

laden with wool, &c., so it could not be stopped easily. I do not think there was any blame to any one.

W. HOBBS.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, MAY 13, 1868.

"The Theanthropic Life of Christ."

This is the title of the first article in the April Baptist Quarterly, from the pen of Dr. S. Talbot. Perhaps there never was a time when so much learned investigation and profound thought were employed in bringing out to view the character of the Lord Jesus Christ as at the present day. The attacks of sceptics and the doubts respecting his miraculous power suggested by materialists, have served the arm of the followers of Christ to pursue the enquiries suggested by those superficial writers, and to carry out the examination of the Divine Record to a fuller and more complete result than any can do who set so little value on the Gospel as made known by the Evangelists.

Almost every man of mark, as a writer, has given new attention to this prime article of faith and religious opinion. On this one point rests our hopes for time and eternity. It is necessary that we have clear views of the person and work of Christ, or the whole of Christian faith is unsettled, and the facts of Christian experience become fancies. But we know that we have not followed cunningly devised fables. The evidence of the divinity of Christianity are being daily multiplied. Every soul that is brought to receive the truth as it is in Jesus, is a new fact demonstrating that Jesus reigns over all, and is bringing men to submit to him, shewing that all the predictions of the glory of his kingdom shall be ultimately fulfilled.

We should like to give our readers something like a general idea of this masterly paper, so that they might have their minds refreshed by a closer acquaintance with its subject, and their confidence strengthened in Him in whose name alone is salvation and everlasting life. We make a few quotations which will shew better than any summary we might give of the author's thoughts on the subject:—

"The incarnation is the central fact in Christianity. At this point the Life entered into the sphere of humanity and a new course of development was originated. The Second Man, the Lord from heaven, here takes his place in history. It is perhaps more common to look to the cross as the centre of Christianity; and it is certain that the incarnation would not of itself have wrought out the salvation of men without the death of Jesus. His crucifixion was the culmination at least of his atoning service. But then the atonement was not the whole of his work. The Life must also be manifest in human flesh. The incarnation was the condition precedent to the new nature imparted in regeneration. The salvation of the redeemed could only be a brotherhood with the first born, and must consist in being conformed to his image. Their spiritual life is not the purely divine life but the theanthropic life of the Son of God; it is Christ in us, the hope of glory. We are members of his body; we are branches of the vine. It is doubtful, moreover, whether the sufferings of Christ could have been an atonement for the sins of men, if he had not suffered in the nature of man. Whether some other method of saving sinners was possible or not, the method actually employed of substitutionary suffering presupposes a common nature between man and his Redeemer. All the redeeming acts on which salvation was to be grounded, depended upon his participating in human nature. Taking now this comprehensive view, it will be seen that the manifestation of God in the flesh was the germinal root, the central fact, in the purpose and accomplishment of human redemption.

The incarnation was rendered possible by the fact that man was originally created in the image of God. We could not conceive of the divine entering and dwelling in the brute nature; it could not be manifested in a nature unlike, not kindred to, its own. But the spirit of man was formed by its Creator with himself as its model; hence a union of the divine and human natures was possible. "Great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh." How this mystery took its place as a fact we cannot explain. How did these two natures, the divine and the human, come together, and how do they stand related in the person of Christ?

The difficulty would not be removed by a denial of his divine nature, so long as it is admitted that he pre-existed in some nature before he came in the flesh; for it is just as inexplicable to our understandings that any two natures should be united in one person as

that the divine and human should be so united. The latter also is the fact, for that he did exist as a divine being before his assumption of our nature is his own testimony concerning himself to the world. He was before his incarnation with God and was God, and in his incarnation he was God manifest in the flesh."

"The Son of God and the Son of Man was one person, Jesus Christ; but the nature of the union, its conditions and effects, are beyond our means of explaining or comprehending.

The literature of our times plainly shows how impossible is the attempt to write the life of Christ and not do violence to the simple portraiture of him in the Gospels, when either the divine side or the human side of his manifestation is held exclusively in view. The divine in him was revealed under human conditions and the human was penetrated with the divine; and hence when we hear those who profess to portray his life, crying at the outset, Behold the Man, or, Behold the God, we expect to find the representation partial and one-sided. The problem cannot be solved with one of the factors left out. Indeed the life of Christ as apprehended in the Christian consciousness will never be written by the pen of the biographer, but must be unfolded rather in the development of redeemed humanity."

