

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

The Evangelical Quarterly

JULY 15th, 1939

THE SERVANT OF THE LORD IN ISAIAH LIII

I

FRANZ DELITZSCH said: "Isaiah liii is the most central, the deepest, and the loftiest thing that Old Testament prophecy, outstripping itself, ever achieved." Nowhere in the Old Testament is a more vivid and gripping picture of the suffering Servant of the Lord to be found than in the chapter under consideration. The history of the interpretation of this portion of Scripture is replete with controversy not only between Christian and Jewish scholars but also within the Christian Church.

I

- lii. 13. Behold, my servant shall prosper,
He shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high.
14. As many were appalled at thee,—
So marred was his visage beyond the semblance of man,
And his form unlike that of the sons of men,—
15. So shall he startle many nations;
Because of him kings shall shut their mouths,
For that which had not been told them shall they see,
And that which they had not heard shall they perceive.

II

- liii. 1. Who would have believed our divine message?
And the arm of the Lord,—to whom has it been revealed?
2. He grew up as a sapling before Him,
And as a root of dry ground;
He had neither form nor splendour, that we should look upon him,
Nor beauty, that we should delight in him.
3. He was despised, and forsaken of men,
A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;¹
And as one from whom men hide their faces,
He was despised, and we esteemed him not.

¹ The Hebrew word *choli*, which means sickness, may also designate suffering in general. See Buhl, F., *Wilhelm Gesenius, Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 17th edition, Leipzig, 1921, p. 233.

III

4. But indeed our griefs has he borne,
And our sorrows,—he carried them;
Yet we thought him stricken,
Smitten of God, and afflicted.
5. But he was pierced because of our transgressions,
He was crushed because of our iniquities;
The chastisement that brought us peace was upon him,
And with his stripes we are healed.
6. All we like sheep had gone astray,
We had turned each to his own way;
And the Lord has made to fall on him
The iniquity of us all.

IV

7. He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself
And opened not his mouth;
As a sheep that to the slaughter is led,
And as a ewe that before her shearers is dumb,
So he opened not his mouth.
8. From prison¹ and from judgment he was snatched away,
And as regards his generation, who is concerned?
For he was cut off out of the land of the living,
For the transgression of my people was he stricken.
9. And they made his grave with the wicked,
Yet with a rich man was he in his death;
Although he had done no violence,
Neither was any deceit in his mouth.

V

10. And yet the Lord purposed to crush him; He has put him to grief;²
If his life shall make a trespass offering;
He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days,
And the purpose of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.
11. Of the travail of his soul he shall see,
And shall be satisfied;
By his knowledge my righteous servant shall justify many,
And their iniquities he shall bear.
12. Therefore will I give him a portion among the great,
And with the mighty he shall divide the spoil;
Because he poured out his soul unto death,
And was numbered with the transgressors,
Though he bare the sin of many,
And made intercession for the transgressors.³

¹ Or "coercion".

² See note 1.

³ The passage is given in the writer's translation.

MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION IN THE SYNAGOGUE

A challenging question at once presents itself: "Who is the Servant?" It will be helpful first of all to ascertain whether any Jewish scholars accepted the idea of a suffering Messiah. There is considerable evidence for an affirmative answer in rabbinical literature, including the prayers of the synagogue. August Wünsche in his book, *Die Lieder des Messias*, made a laborious compilation of extracts from old rabbinical writings from which the conclusion may be drawn that the conception of a suffering Messiah was by no means foreign to the old synagogue.¹ The renowned scholar, Emil Schürer, makes a similar inference:

"It cannot be refuted that in the second century after Christ, at least in certain circles of Jewry, there was familiarity with the idea of a Messiah who was to suffer, even suffer vicariously for human sin. The portrayal of Justin makes it sure that Jewish scholars through disputations with Christians saw themselves forced to this concession. Thus an idea is applied to the Messiah which is familiar to rabbinic Judaism, that is, that the righteous man not only fulfils all the commandments, but through suffering also atones for sins he might have committed, and that the surplus suffering of the righteous benefits others."²

The *Targum Yonathan* (first century), a paraphrase of the Prophets, recognized in Babylonia as early as the third century and generally acknowledged as ancient authority a century later, shows striking inconsistencies in applying portions of the passage to the Messiah and portions—the suffering—to Israel, but nevertheless leaves no doubt that the Messiah gives His life for the redemption of Israel.

