

other, and they hope that ignorant or indifferent lay legislators will not find out the meaning and object of it. Anyone who takes the trouble to read these few pages will see that it means, that without the consent of a single layman or congregation any clergyman may repeal, throughout his parish, all the doctrinal and ceremonial legislation since 1549, and every judgment of the Privy Council against Ritualistic ceremonies. That is a tolerably bold scheme, even if it stopped there ; but we have now to look at all such things by the further light of recent speeches of the president of the E.C.U., who has told his unionists that "the practice of the Primitive Church (by which he means a *multo post primitivam* one) in important respects condemns our own ;" and again, that the same Church cannot hold both those who affirm and those who deny what he calls the Catholic faith about the sacraments ; and tells them that above all things they ought to "strive for union with the great Apostolic Church of the West, which has done so much to guard the true faith about the sacraments." If such schemes and such announcements as these do not open the eyes of the blind and wake up the lazy before it is too late, nothing will.

GRIMTHORPE.



ART. V.—THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

(Continued from page 211.)

THE theological tendencies which are seen to be deducting from the importance given to the Cross of Christ in the theology of Holy Scripture, will be found to aim also at correcting popular views of the relation of the death of Christ both to the moral and ceremonial law of God. In other words, our new teachers are dissatisfied with the doctrines of the Reformation in their bearing on the connection of Christ's death both (1) with the justification of man, and (2) the sacerdotal office of Christ.

In the present paper we must confine ourselves to the first of these points. Our aim must be very briefly to touch upon the matters in controversy between the old and the new, or between the (so-called) popular and scientific, theologies on the matter of the relation of Christ's death to the justification of the sinner.

There are three words in this connection which seem to be specially obnoxious in the view of modern thought. Those words are *substitution*, *imputation*, *vicarious penalty*. We proceed to submit some considerations which we regard as very important in their bearing on this subject.

I. And, first, we have to state a proposition, which we ask to have well tested and carefully weighed. And when weighed we ask that it may have its true weight assigned to it in view of the inquiry we are entering upon. Our proposition is this: That, according to the teaching of Holy Scripture, THE DEATH OF CHRIST AFFECTS THE MATTER OF MAN'S JUSTIFICATION, NOT INDIRECTLY, BUT DIRECTLY; NOT MEDIATELY, BUT IMMEDIATELY. The evidence of this, we think, is very clear; and the importance of this, we are sure, is very great. It is of no small moment that the meaning of this proposition should be fully apprehended, and that its truth should be firmly established in our minds.

It is incredible that the great work of the Incarnate Son of God upon earth should be a work without a wonder. It is impossible that the grand achievement which He came into the world to accomplish should not be, in some very real sense, a miracle. And if it be so, as we have seen, that, according to the clear testimony of Scripture, He came into the world to *die*—can it be supposed that the effect of His death will not be a marvel? It is surely not to be doubted that so stupendous an event as the death of the Eternal Son of God—an event, as our former paper showed, of such vast importance, and such exalted prominence in the oracles of God—can have the force of its result thrown into any effect without making that effect to be marvellous in our eyes.

We commend this consideration to all those who regard man's justification—however connected with the death of Christ—as practically the result of human attainment, needing no miracle of grace on the Divine side, but a certain amount of painful effort, with a certain amount of Divine assistance, on the human side. But we have at present in view a more definite, and a very subtle and dangerous, form of error.

If, then, the effect of Christ's death be thrown only indirectly upon the matter of justification—in other words, if the death of Christ touch the matter of our justification, by first of all qualifying us (in some sense) for being justified, and so bringing us into a state of justification in virtue of this qualification—*then* we may, perhaps, look to find the whole marvel in the qualification, and nothing marvellous—nothing but what is natural, in the justification resulting. But if, on the other hand, the effect of the death of Christ be thrown directly into the matter of justification, *then* we should assuredly expect that the result must be to make the method of the justification of sinners in the New Testament supremely and Divinely marvellous. If the faith of the awakening sinner's soul were to be taught to look to the death of Christ as first of all (first either in the order of time or of causation), preparing the way for, or, in

