract with another, may send him on a specific mission, may impose specific tasks and burdens, and grant him special benefits and rewards as a return for such service. The phrase is not found in the Westminster Symbols ; nor is the conception, as expanded in later Calvinistic theology, justified by them, unless it be in the clause (Conf. viii., 3) where, in defining the mediatorship, it is said : Which office He took not unto Himself, but was called thereunto by His Father, who put all power and judgment into His hand, and gave Him commandment to execute the same. In the catechetical definition of the covenant of grace (L. C., 31) it is affirmed that this covenant was entered into by God with Christ as the second Adam, and in Him with all the elect as his seed. But this is a transaction occurring in time, as one element or feature in the historic redemption, rather than a compact entered into by the Father and the Son in a remote eternity. Neither can sufficient warrant be found in Scripture for such extensive and elaborate descriptions of this divine compact, as to the parties and the provisions and the conditions, and the issues, as are frequently found in Calvinistic theology, after the period of Cocceius. Inspiration has indeed given us rare and sweet glimpses of holy communings within the circle of the Godhead, blessed testimonies of concurrent grace flowing forth from the entire Deity through the Immanuel, comforting assurances that the Messiah bears with Him the commis-

sion of Father and Spirit throughout His redemptive work, delightful pledges that the issues and compensations of this work shall be vast, satisfying, glorious, and everlasting. But the attempt to include all these under the somewhat rigid figure of a covenant, parallel to the two historic covenants of works and of grace, is one liable to introduce confusion, especially into the cardinal conception of unity within the Godhead. All such exhibitions of the mediatorial scheme should be handled by thoughtful minds with jealous care, lest they lead on insensibly to unbiblical views of the trinity in God ; for there is an unconscious tritheism somewhat current in the Church, which is a dangerous foe alike to exactness in doctrine and to freshness and vividness in spiritual experience.

So far as the present discussion is concerned, it is needful only to emphasize the cardinal fact already stated, that the process of mediation, viewed in its totality, must ever be regarded as having its origin in the counsels and purpose, and in the pitying love and grace of the entire Godhead. All the winning and powerful descriptions of that process, in which we behold one Person commanding and another obeying ; one dictating terms and provisions, and another complying ; one prescribing the work to be wrought, and another accomplishing that work ; one endorsing and another receiving endorsement ; one inflicting, and another suffering—must of necessity be held in peaceful subordination to the underlying proposition of the Apostle : one God and one Mediator between God and man. A Deity from eternity so far engaged as not only to accept a scheme of grace through such a Mediator, but also to unite in bringing all the forces of the Godhead to bear in its accomplishment, is an indispensable postulate. We are bound to maintain that this scheme is begun, continued, and ended entirely within the circumference of one Being,—that whatever part either sacred personality may assume, all are agreed in what is done by each, and the result is to be viewed as comprehensively the work of all conjoined. The Father is never opposed, neither is the Spirit ever indifferent, to what the Son specifically undertakes or suffers for us men and for our salvation. The Mediator is never separated from the Deity in His great mission, acting either in independence or in antagonism : the entire Godhead rather manifests itself in and with the second Person as He becomes our Immanuel, and accomplishes for Father and for Spirit His mediatorial work.

II. A second point of unification which is vital to right conceptions of the work of mediation, relates to *the composite yet single personality of the Mediator Himself*. In the Trinity we are confronted by the deep mystery of triple personality blended together within

the one complete Deity—a Being who in essence, substance, nature, constitution is absolutely one, but who, nevertheless, exists internally and eternally as well as externally in three distinct modes or hypostases, which assume to our view personal forms and personal characteristics. But in the unique personality of Christ we are confronted by a mystery even more profound—the mystery of the incorporation of one of these divine hypostases with humanity, or with our human nature, in such a way as to constitute by the combination a distinct being, with two natures, the divine and the human, blending perfectly in one complete, theanthropic Person.

And if the three personalities in the Godhead, as revealed in Scripture, defy analysis or explanation, and must be accepted by us with all the inexplicable mystery that envelops them as a cloud, on the authority of the Inspired Word simply, in like manner must the composite Immanuel, fully God and at the same time fully and perfectly man, be regarded as above explanation or analysis, and demand our recognition on the authority of Scripture alone, as the One Mediator between the one God and our fallen race. Were any scientific dissection, any logical disintegration of this unique personality possible, it would still be the province of faith to accept Him in his totality, with his various attributes and natures all harmoniously conjoined within the one and only Person, alike human, alike divine. His mediatorship could neither be substantiated as a doctrine nor made available in experience under any other conditions.

Yet, at no point in the domain of Christian theology has the disposition to dissect and disintegrate what the Bible presents rather in spiritual unity, been more manifest or more destructive. The record of the discussions, theories, divisions, strifes, heresies respecting the person of the Immanuel is a chapter in the history of doctrine absolutely without a parallel. In the attempt to analyze the two natures, and present them in their separation, while the essential qualities of the personality are preserved, opinion has ranged through every possible variety of hypothesis and surmise, from the baldest humanitarianism at one extreme to the most sweeping monarchism on the other. Nestorianism has held that the union in the case is not a combination of natures within one person, but rather a moral unity of two persons, a perfect God and a complete man, moving together harmoniously along the lines which the mediatorial work required. Apollinarianism, resting on the Greek conception of triplicity in human nature, has assigned to Christ a real body and soul, but denied the existence in Him of a real human spirit; while Eutychianism has affirmed that His entire humanity

was swallowed up and lost in His divinity, as a drop of rain in the seas. Socinianism has acknowledged the presence in Him, as a man, of supernatural gifts and capabilities corresponding to the needs of His peculiar mission, and Arianism has set Him forth as the first and highest among the creatures of God ; Gnosticism has described Him as an eonic emanation from the bosom of Deity, and Docetism has regarded Him as an apparitional God, moving under human guise through the varied experiences of a human life, in the accomplishment of the mystic task of our restoration to Himself.*

