

**HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION**

**CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS**

**R.T. Nolan**

**S. T. 4**

**Dr. Riggan**

[See Riggan biographical note at end of the essay.]

**May, 1961**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### I. THE CHURCH

**The Church in the New Testament**  
**The Doctrine of the Invisible Church**  
**The Church Militant, Expectant, & Triumphant**

### II. SACRAMENTS

### III. CONCLUSION

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**2007 note: The style, spelling, punctuation, and endnote/bibliographic forms remain the same as in 1961.**

## I. THE CHURCH

*The Church in the New Testament.* – It seems now to be generally agreed<sup>1</sup> that Christ called and commissioned a body of disciples to be the new Israel, that the word *ekklesia* came into usage because this was the Septuagint word for the congregation of Israel, the chosen people, and that local churches were localised congregations of the one church. In a discussion of these ideas Dean Nelson of Vanderbilt University writes:

The testimony of the Bible thus presupposes both an historical break between the Jewish People of the Old Covenant and the non-national People of the New, as well as an unbroken continuity between these Peoples insofar as God's saving work is concerned.

Recognition of this continuity rests upon faith in the revelation of God as the New Testament presents it. But there is also an internal verbal evidence which reveals at least what the Christians of New Testament times believed about their relation to the Old Israel. This is found in the relation of the Greek *ekklesia*, which refers to "Church" in the New Testament, to the Hebrew *qahal*, which means the "assembly of the congregation of Israel" in the Old Testament. The Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, translated *qahal* by *ekklesia*. The writers of the New Testament in Greek readily chose *ekklesia* as the word to designate the new community of those who believed in Jesus Christ. This choice certainly implied a continuity between the Christian Church and Israel. ....

The exact pattern of organization of this early Church is not described in the New Testament, although there is abundant evidence that there developed quickly some forms of ministry and order.<sup>2</sup>

Originally the Christian Church was the sect of the Jews which believed that the Messiah had come in the person of Jesus, who had died, risen, ascended and sent His Spirit to bind His followers into the fellowship of forgiven sinners waiting for His return to judgment. At first they continued to take part in the Jewish Temple and synagogue worship, while also baptizing converts into their own fellowship and meeting for "the breaking of bread." Before the close of the New Testament period three significant developments took place: 1. the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles, 2. separation from Judaism, and 3. the realization of the continued presence of the Lord. Professor Burrows writes:

The early Palestinian church was at first hardly distinguished from the Jewish people. Separate synagogues may have been organized by the disciples, since any ten men could organize a synagogue, but there is no positive evidence for this. The disciples evidently worshipped in the temple with other Jews. Gradually, however, the sense of being a distinct group increased. The admission of Gentiles contributed to this development.... The gospel was still regarded as the true Judaism and believers as the true Israel, yet the nation as a whole rejected it.<sup>3</sup>

The prominence of the Spirit in the gospels reflects the interest of the early church. For the evangelists it is clear that Jesus' work is done in the power of the Spirit. Luke especially stresses the Spirit, particularly in Acts, chs. 1f. The work of the Spirit in the church begins at Pentecost. Later the Spirit falls upon the converts at Samaria and at Caesarea.<sup>4</sup>

Canon Hodgson points out the questions on which scholars differ:

1. whether Jesus Christ Himself gave to the church any definite internal structure, whether, in particular, He gave the apostles any special position with regard to either jurisdiction or the administration of the sacraments or both.

2. whether from the first the ministry was an integral element in the structure of the church (like the skeleton in the body), or derives from the whole body commissioning certain members to perform certain functions on its behalf.

3. whether in the apostolic church there was any office corresponding to the later episcopate, from which that episcopate is descended by a continuous sequence of consecrations.