In *Midrash Cohen*, Elijah thus comforts the Messiah:³

"Bear the suffering and the punishment of Thy Lord with which He chastises Thee for the sins of Israel, as it is written: *But He was pierced because of our transgressions, He was crushed because of our iniquities, until the end comes.*"

The *Midrash Rabba* of Rabbi Moses the preacher (p. 660) states:

"In the beginning God made a covenant with the Messiah and said to Him, 'Messiah my Righteousness, the sins of those who are entrusted to Thee will

¹ Cf. especially Sanhedrin 93a and 98b, quoted on pp. 56, 57, 62ff.

² *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th edition, Leipzig, 1907, Vol. II, p. 650.

³ Driver-Nebauer, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters*, Oxford, 1877, p. 337.

impose a heavy yoke upon Thee; Thine ears will hear great shame; Thy mouth will taste bitterness; Thy tongue will cleave to the roof of Thy mouth, and Thy soul will be weakened by grief and sighing. Art Thou willing to undergo this?' He answered, 'I shall joyfully suffer all these agonies that not one of Israel may be lost.' Immediately the Messiah consented to endure all suffering in love, as it is written, 'He was oppressed, yet He humbled Himself'."

Another Midrash states that in the Messianic age the patriarchs will say to the Messiah:

"Ephraim, Messiah our Righteousness, although we are Thy forefathers, Thou art better than we, because Thou hast borne our iniquities and the iniquities of our children, and there have passed over Thee hardships such as have not passed upon men of earlier or of later times, and Thou wast an object of derision and contumely to the heathen for Israel's sake."¹

The Musaph service for the Day of Atonement contains a remarkable prayer:²

"Messiah our Righteousness has departed from us: horror has seized upon us, and there is none to justify us. He bears our transgressions and the yoke of our iniquities, and is pierced because of our transgressions. He bears our sins on His shoulders that He may find pardon for our iniquities. We are healed by His wounds. O Eternal One, it is time that Thou shouldest create Him anew! Oh bring Him up from the terrestrial sphere; raise Him up from the land of Seir³ to announce (salvation) to us from Mount Lebanon,⁴ a second time, by the hand of Yinnon."⁵

Not only in the Old Synagogue, but as late as the seventeenth century, leading rabbis, in harmony with the Jewish liturgy, applied the chapter to the Messiah. Outstanding among them were the renowned Rabbi Mosheh ben Maimon, popularly known as Maimonides, or, from his initials, as Ramban (1135-1204), and Rabbi Naphtali ben Asher Altschul (late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries). The latter states:

"I am surprised that Rashi and David Qimhi have not, with the Targum, applied the passage (Isa. lii. 13-liii. 12) to the Messiah likewise."⁶

The following is from the pen of Rabbi Altschul's contemporary, Rabbi Mosheh Al-Shekh:

¹ *P'siqthá Rabbathi*, xxxvii., ed. Friedman, f. 161b-162a, quoted in full in *Yalqut* on Isaiah lx (499).

² Levy, David, *Prayers for the Day of Atonement*, p. 38.

³ Seir represents Edom, which in the Talmud is a synonym for Rome, where, according to Hebrew traditions, the Messiah undergoes humiliation and suffering.

⁴ Lebanon symbolizes the Mount of the Temple, where the Messiah is to appear.

⁵ Yinnon is a Talmudic term for the Messiah in His pre-existent life, as in Ps. lxxii. 17, which the Talmud renders: "Before the sun (was created), Yinnon was His name" (Bab. Sanhedrin 98b).

⁶ Driver-Nebauer, opus cit., pp. 258, 319.

“ I may remark, then, that our rabbis with one voice accept and affirm the opinion that the prophet is speaking of the King-Messiah, and we shall ourselves also adhere to the same view.”¹

II

NON-MESSIANIC INTERPRETATIONS

But above all, we must go to the text itself for identification of the Servant. The picture portrayed there leaves no doubt as to its lineaments and colouring. The question is: “ Who is the subject of the portrait ? ”

Four non-messianic theories have been advanced by scholars:

1. That the Servant of the Lord represents the people of Israel;
2. That He personifies the spiritual Israel;
3. That He is the ideal Israel;
4. That He is a leper or a martyr.