some sort, effecting, such a miraculous insertion of himself into the mystical Body of Christ, that in virtue of a supernatural extension of the Incarnation, and of some inherent quality thereby infused into his soul, or through the reception of the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost he had become a fit and natural, a worthy and deserving object of justifying grace; and *after that*, or *because of that*, were taught to believe himself justified (*i.e.*, accounted righteous) for the merit of that which had thus been miraculously implanted within him—*then* the marvel might be sought and found, not in the method of justification, but in the inwrought qualification meriting justification. But if it be so that the Christian's faith is taught to see his justification resulting directly from the death of Christ, quite apart from merit of his own, or qualification within him—*then*, assuredly, must the faith of the Christian look to find his justification in God's sight a marvel—a miracle of grace.

Now that the death of Christ does affect the matter of our justification, not indirectly, but directly; not mediately, but immediately, we may cite as sufficient evidence (though much more might be adduced) two passages from the Epistle to the Romans. The first is in chapter iv., beginning with verse 4: "Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness. Even as David also pronounceth blessing upon the man, unto whom God reckoneth righteousness apart from works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin." The second is in chapter v., beginning with verse 8: "But God commendeth His own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more, then, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through Him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life."

Surely, for our present purpose, these extracts need no comment, and no addition. Could anything be added to the evidence they afford as regards the point we are insisting upon? And surely we are, then, justified in inferring that, since the death of the Son of God affects *directly*, and immediately, the method of a sinner's justification, that justification must have in it somewhat that is marvellous, somewhat that shall make it to be a Divine miracle of heavenly grace.

II. The next proposition we have to state is this: THE DEATH OF CHRIST STANDS ALONE IN THUS DIRECTLY AFFECTING THE

MATTER OF MAN'S JUSTIFICATION.¹ There are essential antecedent qualifications no doubt; but it is, according to the teachings of Holy Scripture, by the death of Christ, simply as death, and because it is death, that sinners are justified.

The witness to this truth comes together, not only from the teaching of the Old Testament, from the evidence of type and of prophecy, from the declarations concerning the atonement of blood, and the testimony to the servant of Jehovah pouring out his soul unto death, but also from an accumulation of passages in the New Testament, the weight of which cannot fairly be estimated by directing attention only to a selection. Nevertheless, the plan we have set before us, and the exigencies of our space, demand curtailment; and it must suffice to call for proof the teaching of one text, the force of which, as bearing on this point, seems to have been strangely overlooked, though it appears to be clearly and absolutely decisive.

It will not be questioned by any who have studied the Apostle's argument in the Epistle to the Romans, that it is through justification that we pass from being under the law, with its condemnation, to the condition in which we are not under the law, but under grace. But the seventh chapter sets before us this deliverance, as corresponding to the liberty with which a woman is made free by the death of her husband. As death breaks the bond by which the law binds man and wife together, so it is death—*only* death—which breaks the bond which, by the law, binds the sinner under the law and its condemning bondage. We are delivered from the law, discharged from the law by death, *i.e.*, by the death of Christ for us. "Ye also," the Apostle says, "were made dead to the law by the Body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to Him who was raised from the dead."²

¹ It is not questioned that our justification "can be based upon the death of Christ only on condition that the value of His life . . . be taken into consideration in inseparable connection with that fact" (Ritschl "on Justification and Reconciliation," Int., p. 2). The *value* of the price paid is always inseparably connected with the payment of a debt. The payment could not be a payment without it. The value is necessarily involved in the payment. Yet it is the payment, as such *alone*, which discharges the debt.

Again, it is not questioned that we may be truly said to be justified in the righteousness of Christ—the righteousness of His obedience, the righteousness of His life. But His righteousness and life are made ours only through His making our sin and death to be His; as St. Augustin says: "Delicta nostra sua delicta fecit, ut justitiam suam nostram justitiam faceret" (see Ps. xxi. 3).