4. whether the structure of the church in the N.T. must be taken as prescribing what was to be continued or reproduced in succeeding ages.<sup>5</sup>

Speaking generally, the emphasis they place on justification by faith leads Lutheran scholars to deny the necessity of structural continuity or resemblance. In each land and age the church is free to adopt whatever organization in the circumstances that best equips it to bring the Gospel of God's Grace to mankind. Augustana College President Conrad Bergendoff exemplifies this Lutheran perspective in his following words:

The placing of the center of the evangelical faith in the experience of the forgiveness of sins by

faith in the atoning work of Christ as revealed in scripture (a doctrine called “justification by faith”) left all other matters to the freedom of the congregation. The result was a variety of organization in Lutheranism. In the nations of Europe that accepted the Reformation a form of incorporation of the church within the structure of the state became common (state churches in Scandinavia and Germany). In America, where Lutheran congregations date from 1638, the presbyterian form of church government was adopted, congregations forming synods, and synods gradually entering into relations with each other in conferences or in united bodies. The Augsburg Confession claims that uniformity is not necessary in anything except the fundamental doctrines of Scripture.<sup>6</sup>

Scholars of the Reformed churches, following Calvin, hold that the Church of the New Testament was presbyterian in its organization and that this organization should be perpetuated. Some lay more importance than others on continuity through sequence of ordinations by the presbytery. Professor Trinterud surveys the presbyterian perspective by writing:

Professional office in the Church is but one aspect of the Christian vocation. The “ministry” of the Church is not a group of Church officers. Rather, the ministry of the Church is its obligation under God to minister as His servant, in reconciling the world to Himself. The ministry of the Church is its God-given function, its mission, its apostolate, its vocation. To minister thus, the Church by divine appointment delegates to various officers specific aspects of its function. To some is given the task of preaching, administering the sacraments, and pastoral care of souls. To others, “elders,” is given the task of discipline and overseeing. To others, ‘deacons,’ is given the care of the poor and the benevolent work of the congregation. These officers function through governing bodies, called church courts. These courts are organized over each congregation (the session) and over larger regional areas of the Church....

...the form of this ordination, prayer with the laying on of hands of other officers, is followed as being of long-standing in the Church Catholic, and as being wholly appropriate.<sup>7</sup>

The Lutheran and Presbyterian denominations both maintain presbyterian forms of government in the United States of America; the Presbyterian church, of course, maintains its polity on an international, world-wide basis.

A second form of polity is Congregationalism. International Congregational Council Secretary R.F.G. Calder writes:

Congregationalism, the name given to that type of church organization in which the autonomy of the local church and the voluntary fellowship of such churches for counsel are deemed fundamental. Varied as are the forms which this idea has assumed under varying conditions of time and place, it remains distinctive enough to constitute one of the three main types of ecclesiastical polity, the others being episcopacy and presbyterianism. It regards church authority as inherent in each local body of believers, as a miniature realization of the whole church, which can itself have only an ideal corporate being on earth. It holds this concept of polity to be based on the New Testament and conceives its own contribution to the church universal as consisting in witnessing to this concept. But it also affirms the necessity of voluntary fellowship with other churches.<sup>8</sup>

In the Catholic tradition the unity of the church through the ages is maintained by continuous adherence to the “one true faith” together with a continuous sequence of episcopal consecrations and adherence to the Pope as the prime bishop. This third type of Christian polity is characterized by the combination of the principles of oversight and continuity. As a means of preserving continuity the historic Episcopate exists as a separate order of ministry. As a means of oversight the function of a Bishop may take on a variety of forms depending upon the needs of a given situation.<sup>9</sup> As with supporters of the previous basic polities, those who favor an episcopal polity offer the New Testament as a foundation for their structure.

Canon Hodgson notes that “we have here two types of questions intertwined, (a) the historical question: what was actually done in the N.T. period? and (b) the theological question: to what extent, and in what sense, was that normative for the church in later ages?”<sup>10</sup> The problem is most complex, for (as it has been mentioned) each type of basic polity claims New Testament support for its structure or lack of it. And, in the Catholic tradition alone there exists a diversity of opinions: Some regard the differentiation of an original ministry of presbyter-bishops into the three orders of bishop, priest, and deacon as adopted by the Church

under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; others believe that there was an original episcopate entrusted by Christ to the Apostles and handed on by them to their successors.