In spite of the voices raised in the Old Synagogue, the illustrious scholar, Rabbi Sh'lomoh Yizhaqi (c. 1040-1105), better known as Rashi from his initials, followed by the great grammarian, David Qimhi (1160-1235), interpreted Isaiah liii as referring to Israel. Rashi's position became authoritative in Jewry; but this is readily understood. Although medieval rabbis wrote lengthy penitential prayers, which are still read before and on the Day of Atonement, among the masses the consciousness of sin and of the need for salvation grew more and more faint. Then, as a result of Judaism's polemic with the Christian Church, the idea of an atoning redeemer also became increasingly unwelcome, although to the Old Synagogue this idea was by no means strange.

The first theory, in considering the Servant as a personification of the Jewish nation, forces the following interpretations: Verses 1-6 refer to the Gentile nations; the death of the Servant symbolizes the exile, the end of Jewish national existence; and finally, the resurrection is a figurative prophecy of the restoration of Israel, to be followed by the conversion of the heathen. The insurmountable objection to these interpretations lies in the need for assuming that in verses 1-6 the Gentile nations are speaking. No Jewish prophet would have

¹ Driver-Nebauer, *opus cit.*, pp. 258, 319.

represented the heathen exhibiting the attitude described in that passage. Says Hugo Gressman:

“A penitential psalm in the mouth of the heathen is altogether improbable; the literature of the Old Testament lacks analogous examples.”¹

The second view, that the Servant means the spiritual element of the Jewish nation, also encounters certain obstacles. It may be said that the spiritual Israelites suffered most in the exile and also that they endeavoured to bring the nation to repentance and to spread the knowledge of God among the Gentiles. They probably met with persecution at the hands of their own people during the exile. But it is hard to believe there was in the exile so great a difference between the mass and the spiritual remnant as to account for the language. While they felt the national calamity to be traceable to the sin of the people, there is nothing to justify the view that they were the special object of the divine wrath. The pious did not suffer *for* but only *with* the nation. Of the Servant it is said that *he poured out his soul unto death*, but the spiritual Israel did not die in captivity.

The third view, that the Servant personifies the ideal Israel, existing at present only in the mind and purpose of God and becoming a reality only in the future, creates no less difficulty. In the passage the actual nation is depicted realistically, with all its faults and its greatest sin—the rejection of the Servant, the Redeemer. Do lowly origin, mean appearance, and general repulsiveness characterize the ideal Israel? Can the ideal Israel suffer and die for the actual nation and rise again?

The fourth view, that the Servant is a leper or a martyr, is also untenable. No leper could have made the offering for sin so clearly described in the passage; even the animals sacrificed in the Temple were without blemish. Also, where in history is there a record of such a leper? Some have seen in the passage the portrayal of a martyr, as Isaiah or Jeremiah. But such a glorification of a pious man, even though he be a martyr, and particularly the idea that his death would result in the redemption of the Gentile world, is in itself foreign to the Old Testament, where one would search in vain for a eulogy of even the greatest of Israel's heroes, whether it be Abraham, Joseph, Moses, or David.

¹ *Der Messias*, Göttingen, 1929, p. 307.

III

THE TRADITIONAL CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION

That the Servant is a person, namely, Jesus of Nazareth, can be substantiated by the following considerations:

1. He is portrayed in the features of a human personality (vv. lii. 13–liii. 3).
2. He is an innocent sufferer (vv. 9c, d, 12d).
3. He is a voluntary sufferer (vv. 4a, b, 11a).
4. He is a silent sufferer (v. 7).
5. His suffering is vicarious, that is, substitutionary (vv. 4a, b, 5a, b, 6c, 8d, 10b, 11d, 12c).
6. His suffering is redemptive (v. 5c, d).
7. His suffering ends in death (vv. 8c, 10b, 12c).
8. His death gives way to resurrection (v. 11a, b).
9. His atoning work leads the straying people to confession and repentance (vv. 4–6).
10. His atoning work inaugurates a life of sublime exaltation (vv. lii. 13, 15a, b; liii, 12a, b).