These are familiar illustrations of the multiplied efforts to enter analytically into the personality of the Messiah for the purpose of describing that personality in scientific terms and aspects. Similar efforts appear in the discussions respecting the communication of the peculiarities of the one nature to the other (*communicatio idiomatum*), respecting the depotentiation of the second Person in the Trinity consequent upon His incarnation, respecting the *kenosis* and the limitations of knowledge and power supposed to be involved in the mediatorship. A like endeavor is manifest in the current tendency to divide both the acts and the sufferings of the Messiah into two antithetic classes, according as they are supposed to spring respectively from the divine or from the human nature,—the God speaking or acting at one point, and the man Christ Jesus acting or suffering at another. It was against this tendency, appearing in the opinion of the Zwinglian school respecting the eucharist and the presence of Christ in that sacrament, that Luther uttered his passionate denunciation : We here condemn and curse this *allæosis* to hell itself, as a suggestion of the devil ! It is true that at many points in the career of our Lord, we behold either the divinity or the humanity in Him standing out in special prominence, while the antithetic element is relatively retired ; it is true that we sometimes discern what seems like an empowering of the humanity on one hand with the attributes or characteristics of divinity, and on the other an apparent depotentiating or reduction of the divinity to the narrow modes or limitations of the human ; it is true that, viewed in certain lights, we see the man so distinctly disclosed that for the moment

* It may be of service to some readers to direct their attention to an admirable summary of Christological theories, orthodox and heretical, in the article, *Christology*, in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, or to the fuller essay, *Christ in Theology*, in the recent volume of Dr. Schaff, entitled, *Christ and Christianity*. The author (p. 64) describes the incarnation as an actual assumption of the whole human nature—body and soul and spirit—into an abiding union with the divine personality of the eternal Logos, so that they constitute, from the moment of the supernatural conception, *one undivided life forever*.

we lose our sense of the Deity present in Him, and again we so impressively see the Deity in His words and acts, and in His inimitable mission, that we shrink, as if it were sacrilege, from claiming brotherhood with Him.

But while we are prompted even by Scripture itself to institute such distinctions, and while at some points we may find these distinctions helpful either in sweeping aside error or in confirming faith, yet we should never allow them to disturb in the least our composite, unified conception of the theanthropic Person, who is the one and only Mediator. If we draw lines too broad between the eternal Son of God and the incarnate Christ ; if we separate the two natures, divine and human, in the Immanuel to such an extent as disintegrates Him and makes Him duplex in His personality or His relations ; if we subdivide His words, His acts, His sufferings so as to make them the words, acts, sufferings of either the manhood or the Godhood conjoined in Him, the inevitable result will be a loss of some precious element from His mediation as well as His personality. The cardinal fact is that from His incarnation, through all His historic career, whether of action or passion, down to the close of His mission on the redeeming cross, the Messiah was and remained one Person—as truly one and indivisible as are the three, who together compose the one eternal Deity. In and through all studies into His career or His experience, therefore, this personal oneness is ever to be supremely maintained by us as the sublime underlying verity in the scheme of grace. How many serious errors have arisen from the failure to hold this composite view, every student of Christian doctrine already knows. From bald Unitarianism with its denial of the divine nature, onward through all the various grades of defective or heretical opinion, up to those forms of Monarchianism which openly or virtually deny the presence of the human element, such a student is pained to see how human speculation has cast lots for the sacred vesture which envelops our Immanuel, and in seeking to analyze Him has both bewildered and impoverished itself. And nothing can be more evident to such a student than the fact, still more painful, that what an unreconciled and alien world needs to see is not an analyzed or dissected Christ, but the one composite and living Person, alike human and divine, who alone in His wonderful entirety can truly mediate between such a world and God.

III. Passing from these two introductory aspects of the problem of unification, we may now turn directly to consider *the intrinsic oneness of mediation itself*—viewed as a divine work. Here we are at once confronted by the familiar distribution of this comprehensive work into three offices or functions : the prophetic, the priestly, and

the royal. This distribution is Protestant rather than Papal—it is specially utilized by Calvin (Inst., bk. ii., ch. xv.) as adequately descriptive of what he styles comprehensively the office of redemption. It is also a Reformed or Calvinistic rather than a Lutheran mode of stating that broad fact of mediation in which, as against all Papal notions of priestly interposition, Lutherans and Calvinists were so cordially agreed.* It is justified in part by the Old Testament allusions to the specific works which the coming Messiah was to undertake, and by the New Testament delineations of the functions which the Messiah actually filled during His earthly ministry. It has also been defended on other strong grounds, such as its intrinsic adaptedness to set forth a process so comprehensive as mediation, its adjustment to the three primary departments of human nature, its correspondences in the three ruling classes in human society. Dorner, while emphasizing what he terms the mutually interpenetrating quality of these functions, and strongly maintaining their tributary relation as manifestations of the one great office, insists with equal emphasis on their historic and their intrinsic value in that relation.