When various manuscripts<sup>11</sup> of the first and early second centuries are examined, a logical conclusion that may be drawn is that various forms of ministries and polity were developing in the various geographical areas of the Apostolic Community. *All of these structures were, however, committed in fellowship to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.*

Dr. R.S. Latourette writes:

For the first two or three generations, the Christian community exhibited great variety. There was a consciousness, at least among some of the leaders, of the inclusive unity, which ... was the ideal set forth in the New Testament. Yet no central administration existed as the instrument for knitting together the many local units of the Church into a single articulated structure.

.....  
Uniformity of structure was far from coming into being at once. In the earliest mention of what appears to be officers or leaders in the great Gentile church in Antioch, we hear of prophets and teachers, but not of deacons, elders, or bishops. ...In his *Letter to the Romans* prophets, ministers, teachers, exhorters, givers (perhaps deacons), and rulers are named as what appears to be the order with which Paul is familiar. In another letter the list is apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers.<sup>12</sup>

Professor Latourette points out in his subsequent discussion the various offices used in the earliest Church, but that the distinct office of a Bishop finally emerged as dominant after the fore part of the second century. Thus, any appeal by a particular polity can be, it would seem, supported by the New Testament and other documents, but certainly no one polity can claim to be the norm of ecclesiastical structure. Elements of episcopacy, presbyterianism, and congregationalism evident in the early documents of the Christian Community, and if one considers carefully the life of that Community he could scarcely draw the conclusion that any one of them received primacy either historically or theologically.

Canon Hodgson's second question - to what extent, and in what sense, was that (N.T. period) normative for the church (polity) in later ages? - presents a seemingly insoluble problem. If the New Testament period is considered normative, then in view of our foregoing discussion we might conclude that the diversity in polity which exists today is of the *esse* of the Church. On the other hand, if we take the opposite view of the N.T. period (*i.e.*, not normative), we might conclude that the diversity in polity which exists today is quite acceptable. As a reply to these "alternatives" the words of W.A. Visser 'T Hooft should be considered; he writes:

The theological starting point is that the Church as the one, undivided People of God and the unbroken Body of Christ belongs to the fundamental biblical *kerygma*. When the New Testament speaks of churches in the plural it never means self - contained bodies which live largely in isolation from each other and in many cases do not even have altar and pulpit fellowship with each other. According to the New Testament, unity belongs not only to the *bene esse* but to the *esse* of the Church. And this unity which is given in the fact of the one Lord, must become manifest and incarnate, as the Lord Himself became manifest and incarnate (John 17).<sup>13</sup>

The preceding paragraph does not speak definitely about a unity of polity. And as the author of that statement adds: "It is a grave mistake to suppose that the ultimate goal of ecumenism is a monolithic centralized church structure for the whole world. ... Manifest unity is perfectly compatible with variety, independence and decentralization. The New Testament Church had remarkable variety and was in no sense a super-church, but it manifested to all who had eyes to see that the People of God were one single family."<sup>14</sup>

Thus the unity which the churches should focus upon, it would seem, is the common allegiance to Jesus Christ. The writer would add that the problem of polity should play a decided secondary role in an ecclesiastical expression of the Gospel, a role which would enhance rather than prevent "altar and pulpit fellowship." Unfortunately, polity, among other factors, has provided a stumbling block to the Scriptural ideal of unity in commitment. We would offer an answer to Canon Hodgson's second question, therefore, by saying that the N. T. period is normative in its expression of unity of allegiance for the church in all ages, but that the various polities of the period ought to serve this commitment and not prevent its realization if any or all of those structures are perpetuated.

It seems that if a generalization about polity of the New Testament period can be made, it might be labeled as “situational polity.” The needs of the location of a given congregation evidently determined the polity of the New Testament churches. To the best of this writer’s knowledge, the only denomination which continues the N.T. “situational polity” is the Lutheran church.