Can it be said that these characteristics mark Israel, either the historic, or the spiritual, or the ideal?

1. Could Israel have been personified in a portrait which is without any hint of its allegorical character?

Scripture knows of no parallel case where personification is maintained throughout a whole section without intimation of the figure, but presents distinct hints in any allegorical passage. Even so liberal a scholar as B. Duhm says:

2. Was Israel as a nation an innocent sufferer?

The words in verse 8, *For the transgression of my people was he stricken*, make the application to Israel as the Servant untenable, since “my people” clearly indicates Israel, and if the Servant be the actual nation, how can he be stricken for Israel? In Isaiah i. 4 the prophet speaks of Israel as a *sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers*, while in chapter xlii he states that Israel’s affliction is God’s judgment for the nation’s sins. The Synagogue liturgy for the High Holidays embodies the following confession: “Because of our sins we have been exiled from our land.”¹

¹ *Das Buch Jesaja*, Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Göttingen, 1922, p. 39.

represented the heathen exhibiting the attitude described in that passage. Says Hugo Gressman:

“A penitential psalm in the mouth of the heathen is altogether improbable; the literature of the Old Testament lacks analogous examples.”¹

The second view, that the Servant means the spiritual element of the Jewish nation, also encounters certain obstacles. It may be said that the spiritual Israelites suffered most in the exile and also that they endeavoured to bring the nation to repentance and to spread the knowledge of God among the Gentiles. They probably met with persecution at the hands of their own people during the exile. But it is hard to believe there was in the exile so great a difference between the mass and the spiritual remnant as to account for the language. While they felt the national calamity to be traceable to the sin of the people, there is nothing to justify the view that they were the special object of the divine wrath. The pious did not suffer *for* but only *with* the nation. Of the Servant it is said that *he poured out his soul unto death*, but the spiritual Israel did not die in captivity.

The third view, that the Servant personifies the ideal Israel, existing at present only in the mind and purpose of God and becoming a reality only in the future, creates no less difficulty. In the passage the actual nation is depicted realistically, with all its faults and its greatest sin—the rejection of the Servant, the Redeemer. Do lowly origin, mean appearance, and general repulsiveness characterize the ideal Israel? Can the ideal Israel suffer and die for the actual nation and rise again?

The fourth view, that the Servant is a leper or a martyr, is also untenable. No leper could have made the offering for sin so clearly described in the passage; even the animals sacrificed in the Temple were without blemish. Also, where in history is there a record of such a leper? Some have seen in the passage the portrayal of a martyr, as Isaiah or Jeremiah. But such a glorification of a pious man, even though he be a martyr, and particularly the idea that his death would result in the redemption of the Gentile world, is in itself foreign to the Old Testament, where one would search in vain for a eulogy of even the greatest of Israel's heroes, whether it be Abraham, Joseph, Moses, or David.

¹ *Der Messias*, Göttingen, 1929, p. 307.

III

THE TRADITIONAL CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION

That the Servant is a person, namely, Jesus of Nazareth, can be substantiated by the following considerations:

1. He is portrayed in the features of a human personality (vv. lii. 13–liii. 3).
2. He is an innocent sufferer (vv. 9c, d, 12d).
3. He is a voluntary sufferer (vv. 4a, b, 11a).
4. He is a silent sufferer (v. 7).
5. His suffering is vicarious, that is, substitutionary (vv. 4a, b, 5a, b, 6c, 8d, 10b, 11d, 12c).
6. His suffering is redemptive (v. 5c, d).
7. His suffering ends in death (vv. 8c, 10b, 12c).
8. His death gives way to resurrection (v. 11a, b).
9. His atoning work leads the straying people to confession and repentance (vv. 4–6).
10. His atoning work inaugurates a life of sublime exaltation (vv. lii. 13, 15a, b; liii, 12a, b).

Can it be said that these characteristics mark Israel, either the historic, or the spiritual, or the ideal?