But within this general concurrence of opinion wide varieties are apparent at several points. Some writers, for example, set aside the

* The story of the *Munus Triplex* is replete with interest. The references to it in ancient and mediæval theology (such as Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, bk. x., 6) are too scant and too infrequent to be of value. Among the scholastics, Aquinas sets the Mediator forth, not as prophet, but as legislator or lawgiver, priest and king—without, however, turning the distribution to any special account in his unfolding of the mediatorship. After Calvin, the division of functions appears both in the creeds (*Heidelberg Cat.*, 31) and in the current Reformed theologies. Earlier Lutheranism did not accept it as a helpful analysis, and many German theologians have, for various reasons, either questioned or rejected it. Dorner, following Schleiermacher, Nitzsch, Martensen, advocates it strongly (*Christ. Doct.*, vol. iv., 391, seq.) on both biblical and philosophical grounds. Among the puritan divines, Howe (*Treatise on The Blessedness of the Righteous*) first describes our Lord as “represented to sinners under an answerable twofold notion of a Prince and a Saviour: that is, a mediating Prince and Saviour.” Further on, he defends the triplex division in the suggestive words: “His threefold (so much celebrated) office of King, Priest, and Prophet (the distinct parts of His general office as Mediator which He manages in order to the reducement of sinners) exactly corresponds (if you consider the more eminent acts and properties of each office) to that threefold notion under which the spirit of man must always have been eyed and been acted toward God, had he never fallen.” Van Oosterzee, in a valuable historic *résumé* of opinions (*Christ. Dogmatics*, vol. ii., sec. cviii.) justifies the *Munus Triplex*, while recognizing the difficulties attending its use. For further statement see, also, Hodge, *Syst. Theol.*, Part iii., ch. iv., on the mediatorial office. A strong defence of this distribution may be found in Smith, H. B., *Syst. Christ. Theol.*, Part iii., ch. i. He refers especially with approval to Ridgeley’s *Body of Divinity* (on questions 41–42, in Larger Cat.) where both the triple division and the essential oneness of these offices are alike emphasized. As a question in theology, the whole subject is worthy of careful study.

prophetical function entirely, on the ground that it is properly embodied in the priestly ministration of the Redeemer. Unitarianism recognizes dimly the royal office, but rejects the priestly, and limits the mediatorial work to the teaching and example of the man Christ Jesus. By some theologians the three offices are viewed as successive in time, the first ceasing substantially when the second becomes central, and this in turn retiring when our Lord begins His administration as King over His people and over the world. By others, the offices are (more accurately) regarded as largely synchronous as well as successive: our Lord continuing His prophetic ministry, while offering Himself as sacrifice and even while exercising regal authority, and preparing the way for the universal dominion which He is ultimately to attain. It is a question not wholly decided by contemporaneous discussion whether each and all of these functions are exercised alike in His two states of humiliation and exaltation,—whether, for illustration, His intercessory function before the throne is a part of his priestly office, as our Symbols teach, or is rather one form or manifestation of His kingly grace and power. Nor is it settled absolutely in current usage whether it is proper to refer certain of these offices and ministrations to one of the two natures in the Messiah, the prophetic and priestly representing the human, the kingly bringing out and illustrating the divine; or whether, in the words of our Confession (viii., 7), Christ in the work of mediation acteth according to both natures—yet, by reason of the unity of the person, that which is proper to one nature is sometimes in Scripture attributed to the person denominated by the other nature.

Another practical variation of decided moment demands attention here. If the *Munus Triplex* be thus accepted in substance, though with such varieties in form, the matter of relative importance or prominence is still unsolved. At first view, it would be said that all are alike important, and that comparative estimates of their worth are even irreverent. For it is obvious that the three functions stand to each other in a relation of conditioned and conditional, not unlike the relation which the three primary forces in nature, gravitation, cohesion, and chemical affinity, occupy toward each other. The prophetical function clearly conditions the priestly, as gravitation conditions cohesion: the priestly, in turn, while conditioned by its antecedent, itself conditions the regal, just as cohesion, while dependent on the prior force of gravitation, is the necessary prerequisite to chemical affinity, with its special action and products. There is, indeed, a sense in which, as in the illustration here introduced from nature, the element conditioned is superior to that which conditions it, and that is highest to which the rest are conditioning and tribu-

tary. The priestly office carries the prophetic, and superadds another factor: the kingly bears with it both the prophetic and the priestly, and superinduces upon them another form of force, and therefore a more exalted and comprehensive result. Yet the question whether a higher value should be attached to the one or the other is, in the words of Van Oosterzee, something like that whether among the benefits of the sun, light or warmth or fertility deserves the preference. As a general proposition it is unquestionable that no prominence should be assigned to either which would in the least retire the others from their vital and blessed places within the one mediatorial work.

Still, it is true that at no point in theology do we discover wider variety of opinion and usage. The Unitarian school has practically set aside Christ the king and Christ the priest, and has preserved, in but fragmentary form indeed, the Biblical doctrine of Christ the prophet, first among the teachers of mankind, as peerless in example as in speech, but beginning and ending His unique work as Saviour in the discharge of this function alone. Orthodoxy, on the other hand, spontaneously shrinking from such a perversion or diminution of the mediatorship, has too often allowed the prophetic office to fall away into obscurity. It has not always given to the words of Christ their central and authoritative place in doctrine; it has not adequately exalted Him as the supreme revealer of the future—even of the ultimate career and destinies of man and of the earth; it has not emphasized properly His legislative mission, and His exemplification of the law in His own life; and in the distribution of His ministries to our redemption, it has sometimes almost entirely ignored His prophetic ministry, and made salvation turn wholly on what He suffered rather than on what He did and said. We are familiar also with the peculiar diversities of opinion which have arisen, perhaps chiefly in Scotland, yet not infrequently or obscurely elsewhere, respecting the kingship of Jesus, His crown and covenant, His right to reign over nations as well as saints, and the nature and even the existence of His earthly kingdom. It would not be difficult to trace out variations of opinion at these points as wide almost as those which separate Socinianism on the one hand from mere Antinomianism on the other.