At this point of our discussion the writer would like to “put in a word” for Episcopacy. In a paper for a course in Episcopalian polity he wrote: “As a defense of the Episcopate ... this student would offer the contemporary Protestant this apology: (1) The Episcopacy emerged in the early Church both as a means of ecclesiastical government and as a guardian of the Resurrection Faith of the Apostles. Although its effectiveness in the Church has not always been of a positive nature, its function as a means of ordaining other Christian ministers serves as a great bulwark against gross misinterpretations of the Gospel. (2) The institution’s link with the past and future provides the Church with a visible expression of the continuity of the Faith. (3) Finally, although the Episcopate need not be considered of the *esse* of the Church, it ought to be considered of the *bene esse* inasmuch as its foundations are laid in the historical drama of God’s search for man.” In other words, if the Episcopate is *not* regarded as the *sine qua non* of Christianity, why not make use of it? Its dominance in the Church for about 1400 years (C. 150-1550) certainly has enriched the ministry with a sacramental tradition. With the proper focus (*i.e.*, upon Jesus Christ) the Episcopacy could well serve the Church Universal.

What is the Church in the New Testament? We have seen that its external structure takes on a variety of forms. We have seen that rising above all polities is the allegiance to Jesus Christ. We have seen that no single polity receives historical or theological primacy. We have seen that the unity which is normative in the N.T. is the unity of commitment, and that it is this allegiance which is to be perpetuated in the Church for all ages. Jesus did not command that a structure be handed down, but rather that the believers should “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you...” Jesus did not promise that episcopacy, congregationalism, or presbyterianism would endure, but rather that “... *I am with you always, to the close of the age.*” (Matt. 28:19-20)

*The Doctrine of the Invisible Church.* At the time of the Reformation some Reformers stressed the importance of distinguishing between the invisible and visible church. They were of the opinion that on account of its corruptions, the Catholic Church of that time could not be regarded as a fellowship of men in communion with God through Christ in the Spirit. They felt that it would be wrong to describe such a church as the Body of Christ. In the New Testament they discovered that the Church sometimes appears as the Body of Christ and sometimes as a somewhat organized community of men by no means free from corruptions. The conclusion was drawn by those Reformers that the real Church is the community of men who stood in a faith relationship to God, the composition of which is known to God alone and thus invisible, they regarded the visible church as the true Church only in so far as it is an expression of the invisible. The late Reverend Dr. Hall writes in a discussion of this differentiation made by some Reformers:

The distinction between the visible Church and as invisible one, consisting of the elect, is not scriptural. (a) The phrase, “the elect,” is used in the New Testament as equivalent to the baptized. That is, the members of the visible Church are the elect, although they have to make their calling and election sure. (b) No biblical passage demonstrably distinguishes between a visible and an invisible Church; (c) No one is described in the New Testament as a member of Christ’s Church who is not a baptized member of the visible church; (d) The Church which Christ teaches that men should hear is obviously a visible one, and He mentions no other. It is clear that the visible Church is the subject of the promises in the New Testament, although it is implied that individual members can fall away and be lost.<sup>15</sup>

R. H. Fuller lends support to Dr. Hall’s thesis by writing: “The NT knows no distinction between a visible and an invisible church. The Christian community is as visible and as bodily as the individual Christian.”<sup>16</sup>

It is obvious that there are evil persons in the visible church and men living lives pleasing to God outside of the Church. It is probably true that only God knows who will ultimately be saved. If this were all that the doctrine of the invisible church were meant to affirm, the controversy would not be so severe. The truth for which it stands is exemplified in some Christians’ distinction between the church’s body and soul.

Much more difficulty arises when some thinkers assert that Christianity is essentially an individual

faith-relationship between God and separate persons. To this difficulty Canon Hodgson writes:

The view that the church is constituted by a faith-relationship to God in Christ raises the question of what is meant by faith. In the Catholic tradition the maintenance of such faith-relationship would require the church corporately to profess the faith of the creeds and to maintain continuity of structure through its ministry, thus providing the framework within which the individual Christian can enter into faith-relationship in the sense of personal surrender. For certain Protestants the continuous maintenance of this framework of creed and ministry is irrelevant and unimportant. All that matters is faith in the sense of personal surrender; wherever a congregation of men is come together on the basis of such surrender, there is the church.<sup>17</sup>

Although we might want to take with a grain of salt Canon Hodgson's "requirements" of the Catholic tradition (after all, he's an Anglican!), his analysis includes a most important motif for an understanding of the Church, that of "corporeality." That the Church is a community is a central motif in Biblical thought, and the relationship between God and his People is not just a highly individualized one, but, on the contrary, highly corporate. The Book of Common Prayer begins no prayer, to the writer's knowledge, with "I," but with "We." This is not to say that an individual I-Thou relationship with God is un-Christian, but rather that the I-Thou relationship is also between members of the visible covenant community.