1. Could Israel have been personified in a portrait which is without any hint of its allegorical character?

Scripture knows of no parallel case where personification is maintained throughout a whole section without intimation of the figure, but presents distinct hints in any allegorical passage. Even so liberal a scholar as B. Duhm says:

2. Was Israel as a nation an innocent sufferer?

The words in verse 8, *For the transgression of my people was he stricken*, make the application to Israel as the Servant untenable, since “my people” clearly indicates Israel, and if the Servant be the actual nation, how can he be stricken for Israel? In Isaiah i. 4 the prophet speaks of Israel as a *sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers*, while in chapter xlii he states that Israel’s affliction is God’s judgment for the nation’s sins. The Synagogue liturgy for the High Holidays embodies the following confession: “Because of our sins we have been exiled from our land.”¹

¹ *Das Buch Jesaja*, Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Göttingen, 1922, p. 39.

3. Was Israel a voluntary sufferer?

Never did the Jews voluntarily go into captivity; each exile was the result of a humiliating national defeat.

4. Was Israel a silent, unresisting sufferer?

George Adam Smith has well observed:

“Now Silence under Suffering is a strange thing in the Old Testament—a thing absolutely new. No other Old Testament personage could stay dumb under pain, but immediately broke into one of two voices,—voice of guilt, or voice of doubt. In the Old Testament the sufferer is always either confessing his guilt to God, or, when he feels no guilt, challenging God in argument.”¹

No sooner was Israel released from Egyptian bondage, than it rebelled against privation in the wilderness.² Even such personalities as David, Jeremiah, and Elijah succumbed to the temptation of complaining bitterly against their lot. The subjugation of Jerusalem by Titus in A.D. 70 was one of the most stubbornly contested sieges in all human history. At various times the Jews revolted against their Libyan, Roman, Alexandrian, Persian, and Moslem oppressors.

5. Has Israel suffered for other nations?

Nowhere in the Old Testament or in rabbinical literature is an affirmation of this idea to be found. But yet the idea of substitutionary suffering has a prominent place in the chapter, being expressed no less than twelve times in seven out of twelve verses:

4. But indeed our griefs has he borne,
And our sorrows,—he carried them;
5. But he was pierced because of our transgressions,
He was crushed because of our iniquities;
The chastisement that brought us peace was upon him,
And with his stripes we are healed.
6. And the Lord has made to fall on him
The iniquity of us all.
8. For the transgression of my people was he stricken.
10. If his life shall make a trespass offering,
11. And their iniquities he shall bear.
12. And was numbered with the transgressors,
Though he bare the sin of many.

¹ *The Book of Isaiah*, London, 1927, Vol. II, p. 375.

² Exod. xvii. 3; Num. xi. 1; Deut. i. 27.

6. Have the sufferings of Israel brought redemption to the world?

The sin of man is too great, the holiness of God too sublime, for man to be able to redeem himself, far less others. Scripture nowhere teaches that Israel will be redeemed by its own suffering, far less that it will redeem other nations. Nor does it indicate that a few righteous individuals will redeem either Israel or other nations.¹ Since Israel's sufferings have never been *voluntary*, they could have no intrinsic moral value and no redemptive power.

7. Have the sufferings of Israel ended in death?

Whether the historic or the ideal Israel be considered, the answer is assuredly negative. Some see the exile portrayed by the figure of death, but this is inadequate since the exile acted in a contrary manner, as a purifying force, strengthening the monotheistic belief of the Jews and their zeal for God. The Jewish people present a striking exception to the usual course of national development and decline. Every nation that played its role contemporaneously with Israel on the stage of Old Testament history has long since passed into oblivion. But the survival of the Jews is unique, defying fundamental laws observed in the history of nations. In spite of exile, dispersion, attempts at forcible assimilation, persecution—in spite of liberation and toleration, often more disintegrating than persecution, Israel still maintains its racial identity.

8. Has Israel experienced a resurrection?

Since neither the ideal nor the historic Israel died there was naturally no resurrection.

9. Has Israel's suffering made the nations break down into a confession of guilt?

World history answers this in the negative. Throughout the ages nations which oppressed Israel were never known to show the attitude expressed in the chapter, where prominent place is given to confession and repentance (vv. 4-6).