It is also a delicate and yet a just query whether, in the strong and tender emphasizing of the priestly office so characteristic of evangelical Protestantism ever since the Reformation, Christ the king and Christ the prophet have not been relatively too much retired from both dogma and experience. It is a still more delicate query whether, as Lutheran writers have sometimes alleged, the Reformed

theology has not been especially prone to exalt the *Christus pro nobis*, centred particularly in the priesthood, at the expense of the *Christus in nobis*, manifested especially in our Divine Teacher and Example, Ruler and Lord. There could be no justice in the charge that the Reformed theology makes too much of the great High Priest, of the Lamb of God offered in sacrifice, of the vicarious atonement made once for all on Calvary; for no theology can be truly biblical or truly commanding in which these sacred conceptions are not central and even dominant. But it may without offence be asked whether, in the ardor of our interest, the glowing fervor of our faith, at the foot of the redeeming cross, we may not be giving up too much to an intellectual Unitarianism that holy prophet whose words and whose example are no less essential, as preliminary to the proper efficacy of His sacrifice, than the light of day is to the warmth and the fertility conditioned upon it. It may also be asked without offence whether, under the influence of the same sacred ardor, we have not suffered the kingly sway of the Mediator, first in the heart, then in the life, further in the Church, and finally through all the realms and phases of human existence, to fall too much out of mind and out of experience. There is certainly no necessary contrast, but rather a unity as close as that between His two natures, between the *Christus pro nobis* and the *Christus in nobis*; and theology and faith can find their highest completeness only as these antithetic conceptions are vitally unified.*

There is a further inquiry at this point, to which it is necessary at least to advert—the inquiry whether the entire mediatorial work is distinctly included in the three offices as here described. It is the question, in other words, whether the Messiah is not prophet and priest and king, and something more—whether the comprehending conception of mediation does not broaden out beyond these descrip-

* An interesting exhibit of this tendency toward what may without invidium be called disproportionate treatment of this branch of theology, may be gained by a comparative grouping of representative systems of doctrine at this point. The writer has selected, for the purpose of illustrating this tendency, four names of the highest rank among the evangelical theologians of this generation: and grouping the number of pages under each head in their respective treatment of this subject, has found them tabulated as follows:

	Mediation.	Prophecy.	Priesthood.	Kingship.
Van Oosterzee,	8	6	34	7
Dorner,	10	4	153	27
Hodge, Ch.	7	2	130	13
Smith, H. B.	6	0	51	11

In this grouping, the atonement and intercession are included under the priestly office, and the kingdom of Christ under the kingly office. The first head includes also all that is said respecting the *Munus Triplex*.

tive lines and areas, and take in more than these three precious titles contain. One who carefully gathers up and properly utilizes all the subordinate names applied to the Immanuel, all the special functions which He is said to fill, all the metaphors called in from almost every sphere of nature or of human experience to set forth His numberless ministries to human need, may possibly be led at length to realize that he cannot easily compress the whole of what the Holy Spirit has graciously revealed concerning our Redeemer, even into three offices so broad and inclusive as are given to us in the doctrine of the *Munus Triplex*. He will find it difficult to locate the Lawgiver, the Shepherd, the Advocate, the Surety, the Captain, the Corner-Stone, the Head, the Resurrection—the Bread and Water of Life, and the Light of men—the Word, the Way, the Sun, the Star, the Vine—the Bridegroom and Husband—the Angel, the Counsellor, the Almighty God, the Everlasting Father, and other like designations, all within the territory properly assignable to these three primary offices. And possibly he may be brought to realize that a work which requires such variety and wealth of illustration to set it forth—a work for whose adequate portrayal the Holy Spirit has thus subsidized almost every department of nature or of human experience, contains more, much more, than any technical analysis, any philosophic distribution such as this, can ever adequately present to the mind. Such an inquirer will at least feel assured that Christian thought cannot afford for any consideration to press out either of these three primal elements of mediatorship at the expense of the others, or to consent to any disparted or fragmentary conceptions at a point where, above all others, all thinking and believing ought to be centralized and unified.

What is sought here is simply the general presentation of this vital fact. If it is important that our views of the relations of the Trinity in the sphere of salvation, and of the composite, theanthropic person of the Mediator should be thoroughly unified, a thousandfold more important is it that Mediation, as a work, should be habitually contemplated by us, not in its analytic parts and sections, but rather in its economic unity—its divine oneness, as seen and unfolded by the Redeemer Himself. Though such an effort may seem to our narrowed minds impracticable, it is still to be cherished as a fundamental form of aspiration; and every failure so to cherish it will surely be followed, as the history of the doctrine bears abundant witness, by diminished and partial estimates of the mediatorial work, and too often by strifes, divisions, heresies, from which wider vision might have spared the Church.