Thus to those Reformers who stressed such an interpretation of the Invisible Church, one might express agreement that idolatry can enter the Church, but that the whole Community suffers as a result. Those Reformers need be reminded that the Church is yet a community of sinners, though redeemed, and *not* the Kingdom of God. The equivalence of the Church with the Kingdom of God is, perhaps, one of the greatest pitfalls of many theologians, Protestant and Catholic... in my opinion.

*The Church Militant. Expectant, and Triumphant.* As the object and instrument of God's redemptive work the church is subject to the same conditions as was its Incarnate Lord. He had come to win men back to the love of God and neighbor; for this purpose He immersed Himself in the cross currents of human society. Likewise, the Church Militant is immersed in the world, in human society for the continuation of His ministry. Although we have been thinking of the Church as Christ continuing His redemptive work in the world through the Spirit, we must not forget that when those members die, they are still members of the Body of Christ. The Communion of Saints includes both its members on earth and those who have died. As Canon Hodgson writes:

The Church... is a fellowship or communion embracing Christians alive, the saints in Heaven, and those who have died and are awaiting their final destiny. When we speak of the church militant, the church expectant and the church triumphant we are speaking of one church whose members are at different stages in their pilgrimage.<sup>18</sup>

When that great state is reached wherein the pilgrimage is ended and God's reign and rule are established, the Church can pass out of existence to usher in the Kingdom. To this destiny the Church presses onward.

## II. SACRAMENTS

During the writer's period of life he has enjoyed the instruction in religion by Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and other Christian persons. A Christian theme which, it seems to him, has many variations is the concept of the sacraments.

In the catechism of the (1928) Book of Common Prayer is a classic statement or definition of the sacraments; the *BCP* states that they are "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." It would seem that this definition would be acceptable to most Christians today, but the additional qualification might be needed that a sacrament must have been instituted by word or exemplary action of Christ Himself. In addition, some Christians would include the notion that a sacrament is efficacious only when it is performed within the Church by ministers of the Church. On the general nature of the Sacraments Professor Shepherd writes:

Apart from the context of corporate church life, a sacrament is meaningless, if not, more extremely, a superstitious piece of magic. To be a Christian involves more than a personal faith in the redeeming act of God and Christ. It demands an incorporation into the community where the effects of Christ's redemption in reconciliation and charity may be actualized and nurtured. A sacrament cannot

be performed by an individual for himself alone; it requires at least another party. Thus a sacrament is more than a visible token of God's free favor and grace offered to one who accepts His redeeming love in faith and devotion. It is an instrument whereby the individual is made a member of a covenant-community and ordered by its disciplines and responsibilities. To say that any particular sacrament is necessary to salvation does not mean that God is tied and bound to bestow His grace only by this means, but to affirm that in all normal circumstances an individual is made a partaker of Christ's redemption by being related to others who share the same benefits. In the sacraments, therefore, both the personal and the social relationships of Christian salvation are publicly ratified, accepted, and communicated.<sup>19</sup>

The preceding statement about the sacraments seems to the writer to be a splendid generalization, one to which most contemporary Christians would adhere. Were such a comprehensive commentary further elaborated, however, disputes on the more "fine points" might well occur, as has happened in the past. In the Reformation period of Christian history, for example, Catholics and Protestants emphasized differently the nature or means by which sacraments conveyed divine grace. As Dr. Shepherd notes: "Catholics stressed the objective efficacy of sacraments when duly performed with sincere intention by authorized ministers using the proper form (words) and matter (elements or actions) of a sacrament."<sup>20</sup> The Professor further points out that "protestants tended to emphasize the subjective conditions of penitence and faith in the recipients of sacraments as a condition of receiving beneficially the promise of grace proclaimed by the word of Christ and offered with the sacramental signs."<sup>21</sup>