10. Has the humiliation of Israel resulted in glorification?

Even if death could be taken as a figure for the exile, the restoration thereafter did not lift Israel from extreme humiliation to sublime exaltation. Neither did Israel win many followers

¹ Cf. Ezek. xiv. 14ff.

among the nations. It must be noted that the missionary zeal of the Jews died out in the early years of the Christian era, when they no longer took an interest in winning converts among the Gentiles. For Israel to fit into the prophetic picture of a state of pre-eminence, *he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high . . . because of him kings shall shut their mouths*, three things must be true:

(a) Israel must have made a conscious voluntary atonement—an atonement accepted by men as well as by God—bringing redemption to the world.

(b) As a result of this atonement, *because he poured out his soul unto death*, Israel must have attained a position of great power and glory in the world.

(c) Israel must be making intercession for transgressors.

Not one of the three is true of Israel, either the ideal or the real.

But in some other Servant passages is not Israel called the Servant? While that is true,¹ this relationship to God was interrupted when the nation became unfaithful.² The idea, "Servant of the Lord", originally identified with the nation Israel, in transcending its former national limitations, became associated with the person and office of the Messiah, who was entrusted with the mission in which Israel so ignominiously failed. Therefore in a number of passages³ the application of "Servant of the Lord" to the actual Israel is untenable, as in them the Servant is distinguished from Israel in having a mission to fulfil—to gather Israel and to be a light to the world.

An examination of the objections Jewish interpreters raise to the theory that the Servant is Christ⁴ reveals a fundamental failure to take into consideration the twofold nature of Christ, the human and the divine, which are not mutually exclusive, and to comprehend the twofold purpose of his ministry,—to suffer and die, and then to rise triumphantly.

The conclusion is inescapable, that the obstacles to the Jewish and the so-called rationalistic interpretation of Isaiah liii are insurmountable. It is a striking fact that the synagogue

¹ xli. 8-9, xlv. 1-2, xlv. 4, xlviii. 20, xlix. 3.

² xlii. 18-20.

³ xlii. 1-4, xlix. 3-5, l. 4-9.

⁴ Driver-Nebauer, *Opus cit.*

readings from the prophets always omit the passage from Isaiah lii. 12 through liii, although the portions immediately preceding and following are read. Has the fifty-third chapter become the "bad conscience of the synagogue", because it would rather not face so crystalline a picture of the atoning Redeemer it has denied? The suffering Servant presents a perfect picture of Christ against which no objections can reasonably be sustained. Only as we recognize in the awe-inspiring delineation the features of Christ do the blurring contradictions vanish away.

IV

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SERVANT'S ATONEMENT

When doubt as to the identity of the Servant of the Lord gives way to certainty, there still remain to be considered the *implications of the atonement of Christ*. Some scholars take issue with the atonement on moral grounds, but the principle of the individual's bearing the guilt of the community has no connotation of injustice, since the divine judgment on sin is *willingly* accepted and endured by the blameless Servant of the Lord. Although some may find the idea of one suffering for others abhorrent, there is no moral impropriety when love steps in voluntarily to suffer and to save the sinner from the just consequence of transgression, as there is no moral impropriety when the creditor remits a debt and thus himself becomes the loser. More than this, the basic law of redemption through sacrifice operates in the entire world. No less an authority than Dr. A. McMillan, of the Royal Scientific Society of England, concurs in this in calling attention to the fact that the mineral sacrifices itself for the vegetable, the vegetable for the animal, and the animal for man. Among the Jews the idea of vicarious suffering was current, since it underlay their entire sacrificial system, which taught that a righteous God could make no compromise with sin, but must punish it by its merited recompense, death. But since God is also loving and merciful, He has instituted a means whereby sin may be atoned for through sacrifice, without violation of righteousness, for were He to pardon merely out of compassion, He would undermine the moral structure of the universe. While the legal sacrifices of the Mosaic code were of no intrinsic efficacy, they symbolized

the substitution of the righteous Servant of the Lord in place of the sinner. In the vicarious atonement of Christ, God's compassion is manifested and the sinner is pardoned, and yet, in consistence with the rectitude of the divine government, sin is punished.