I. *His divine nature was manifested under human limitations and conditions.* The determinateness which his human nature had already received at birth through union with the Godhead, did not exclude its own peculiar development. The finiteness and laws of growth of his human faculties were not abrogated by the divine having been incarnated in him. Hence it follows that his divinity must have been manifested in conformity with his human nature. The divine knowledge and divine will in him revealed themselves in his human existence. Wonderful indeed must have been the first opening of his child-life, and yet not perhaps out of nature! How early he came to the full consciousness of himself as the divine-human, we never can determine. Was he always conscious in his higher nature, even while in the womb of Mary? Was he, even while a little child, in the free use and exercise of his divine attributes? The difficulty in an affirmative answer to these inquiries would be, that this would seem inconsistent with the union of the two natures in one person. We are told that he "grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." There was a gradual unfolding of his faculties of knowledge. If his divine knowledge was not brought wholly into the sphere of the human, it must at least have been held in connection with the human; that is, it must be understood as being in part only potential. It is specially important to observe here that he was not dependent on human sources, at least in the ordinary way, for his knowledge of divine things. He must have learned to read as other Jewish children, but his doctrine came to him neither from his mother nor from the schools of his time. At twelve years of age we find him in the midst of the doctors, both hearing and asking them questions, and he was at that time distinctly conscious of his Messiahship. "Wist ye not," he said, "that I must be about my Father's business?"

II. *He was in the condition of a servant;* that is, a servant to God. This was one element in his state of humiliation, the subordination of himself to the Father. In the volume of the book it was written of him, "I delight to do thy will, O my God." Of himself he said, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will but the will of him that sent me and to finish his work." Being in the form, the condition, of God, and thinking it not robbery to be equal with God, he made himself of no reputation and took on him the form, the condition, of a servant and was made in the likeness of men."

III. *He was here subject to trials and temptations.* To this his human nature was an indispensable condition. We know that God cannot be tempted of evil. Having in himself infinite fulness and absolute blessedness, and withal being perfectly holy, evil can be no motive to him. But the Son, when he was manifested in the human condition could be tempted and must needs be tempted. By virtue of the human side of his nature, he was capable of being affected with all human feelings, such as do not involve human imperfection. He could hunger and thirst and be weary; he could desire and hope and fear; he was subject to the alternations of pleasure and displeasure, joy and grief; he was capable of friendship and affection; he learned obedience by the things he suffered; in a word he was in all essentials like one of us. Temptation could appeal to him, as it can to us. But it may be asked whether his divinity excluded at the same time the possibility of his sinning, of his yielding to the

temptation. It would seem so. We are not prepared to concede with some that he was capable of sinning under temptation. Such a conception should be as utterly abhorrent to our reason as it is to our feelings. How could the divine, even when participating in the finite and subject to human conditions, come under the power of evil? If it be asked, How then could it be tempted? we answer, The divine in the Son of God was not tempted, but he, the divine-human, was the subject of the temptation. Was it then the human nature in him alone that was tempted? We answer as before, No! it was he, the divine-human, who suffered, being tempted. His human was the necessary condition to his exposure to evil; but we must neither divide the person nor confound the natures. The temptation, it is enough to know, though real, came to him from without and remained wholly without; it never became an internal temptation to him. It was proved, not here alone but through the whole of his life, according to his saying, that the prince of this world came and had nothing in him; found in him "no point of tangency for evil."

IV. *He suffered death.* Death to him was the same as death to us, viz., the separation of the soul from the body. "Father," he cried, "into thy hands I commit my spirit." Death is not the extinction of being nor a sleep of the soul. But how did death affect his divine nature? The same as his human spirit, for they were inseparably conjoined. The human spirit entered into direct union with the divine in him, and death merely separated him as thus constituted from the human body. Did then his divine nature suffer in death? This question is not answered by predicating the impossibility of the existence of pain and sorrow in deity, for Christ did not then exist as pure deity. He himself suffered, being what he was, the divine-human in one person. Since the union of the two natures was not formal but real, a life-union, the presumption is that the divine in Christ participated with the human in his suffering. Against this presumption we cannot conceive of any thing that reason is competent to allege, and the Scriptures are silent. While therefore we may not feel authorized to teach the suffering of the divine, we cannot allow any argument to be drawn from an assumption to the contrary.

But since the theanthropic life of Christ was not limited to his state of subjection, we may advance a step further and affirm."

V. *Our nature was carried by him in a state of glorification to heaven, where it will forever exist in union with the divine.* After his experience of death his body was laid in the grave, but his human soul was not separated from the divinity. The spirit of man possesses immortality, and death can in no way reach or rob it of its dowry. During the three days he, the divine-human, was in Paradise, not yet however pleading for sinners. At the end of the three days he entered and re-animated the broken body, and thus, after his resurrection, remained on earth forty days, going in and out with the disciples and eating and drinking with them. His body was not yet glorified, for he needed to be raised in a natural body for the purpose of identification by the disciples; besides he did not exhibit the appearances ascribed to the changed body; but when he ascended and the bright cloud received him out of their sight, his humanity was clothed with glory and death was swallowed up in victory. In this condition he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High, as Head of the kingdom of God and Lord of the human race. All power on earth was given to him and all power in heaven,—angels, principalities and powers being made subject to him.