Dr. J. S. Whale raises the question: "Would it be sound doctrine ... to teach, as Rome does, that the Sacraments exert their influence *ex opere operato*, that is, simply through the objective performance of the rite?"<sup>22</sup> With an affirmative reply Dr. Whale elucidates:

First, it is erroneous to suppose that Protestantism repudiates this great truth as to the objective operation and efficacy of the Gospel Sacraments. It is also misleading to say that Roman doctrine requires no faith at all from the recipient of the Sacraments. To quote Cardinal Bellarmine: 'Goodwill, faith and penitence are necessary in the adult communicant, not as the active cause of sacramental grace, nor as giving efficacy to the Sacrament. These dispositions merely remove the obstacles which might hinder its efficacy.' Now, no Protestant would deny this, even though he means by 'faith' something notably different from what this great Jesuit meant. Indeed, the classic Protestant Confessions do not deny this, but they go much further.

Secondly, then, Protestantism has never even distantly denied that God's power dwells in the Sacraments in virtue of the Lord's institution. But it denies that grace is ever conferred *ex opere operato* without corresponding faith on the part of the recipient. The grace of the Gospel is not a 'thing', a sort of spiritual 'blood-plasm' for distribution to men through the channels of the sacramental system: a divine 'stuff', so to speak, fused indissolubly with the sacramental elements, and working in magically objective fashion on the soul of the Communicant, without conscious response on his part, just as aspirin might work on his body. ... The heart of the Sacrament is divine Action not divine Substance. God's grace is conveyed not through the elements but through the act.<sup>23</sup>

Thus, according to Dr. Whale, the operation of the Sacrament depends upon the action, not the elements themselves. He analogizes such action in the following words:

Just as inoculation exerts its influence on a man's body, irrespective of his feelings about it, he may be asleep or unconscious while it does its healing work: or just as a fire warms simply by the fact of our coming to stand in front of it; the burning coal is the *opus operatum*, and our bodily presence is alone necessary to make its warmth operative.<sup>24</sup>

Both Catholics and Protestants seem to agree more that one might expect on the idea of grace, differing chiefly in emphasis rather than in essence. Both affirm the necessity of faith and the use of certain actions and elements.

The chief issue of difference between the two parties was and is centered about the question: in what manner was grace inherent in the sacramental signs? Particularly in the study of the Holy Communion this issue came to light. The Roman Church has maintained that the substance of bread and wine are miraculously changed by consecration into the actual substance of Christ's Body and Blood; only the appearance (accidents) of the bread and wine remain the same. While few Reformers oppose the notion of Christ's Presence, the Roman notion of transubstantiation has been repudiated by most, if not all, Protestants. This difference well

illustrates, in the writer's opinion, the Roman Thomistic perspective as contrasted with Protestant Augustinianism.

Another difference between Catholics and Protestants centers about the number of Sacraments. Romans have signified their belief in seven, but Protestants have accepted only two. Anglicans, bridging the two extremes, acknowledge generally the "primacy" of two Sacraments necessary for Salvation (Baptism and Holy Communion), but include Penance, Confirmation, Matrimony, Unction, and Holy Orders as five sacraments of the church. Anglicans do differ, however, on the degree of "sanctity" of the latter five.

Significant re-thinking by all Christians about the Sacraments is being enriched by modern biblical and theological study. "Mediaeviality" and stubborn dogmatism might yet be overcome, but at the same time many conservatives (like this student) intend to be most careful that these gifts of God, whether Sacramental or sacramental, be not demythologized or psychologized out of meaningful existence. Let superstition be exposed, but let meaningful aids in our encounter with God be strengthened through understanding.

### III. CONCLUSION

The Gospel that God has again acted in history, this time to redeem the world through the life and Message of His Son, comes to man through a community of faith, a covenant community, a committed community continuous from the Jews to the present. St. Paul often used the phrase "the body of Christ" as a synonym for the Church. God has chosen a people who have responded to the Gospel, a community to live in commitment to Him. Because this community is a social institution but also intent on enhancing an I-Thou relationship with the Father, it seems to be both in the world but not of the world. Its allegiance and source of guidance is lifted out of an exclusively worldly perspective to the hope for the coming Kingdom of God.