IV. Proceeding to a still closer view of *the more specific elements*

or factors which make up this comprehensive mediation, we shall find yet further need for the kind of unification already advocated. Without recurring to the *allaosis* so bitterly condemned by Luther, with its illusive classification of these factors and elements as referable to the human or the divine natures severally rather than to the sole and single personality, we may easily discern other analytic procedures in this field, of kindred character and of like effect. Injurious comparison is sometimes instituted, for example, between the acts and the sufferings of the Messiah, in which the acts are relatively retired and the sufferings lifted into the foreground, even to such an extent as to make His redemptive work turn chiefly, if not wholly, on what He suffered. Again, the acts of Christ are sometimes set into antithetic classes, and special value is attached to some single class or group of acts—the signs and miracles, for illustration—as if these carried in themselves the substance of His redemptive mission. Still more frequently are the sufferings of Christ thus divided; and Gethsemane and Calvary, with all their special solemnities, are brought into distinctive prominence, as if the entire work of salvation began and ended on the cross. The vicarious nature and the mediatorial relations and worth of all the sacrifice that preceded from the hour of the incarnation, are unconsciously obscured, and only that which crowned and closed the long and sad passion is held conspicuously in thought. To such an extent is the latter process sometimes carried that what Christ said and did and suffered, either prior or subsequent to the crucifixion, is quite forgotten in the presence of the crucifixion itself; mediation is limited to propitiation only; the evangel commences and closes in the sacrifice of Calvary, and justification becomes the whole of religion.

But certainly, so far as the acts of Christ are concerned, it is a fundamental proposition that all these are, in the phrase of Ridgeley, mediatorial acts. No essential distinction can be established, for example, between what preceded and what followed His baptism,—if the baptism be regarded as the official introduction to His Messianic work. For His incarnation and birth, as truly as His baptism, were mediatorial acts; His youthful conference with the doctors of Jerusalem was as truly mediatorial as His last conference with His disciples in the upper chamber. In like manner, even the most casual of His official acts, if anything in His career can be esteemed casual, has a vital place in the great work as truly as the most conspicuous event; His quiet visit to a Galilean village as really as His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Nor can any class of acts, such as those which demonstrated most conclusively His divine origin, be exalted above those which more especially impress us with

His complete humanity ; His sleeping in the hinder part of the ship, His hunger by the well at Samaria, are as truly parts of His mediation as was the raising of Lazarus from the dead.* And what is true of the acts is no less true of the words of the Immanuel. While we see His prophetic mission more conspicuously in such central utterances as the Sermon on the Mount, or the official commissioning of the Twelve, or the public discussions with Scribes and Pharisees near the close of His life, that mission is as really apparent to the thoughtful eye in the simplest conversations, or the most incidental words, strewn almost as if by accident along the sacred Record. The great evangel, so far as it embodied itself in language, must be taken in its inspired totality—no word viewed as casual, no utterance separated from the rest, but all conjoined in the one comprehensive Message which, from the advent to Olivet, He came to deliver.

Neither are the words nor the acts of the Messiah to be narrowly or inadequately interpreted, in their relation to the comprehending mediation. Every utterance, however incidental, should be regarded not as the teaching of a wise or holy man merely, nor as so much drapery appended to the Messiahship like the incidentals of a parable, but rather as an essential factor or element in the mediatorial process itself. Nor should the acts be viewed merely as so many exhibitions of His obedience as a human being to the law under which the Messiah had voluntarily placed Himself—proofs that He was perfect as a man. They are not even so many contributions to personal righteousness, which becomes in the divine economy a species of substitute for personal righteousness in those who believe, and thus a factor in their justification. Rather are these acts, like the words of Jesus, one and all mediatorial in a still broader sense ; they embody and represent the divine Mediator in more positive and comprehensive forms as our Immanuel ; they minister, therefore, not to instruction or to legal justification merely, but to redemption in every spiritual mode and aspect. The mediatorship would be incomplete without them ; without them salvation would be an impaired and an inadequate product.

Turning again to the sufferings of the Messiah, we are bound to emphasize in like manner their mediatorial quality throughout.

* "His achievement of righteousness for us rests upon the whole course of His obedience ; the ground of the forgiveness which frees us from the curse of the law is spread over the entire life of Christ ; as soon as He assumed the form of a servant He began to pay the price of our liberation. Death is merely the close of His protestations." Ritschl, *Justification*, p. 213. So, also, Calvin, *Inst.*, bk. ii., ch. xvi : 5. "From the time of His assuming the character of a servant, He began to pay the price of our deliverance."

No one can ever adequately estimate that final hour of anguish, when our dying Lord uttered those plaintive and mysterious outcries on the cross, and gave up His sacred life with the touching yet triumphant declaration : It is Finished ! What the hour of coronation is to all the discipline that has preceded and all the official activities consequent upon it, that moment of supreme yet victorious sorrow is to the entire tribulation, and as well to the final triumph of the mediating Saviour. Yet is it true that His entire career was an exhibition of the same suffering, enduring love which glorified itself so incomparably at the last. The incarnation cannot be contemplated rightly as anything less than a vicarious sacrifice ; the entire career of labor, privation, endeavor, which culminated on Calvary, was at every stage a real part of the atoning scheme. The homeless life, the state of dependence, the wearinesses, the struggles with men and with devils, the inward agonies and groanings in spirit, were all as truly crosses as that which Simon of Cyrene bore for the suffering Redeemer through the streets of Jerusalem. The pathway of the Mediator was a *Via Dolorosa* at every step from Bethlehem to Calvary ; and not one pang should be counted out from His propitiating contribution to our reconciliation with God. And, instead of subtracting anything from the immeasurable meaning of the cross by such association of all that preceded it in the form of suffering, we rather then behold that transcendent event in its true central position and grandeur, and both mind and heart are bowed down the more before it.*

Such is, in fact, the teaching of our Symbols as to that estate of humiliation which the Mediator assumed. It is properly described as an estate, in order to guard against the impression that the humiliation consisted simply in a series of acts or of sufferings. It is also set forth (L. Cat., 46) as that low condition wherein He for our sakes, emptying Himself of His glory, took upon Him the form of a servant, in His conception and birth, life, death, and after His