Before his incarnation his position in the Godhead was that of an equal, but by virtue of his entrance into humanity he assumed the condition of a servant, and to a similar condition essentially he will return at the consummation of his kingdom. When he left his throne in the Godhead to become incarnate, he left it not to return again forever and ever. Into the glory of the Father he has now again entered, but he will never re-take his place of equal authority. His present Headship to the church and his Lordship over the world and the angels is not a resumption of his equality with God, since this exalted state was given to him by the Father as his recompense of reward. Nor do we know that his mediatorial reign is co-extensive with the entire universe. But even his present government will come to an end. As to his position after that event Scripture says only that the Son will be subject. It is certain that he will still be the personal head of the church triumphant. His is an everlasting crown. But it will not then be a crown of power; he will not wield a sceptre of authority, but of truth and grace. Jesus will be forever the Prince in the house of God, having the glory of

God; but God, no longer mediately through his Son, but immediately, will hold the reins of empire. With what songs of praise will the Son be everlastingly surrounded, because he is subject! His self-sacrifice is eternal, even as his love.

It has been supposed by some that the Son at the termination of his work as Saviour, will divest himself of his humanity and retire back into pure deity. But this seems directly contrary to the statement that the Son shall be subject. The church also, made like him, would be as a bride forsaken of her husband, if he did not dwell in his bodily presence forever with her. "I will," he says, "that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me." "And so shall we be ever with the Lord."

The following are the remaining "Contents" of this valuable periodical:—

2. Celsus' Attack upon Christianity; By Prof. G. D. R. Pepper, D. D.
3. Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem; By Rev. Henry S. Burrage.
4. The Christian Sabbath; By Prof. A. N. Arnold, D. D.
5. The History of the Christian Commission; By Rev. W. C. Wilkinson.
6. Dissent on the Communion Question; By Rev. H. A. Hart.
7. Editorial notes.
8. Intelligence.

THE ENGLISH SKYLARK.—One of the most cheering features of country life in England is the variety of its singing birds. Of these the skylark, is perhaps, the most peculiar and striking. An early morning walk is well repaid, by the warblings of this heavenly musician. Rising from his nest, built in some hole on the ground, he soars and warbles rising up into the sky almost perpendicularly until his little body is lost to human vision by the distance it has arisen. Even when no longer seen it is still heard in the far distance, like a thread of silver, leading one up from the glories of nature under the influence of the rising sun to the great God of heaven and earth. These reminiscences have been called up by reading an illusion of two or three lines to this beautiful English song-bird in the *Sunday Magazine*. The author of "The Seaboard Parish," in describing a piece of beautiful scenery, says: "and one lark was somewhere, in whose little breast the whole world was reflected as in the convex mirror of a dew-drop, where it swelled so that he could not hold it; but let it out again through his little throat metamorphosed into music which he poured forth over all, as the libation on the outspread altar of worship."

In the recent trial before the Court of Arches—the highest ecclesiastical Court of England—on the question of Ritualism, Sir Robert Phillimore gave judgment:

Against—1st, the elevation of the Eucharist; 2ndly, the use of incense during the communion; 3rdly, the mixed chalice; (putting a small quantity of water into the wine) but, 4thly, for the use of two lighted candles on the altar. Dr. Phillimore enumerated three categories in regard to the Rubric—1, things lawful and ordered; 2, things unlawful and prohibited; 3, things neither ordered nor prohibited expressly, but the doing or use of which must be governed by the living discretion of some person in authority.

This is considered a triumph by the Evangelical party in the Church. It appears, however, but a small triumph, for whilst the use of incense is prohibited during the communion, it does not forbid its use previous to the time of service. The Ritualists are consequently now burning incense in the chancel of their churches before the commencement of the services, so that the place shall be thoroughly incensed during the time of service!

Rev. Dr. Cramp writes us he would like to make the following suggestion to the churches throughout the Province, viz.,

"That the clerks of the churches be directed to mention in the letters to the Associations the names of their Licentiates. It is important to ascertain the preaching strength of the Denomination."

This, we think a very important item, and one which we fear has of late been somewhat neglected and lost sight of in our statistics.

The young man who occasionally writes for the *Chronicle*, need not trouble himself about the communications that appear in the *Messenger*. The readers of the *Messenger* are capable of understanding what they read in our columns, without having him for an interpreter. His efforts to give another meaning than what the words of our correspondent plainly convey, will not be likely to prove of much service to him or his friends.