

of all theology, is forward — tending toward the time which shall see realized the harmonious union of reason and revelation, of faith and works, of the supernatural and the natural, of the spirit and the understanding, of the faith of the heart and the faith of the intellect.

NOTE.

THE sketch of the history of the Atonement, just presented, is confined to the three great forms which the doctrine has taken in the church, and does not undertake to treat of more recent developments. It may, however, be safely said, that the ancient and Orthodox form of the doctrine is now seldom received or taught by those who consider themselves the most Orthodox. The object of the death of Christ is now said to be, not the satisfaction of Divine Justice, but the exercise of a moral influence on the human mind. Christ did not die to appease the wrath of God, nor to pay the debt of obedience due to the Deity, but to manifest the evil of sin, and so to impress the human mind as to make it safe for God to pardon. He died then to reconcile man to God; not to reconcile God to man. Although the more orthodox language is continually used, yet if we look through it, we see that this is the meaning really intended.

One or two instances will be given, in order to illustrate the truth of these remarks. These instances will be taken from books, the professed object of which is to teach the Orthodox theory of the Atonement, in opposition to the Unitarian theory.

Our first extract is from Archbishop Magee, and is taken from his large work on the Atonement. This book throughout is a violent polemic against Unitarianism, and the author evidently regards himself as highly Orthodox. But in his statement of the doctrine he virtually surrend-