The presence of God's guidance and activity in His community, through the Sacraments and sacramental lives of persons, raises the Church above the category of just a social institution, and places it in a mystical body. Its mission, this student is persuaded, is to make disciples of all men and to transform all societies into the covenant community, an assembly of God. Its Gospel of joy, love, and peace is to be made relevant to the totality of life that the hearts of men might respond to the love of God.

As the object and instrument of God's redemptive work, the Church is subject to the same conditions as was its Prince. He had the mission to win men back to the love of God and neighbor; for this purpose he immersed himself in the turbulence of human society. Likewise, the Church Militant is immersed in the world, in human society for the continuation of his ministry. Those members who have died are still members of His community; the Communion of Saints includes both its members on earth and those who have died, all on the pilgrimage of hope for the establishment of the Kingdom.

The writer is also persuaded that the Church has been given special gifts by God through His Son, gifts that may focus the heart and mind of the committed Christian upon the love of God. These Sacraments may impart, at God's will, special help to strengthen each man as a member of the Community. Within the Church each Christian has the opportunity both through the Sacraments and sacramental living to respond continually to and be nurtured by God's love. Through worship, prayer, and other aspects of this life, it seems to this student, that one can experience the I-Thou encounter with the Father. It may be through this total sacramental living within the New Israel that the faithful may experience the assurance of God's forgiveness themselves as a participants in a reality which is not yet the Kingdom of God.

### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> - amongst Protestant scholars -

<sup>2</sup> J. Robert Nelson, "Church," *Handbook of Christian Theology* (N.Y., 1958), pp. 54 f.

<sup>3</sup> Millar Burrows, *An Outline of Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia, 1956), p. 149.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77.

<sup>5</sup> L. Hodgson, "Christian Doctrine - Lecture Summaries," Dept. of Theology of Berkeley Divinity School Publication (New Haven, 1958), p. 45.

<sup>6</sup> C. Bergendoff, "Lutheranism," *Handbook of Christian Theology*, pp. 222 f.

<sup>7</sup>L.J. Trinterud, "Presbyterianism," *Handbook of Christian Theology*, p. 275.

<sup>8</sup>R.F.G. Calder, "Congregationalism," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, VI (1960 ed.), p. 247.

<sup>9</sup>For example, the diocesan Episcopate could conceivably be changed to a university or monastic Episcopate if the need were to arise.

<sup>10</sup>Hodgson, p. 44.

<sup>11</sup>the Didache, Letters of Clement, the New Testament literature, etc.

<sup>12</sup>K.S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (N.Y., 1953), pp. 115 ff.

<sup>13</sup>W.A.V. 'T Hooft, "Ecumenism," *Handbook of Christian Theology*, p. 92.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>15</sup>F. J. Hall, *Theological Outlines* (N.Y., 1933), p. 224.

<sup>16</sup>R. H. Fuller, "Church," *A Theological Word Book Of The Bible* (N.Y., 1959), p. 49.

<sup>17</sup>I. Hodgson, pp. 46 f.

<sup>18</sup>L. Hodgson, p. 48.

<sup>19</sup>M. Shepherd, "Sacraments," *Handbook of Christian Theology*, p. 331.

<sup>20,21</sup>M. Shepherd, pp. 331 f.

<sup>22</sup>J. S. Whale, *Christian Doctrine* (London, 1952), p. 162.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 162 f.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 161 f.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burrows, M. *An Outline of Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia; 1956.

*Encyclopedia Britannica*. Vol. VI. 1960 edition.

Hall, F.J. *Theological Outlines*. New York: 1933.

*Handbook of Christian Theology*. New York : Meridian Books, Inc., 1958.

Hodgson, L. *Christian Doctrine-Lecture Summaries*. New Haven: 1958.

Latourette, K. *A History of Christianity*, New York: 1953.

Niebuhr, H.R. *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry*. New York: 1956.

Richardson, A. (ed.) *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible*. N.Y.: 1959.

Whale, J. *Christian Doctrine*. London, 1952.