* There is one event in the mediatorial career which must ever take its place in Christian thought by the side of the sacrifice on Calvary : it is the *Kenosis* in which that career began. Whatever view be taken of that depotentiation, or emptying of self, which preceded the incarnation, the consent of the Son of God to become man—to come down into our human nature, wear and bear its limitations, and live out so constrained a life as His was from the incarnation to the cross, is a step of as much significance both in itself and in its relations to our salvation through Him, as was the final act of atonement. The cost of feeling in it could not have been less : the sacrifice seems, in some aspects, even greater. At least, the question of Anselm, Wherefore did God become man ? and the question, Why did the Son of God suffer death ? must be studied together, in their vital relation, by any one who would fully, profoundly apprehend either.—See Van Oosterzee, *Christ. Dogm.*, 543.

death, until His resurrection. In further analysis of this low condition or estate, it is said (Ans. 47) that He humbled Himself in His conception and birth, in that, being from all eternity the Son of God in the bosom of the Father, He was pleased in the fulness of time to become the Son of man, made of a woman of low estate, and to be born of her, with divers circumstances of more than ordinary abasement. And it is further taught (Ans. 48) that His humiliation during His life consisted not merely in His subjection to the law, and perfect fulfilment of its demands as a man, but equally in His conflict with the indignities of the world and the temptations of Satan, and in His being weighed down with the infirmities of the flesh, whether those common to the nature of man or particularly accompanying that his low condition. These are all in the Shorter Catechism (Ans. 27) condensed into the strong phrase, the miseries of this life ; and are directly associated with the cursed death of the cross, as essential elements in the one comprehensive humiliation. Such is the universal teaching of the Reformed Confessions as to the humiliation of the Messiah ; and it is probably one of their good features that they have refrained so obviously from that process of analytic dismemberment and disintegration, so often visible in the theologies of the two succeeding centuries. We see indeed in them the several elements or factors of the one mediatorial process, so far separated as to assure us that each was definitely in the mind of those who prepared these Symbols : we see distinction and division enough to guard against the errors that might flow in from partial or distorted conceptions ; but we also see member joined to member, one factor flowing into another, all the parts and elements so combining in one organic unity, that the final impression made upon us (even in the case of the most specialized creeds, as that of Westminster) is that of one living, complex, sublime process—one comprehending and glorious mediation, corresponding to their exposition of the one and only Mediator between God and our fallen humanity.

V. Contemplating this mediation once more, in respect to *the necessity for it*, and to *its actual operation and results*, we shall discover still further occasion for the unifying process here commended. If we are to contemplate the mediatorial work as one work, notwithstanding the variety of offices contained in it, and of terms and metaphors employed to describe it,—if we are to group together into living unity all the factors and elements combined in that work, whether these assume the form of action or of passion, however exhibited to us in Scripture, no less essential is it that this mediation should be seen to be one and single in the need that demands it, and that its operations and issues, however various in appearance,

should be organically combined in our thought within the one comprehending conception.

The question whether mediation was necessary, like the associated question whether an incarnation was necessary, is practically solved for every believer in Scripture by the simple fact that an incarnate mediator has been provided. There are indeed many reasons which commend themselves to our minds, as explanatory of that mysterious and sublime process by which the Son of God became man in order to our salvation ; but there were doubtless other reasons recognized within the interior circles of Deity, which are possibly forever beyond the range of human vision. That the considerations which justify the mediatorial work of the Immanuel are in like manner partly within the range of our knowledge, but also largely beyond our capacity even for apprehension, is equally obvious. The great fact stands forth in one aspect as a revealed and demonstrated verity, invested with divine authority, and commending itself to faith by a process superior to all formal demonstration. At the same time, what we know of the Mediator as to His personal qualities, to His inherent fitness, to His official recognition, to His actual ability to mediate effectually at every point where human sin has created a need of such gracious intervention, powerfully flows in upon the soul as a rational justification of such spontaneous faith. Thus, both instinctively and from reflection, we perceive, not merely that in our sinful condition mediation on the part of God was needful, but further that just such a Mediator as Jesus was, and none other, could adequately meet that deep, complex necessity.

Yet at precisely this point we discover some of the widest variations in Christian belief. We also see that each mind is regulated, in its explanation of the grounds and nature of this necessity, by its estimate of sin on one hand, and its notion of salvation on the other. To the Unitarian there is revealed no need of mediation beyond what appears in the teaching, example, and spiritual inspirations of Christ ; the Mediator needs to be a prophet only, and that in a subordinate sense. To one who regards sin as a lapsed condition of soul merely—a spiritual state, devoid of love, prone to evil and corruption, from which nothing but a disclosure of Divine love, not only speaking words of tenderness and grace, but assuming the winning form of sacrifice, and breathing its life out in gracious endeavor, can ever rescue the sinner, mediation becomes merely an expression, a prolonged and beautiful and wonderfully effective expression indeed, of such salvatory love. The necessity in this view is to be found, not in any claims of law or government, or in the sense of justice in God, but simply in the state of the sinful nature, the love-

less and deteriorate character of the sinner, whom nothing but such a revelation of divine affection can ever restore to a true life. To one who, on the other hand, contemplates redemption simply as a process under law, completing itself in a forensic justification, mediation becomes a mode of vicarious satisfaction only; Christ is simply a propitiation, and His mediatorial work begins and ends substantially with His priestly office. And among the latter class, who in general are agreed in finding the need of mediation within the territory of law and justice—who, in other words, regard mediation as mainly vicarious and propitiatory, and as having its correlative in a legal reconciliation effected through sacrifice, many minor variations appear, according as one or another aspect of this complex reconciling work is emphasized. In attempting to define with greater exactitude the necessity for that work, wide disagreements thus arise, and too often bitter conflicts have been waged by those who stand alike on clearly evangelical ground, around that blessed verity which should rather have been to each and all a standard of unity and a badge of peace.