Moreover, not only does the atonement appear to be the only righteous means of dealing with the problem of sin, but also the only efficacious one, since only after awful suffering and death does the Man of Sorrows become the authoritative teacher and redeemer of mankind. The passage indicates that the Servant's suffering and death resulted in fruit which could not be produced by His teaching alone, since it is only "if his life shall make a trespass offering", that "he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the purpose of the Lord shall prosper in his hand". The doctrine of the atonement is not a mere theological abstraction apart from life. The God of all Wisdom, who knows the human heart better than man, also knows the best remedy. It has been seen that the atoning work of the Servant is followed by confession and repentance of the erring people. Throughout the ages men and women obedient to the divine will and willing to accept the salvation provided by God have found in the atonement "a power of God" which changed their lives and raised them to a higher plane. The transformed life is a practical proof for the efficacy of the atonement in the divine plan of human redemption.

But does not God forgive sin apart from blood atonement? Some rabbis teach that in cases where the Mosaic law prescribes capital punishment, in the words of Scripture, ". . . that soul shall be cut off from Israel",¹ the sole efficacy of repentance and of the Day of Atonement is that of suspension of the sentence. They hold that the sin of profanation of the name of Heaven (God) is atoned for to the extent of one-third by repentance and the Day of Atonement, one-third by bodily suffering during the remainder of the year, while nothing less than death can accomplish the final expiation.² The tradition of the School of Ishmael teaches that sins are expiated by suffering: "Chastisements wipe out all a man's wickedness."³ According to another tradition, the efficacy of suffering is even greater than that of

¹ Exod. xii. 15.

² Tos, *Yom Hakippurim* v. 6.8 ; *Yoma* lxxxvi. a. Bacher, *Tannaiten*, i, 258. Isa.

xxii. 14.

³ *Berakot*, v. a, end ; Cf. *Sifre Deut.* 32 (ed. Friedmann, f. 73b).

sacrifice, for the former is personal, while the latter concerns man's property.¹

More than this, Judaism teaches that the suffering and death of the righteous effect atonement also for others. In *The Fourth Book of Maccabees* there is recorded a prayer ascribed to the martyr Eleazar:

“Thou knowest, O God, that when I might be saved, I am dying in fiery tortures on account of thy law. Be gracious to thy people, being satisfied with our punishment in their behalf. *Make my blood a sacrifice for their purification*, and take my life as a substitute for theirs.”²

In conclusion, the author thus affirms the idea of substitutionary suffering:

“These, therefore, being sanctified for God's sake, were honoured not only with this honour,³ but also in that for their sake the enemies did not have power over the nation, and the tyrant was punished and the fatherland purified, they having become, as it were, *a substitute, dying for the sin of the nation*; and through the blood of those godly and their propitiatory death,⁴ divine Providence saved Israel, which was before in an ill plight.”⁴

A clear distinction must be made between the Mosaic doctrine of atonement and the rabbinical teaching, often contradictory, which gradually took form in later centuries. The prayer of Eleazar is impressive, but out of harmony with the Scriptures. Neither penance, nor good works, nor physical death, even that of the martyr, can satisfy the perfect law of God, for “There is none that doeth good, no, not one” (Ps. xiv. 3). Every transgression deserves the divine wrath and curse, in this world and in that to come. Physical death is a part of the punishment for sin; it has no atoning efficacy for a third, or a half, or indeed any part of man's sin. After death, the predicted consequence of man's sin, comes the judgment. If all men have transgressed, as the Old Testament distinctly teaches, and if no man can make atonement for his own sin which is acceptable to a just God, it follows that works of supererogation are impossible, far less an atonement for others. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. The Old Testament ritual of sacrifice was a type of that on Calvary. The blood of animals expiated sin only because it foreshadowed the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, whose death on the cross provides the actual atonement

¹ *Sifre* i. c.

² vi. 27-9.

³ Heavenly rank near the throne of God.

⁴ xvii. 20-2.

typified by every sacrificial ritual and predicted by Isaiah, who declares in the fifty-third chapter that the Messiah is to make or be an *asham*, or trespass offering. Only the Servant of the Lord could make a valid atonement, for in Him we have not a mere man, who, because of his unique personality and matchless life, commands our following, or a martyr, who, in dying for his fellow-men, inspires our adoration, but God incarnate coming down to man and Himself accomplishing the work of redemption.

FREDERICK A. ASTON.

New York, U.S.A.