

relations to his creatures. Each of the theories implies a limitation of the Divine attributes. In the first the Divine power is limited by the opposing power of evil, which is a dualistic view allied to Manicheism ; in the second, the Divine goodness is limited by the demands of the Divine justice, which implies a conflict in the Divine Mind ; in the third, the Divine wisdom is limited by difficulties inherent in the government of free beings.

2. We have before remarked, that the direction taken by the theory of the atonement during each period seemed determined in some degree by the prevailing ideas of the time, and the tendency of the age. The first theory was warlike, the second legal, the third governmental. It was natural during those terrible centuries in which the church was exposed to so many forms of outward evil, that the theory of redemption should assume the form of a conflict with outward evil, and a victory over the Prince of Darkness. It was an age in which persecutions tormented the Christian church, in which the Emperors of the world seemed to rival the Evil One in atrocious wickedness ; in which the legions of the empire bound with their iron chain the whole earth in military subjection. Then came the dreadful inroads of the barbarians, the destructive famines, and awful pestilences which were thought to have consumed in a few years half of the human race throughout the civilized world. What wonder that redemption from outward evil and sin should seem to be the chief work of Christ, and the passages of Scripture which indicate a conflict with evil be taken as the basis of the theory of redemption ?

But when a thousand years had passed, these tumults had gone by. The barbarous nations having conquered