These disagreements find one marked illustration in the antithetic theories current among us with respect to the necessity which demanded the atonement, or the vicarious death of the Mediator. One group of theories finds that necessity wholly in the sentiment or attribute of justice inherent in God—a sentiment which can consent to reconciliation with the wicked and alien transgressor only on terms of explicit expiation, even to the extent of penalty for penalty. A second group discerns that necessity chiefly in the nature of law and government, which requires some appropriate administrative satisfaction, such as Christ provided, as the just ground of forgiveness and restoration. A third group, rising somewhat into prominence of late, and representing another aspect of the need that demanded a Mediator, finds the justifying ground of the atonement in love rather than in justice, personal or administrative—in the nature of that spiritual salvation which man needs, and which is none other than a restoration to love, secured through the love which manifests itself in every phase and aspect of the Messianic mediation. We have thus a threefold necessity: first, ethical, then legal, then gracious, which may be, and habitually are, set over against each other as if they were radically antagonistic. With the fury of the battles waged even between the first and second in these groups of opinion, which have in fact so much in common, and indeed seem hardly separable, every one is familiar. And possibly the time has not yet come when the question can be safely asked whether all these forms of orthodox belief may not in fact be blended together as being harmonious parts

or elements in that one comprehensive need, in reverent recognition of which our Lord consented to die for us men, and for our salvation. Without any discussion as to the relative order or value of these explanations, or to the methods in which they may be thus conjoined in the broader conception here suggested, it may justly be claimed that such combination, even imperfectly secured, would be an important help toward making the necessity for the atonement more apparent to men, and toward making still more glorious an atonement which at one and the same time accomplishes results so diverse and so inexpressibly vital to our complete reconciliation with God.*

As in respect to the atonement, so the necessity for the mediatorial work generally can be fully apparent only to those who are capable of taking in all the parts, factors, aspects, operations, and issues of that divine work—who can see it both in its diversified complexities and in its supreme oneness. The profound remark of John Howe to the effect that the three offices of Christ have their justification in the triple need even of unfallen man as a religious being, and eminently in their application to the threefold need of man as a sinner, is specially suggestive here. It furnishes at least a helpful hint toward a method of studying the necessity for mediation which would result in, not a series of dismembered specialties or of antagonistic notions, but rather a broader, deeper, incomparably more effective conception of the reason why God became man, and why, having become man, God took on Him this mediatorial service for our alienated, loveless, condemned race.

Turning from the question of necessity, to contemplate for a moment the special methods of applying this mediation, and the several issues or benefits flowing from it, we may readily observe how all these are in like manner blended together in two correlative terms, reconciliation and salvation. A glance at each of these terms will be sufficient to illustrate this fact.

What is that reconciliation which, according to Paul (2 Cor. v.

* The writer takes pleasure in referring, in this connection, to the two valuable papers on the Atonement read by Dr. Cairns and Dr. A. A. Hodge, at the Presbyterian Council held at Philadelphia, in 1880 (*Proceedings*, pp. 357-369). The closing sentences of the second paper deserve to be written in letters of gold :

“The orthodox doctrine is more and more seen not only to be essential and radical but also catholic and comprehensive, affording the necessary basis for all the side lights and secondary aspects of the great Scriptural truth, which individuals have often seen disconnectedly, and have often unduly isolated and emphasized. The statement of this great truth at the hands of orthodox theologians is becoming less mechanical, less logically squared, and more after the manner of the word and works of God, where truth lies in broad surfaces, and not in narrow lines—where it has breadth as well as length, and where the glory of the parts melts into the greater glory of the whole.”

18, 19: *τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς*), constitutes the sum of the Gospel? The answer to this question depends entirely upon the view taken of the nature and extent of the alienation, the actual separation, the legal and spiritual antagonism, which sin has induced between God and our degenerate race. That sin is causing a voluntary withdrawal of the sinner from truth, from duty, from holiness—that, by a process as certain as that which would sweep off into the abysses of space a planet freed from the law of gravitation, it sweeps the transgressor away, in all the parts and factors of his spiritual being, into cold, dark, fatal distance from the God who made him, is an awful fact—a fact whose dreadful nature and issues the sinner himself can never adequately measure. That sin also causes a voluntary withdrawal of God from the sinful soul, brings down upon that soul a shadow more dreadful than death, bears in its train progressive withholding even of temporal good, and still more of all spiritual gifts, is a corresponding fact of even greater significance. More than this: sin brings the sinful soul under wrath as well as disfavor, involves it in guilt and therefore in condemnation,—sets it in a retributive estate, under the arraignment of law and the judicial frown of justice at once, continuously, and possibly forever. The Bible employs a large variety of the strongest images to set forth this moral distance, this spiritual and forensic alienation, this inward and outward antagonism; nothing could be more terrific than its solemn and penetrating imagery. And these Biblical images may be grouped under the two conceptions, a disordered relationship and an alienated disposition: and the reconciliation which the apostle describes must reach the evil at both points, and make God and man, as to both state and relation, completely at one.

Hence the mediation of Christ is set forth on one side as a propitiation—a vicarious and expiatory work, wherewith the sentiment of justice in God is satisfied, and the righteous claims of law and government are fully met, and wherein ample provision is made for a pardon of the sinner and his restoration to the divine favor. This propitiatory element is indeed central in the mediatorial scheme; it can neither be set aside nor thrust into a secondary position, by one who seeks to comprehend the Gospel plan of redemption. On the basis of this expiatory work, a changed relation becomes possible; the condemnation of law is removed, the judicial frown of God is justly withdrawn, forgiveness is granted, the rebel is regarded as a subject, and is accepted and justified in Christ. But, while this must ever remain the central feature, it is far from being the whole of that wondrous reconciliation which the Immanuel came to earth to bring. His incarnate presence is a reconciling power; His words of wisdom

and tenderness are designed to reconcile both mind and heart ; His disclosures of God, in whatever form, are reconciling manifestations. He reconciles as prophet, He reconciles as king, no less really than when He as priest makes atonement on the cross. It is not the disordered relationship merely which He came to disentangle and replace in heavenly order ; He came to minister at every point to the alienated disposition of man. And whether He speaks or acts or suffers—by word, by example, by the inbreathing of His spirit—at every point and step in His mission, He is always the reconciling Saviour. Mediating for us, He takes up our alienation and our separation in every possible aspect, and seeks to make us one, inwardly as well as forensically one, with God. And throughout this mediating work He is at the same time as truly rendering it possible for God to be graciously reconciled to us, and to fold us as pardoned and accepted sinners to His paternal breast forevermore. Reconciliation as described by the Apostle is thus a broader process than propitiation. It requires for its accomplishment not merely the atoning, but also the entire Christ, in both His active and His passive obedience, and in each and all of His gracious offices and relations. It addresses itself to the high task of healing, not one, but every aspect of sin—of rectifying not one, but all of the relations which we sustain to God, or God to us—of bringing the Deity and the sinner together in amity, not only in the court of justice, but within the divine family, and in disposition as truly as in form. And we may well believe that after we have classified these mediatorial ministries, so far as our minds can measure them, the great reconciling work still goes on in our behalf, in modes and conditions of which we can have no real conception. The heavenly advocacy, the priestly intercession, the princely relation and sway sustained in eternity, are dim illustrations of this transcendent fact.

The second term, salvation, simply expresses the result of this comprehensive reconciling process. We seek to embody that result in the more specific term, justification, as containing the three particular benefits accruing, described theologically as pardon, acceptance, and adoption. We believe that through this mediation the sins of believers, whether they be of transgression or of omission, are absolutely forgiven, and that such forgiveness is pledged to attend believers through all their earthly experiences of sin, and will finally be made complete before the throne of God in glory. We believe that when the believing soul is pardoned, it is also accepted—accepted in person, notwithstanding its still degenerate nature, and reckoned as intrinsically righteous at once and for all the future. We believe that the pardoned and accepted soul is also adopted into

the family of grace, set in new and loving relations toward God and all His spiritual children, and made the heir of spiritual blessings both here and hereafter. Yet it must be held that these are synchronous rather than successive acts: no instant of time ever intervenes between them. In fact, these are not so many mediatorial ministries set in a certain succession; they are rather the several aspects, separable in our analytic thought, but in fact inseparable, of the one justifying act. While for purposes of analysis and description we hold them before our mental vision in their separateness, and though we find in the Scripture itself some warrant for these distributions, yet we are bound by the highest spiritual considerations to emphasize as supreme the oneness of that justification in which they are all so remarkably blended together.

Nor is justification the whole of the redemptive process. For Christ is of God made unto us wisdom (made unto us wisdom from God: *Rev. Vers.*), and righteousness and sanctification, as well as our redemption; righteousness, in both the forensic and the spiritual sense, as grounded in His redeeming sacrifice—sanctification, as a salvatory process, ever tending toward the final redemption or deliverance of the soul. Righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, says a recent commentator (Edwards: 1. Cor.), are the three great spiritual necessities of man; and each and all of these find their provision and source in the one Messianic mediation. While the Spirit is indeed to be recognized as the immediate divine actor in regeneration and sanctification, and the development of a Christly manhood—while repentance and faith and every spiritual grace, and the spirit of prayer and adoption, are referable directly to Him, yet the Mediator is also our sanctification, and these are, one and all, the outgrowths of His comprehensive reconciling work. He is the Saviour, and every spiritual gift is summed in that correlative word of words, Salvation.

—In closing these fragmentary suggestions, the writer desires to guard himself against one possible misapprehension. While pleading thus for the Unities of Mediation, he may seem to some minds to be undervaluing that long and elaborate process of discrimination, analysis, segregating classification which naturally followed the synthetic processes of the Reformation, and gave a peculiar character to the theologies of the two succeeding centuries. Such undervaluation would be a disastrous mistake, and the mere merging of all these historic distinctions into one confused medley would prove in many aspects mischievous. But synthetic processes are as important as analytic, and Christian Theology towers into its proper magnitude and grandeur when it is studied in its unities, rather than

in its special variations. And, in our time, what seems to be needed most is, not the emphasizing of these specialized divisions, which have become so largely the distinguishing dicta of schools and the war-cry of partisans, but rather the unifying of faith—the irenic blending into oneness so far as possible of all that goes to make up the essential belief of Christendom. And certainly at no point can this process be more safely or happily undertaken than at that luminous point where everything in Christianity naturally centres, the one God and Mediator, and the one comprehensive and glorious Mediation on which all our hopes are based.

E. D. MORRIS.

Cincinnati.