² So in verse 6: *κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες* (the reading *ἀποθανόντος* appears to rest on no authority beyond a conjecture, or mistake of Beza's). Compare vi. 7: *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεικνύεται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*.

It is obvious that—unless we make void the Apostle's teaching altogether—as death stands alone in affecting the matter of the wife's release from the law as pertaining to matrimony, so death—

Godet translates : "Ye have been *put to death* in relation to the law."

In Christ's being put to death for us *we* have been put to death. His death for us is our death. So 2 Cor. v. 14 : "That One died for all, therefore all died" (R.V., εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον).

It should be observed that "the Apostle is insisting on the fact that *death dissolves legal obligation*; but he is not drawing an exact parallel between the persons in his example and the persons in his application" (Alford, *in loc.*).

The idea of our spiritual crucifixion in Christ Crucified for us is no doubt involved, and may perhaps be prominent in the Apostle's view. (See Godet's Comment. and Dr. Gifford, *in loc.*) Compare vi. 6, 7, and Gal. ii. 19, 20. But this does not at all break the force of the argument in the text. Underneath that spiritual conformity to Christ's death is undoubtedly the objective fact of Christ's death for us. The words διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ are decisive upon this. Alford compares διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Heb. x. 10).

So Theophylact : Εἰ νεκροὶ γεγονατέ, φησιν, οὐκ ἐστὶ ὑπὸ νόμον . . . Ἀπὸ ἀλάγητε οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ νόμου διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος καὶ θανατωθέντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. Τὸ γὰρ σῶμα ἔκενο διὰ τοῦτο ἐθανατώθη, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἀποθάνητε τῷ νόμῳ (*in loc.*).

And so Œcumenius : Τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰσάγει τῷ θανάτῳ Χριστοῦ ἀποθανόντας ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, διὸ καὶ ἐλευθερωθέντας. Εἰ οὖν τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντος οὐκ ἐστὶ παραβάτης ὁ καταλιμπάνων αὐτὸν καὶ πιστεῖων τῷ Κυρίῳ, πολλῶν μᾶλλον ἂν καὶ αὐτὸς τις ἀποθάνῃ, ὡσπερ, φησὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπεθάνομεν, λέλυται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ παραβάτης (*in loc.*).

So Chrysostom had said : Τοῖς ζῶσιν ὁ νόμος κείται· τοῖς δὲ τεθηνηκόσιν οὐκέτι διατάσσεται . . . οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπλῶς τέθηκε τὸν θάνατον, ἀλλὰ πάλιν τὸν ταῦτα ἐργασάμενον τὸν σταυρὸν εἰσήγαγε, καὶ ταύτη ποιῶν ἡμᾶς ὑπευθύνους· ὅτι γὰρ ἀπλῶς ἀπὸ ἀλάγητε, φησιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ. ἐθανατώθητε γὰρ, φησὶ, τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. (In Ep. Rom. Hom., xii., § Op. Tom., ix., pp. 544, 545, 546, edit. Montfaucon, Paris, 1731.)

Wordsworth says : "They had been made dead to the law through *the body of Christ*, the Second Adam, who was their Representative, and who underwent, as the universal Proxy of mankind, the *curse* due for disobedience, and so liberated them from the law" (*in loc.*).

Moule says : "The word '*body*' is used instead of '*death*,' probably to remind the readers that the Lord 'took our nature upon Him' *expressly in view of His death* (see Heb. ii. 14). Meanwhile, the truth of the connection between believers and their Head—their second Adam—is still full in view. By virtue of it the *death* of the Lord counts as the *death* of His brethren, in respect of the claim of the law upon them" (*in loc.*).

The following extracts from the Commentary of Beet are specially valuable (the italics are ours) : "The essential points of comparison are that we are set free from the law, according to the principles of the law; and *by death*, not of ourselves, but of another" (p. 198). "We are reminded that the law does not even claim authority over *the dead*; and therefore not over *us*, for we are practically *dead*. Through the *death of Christ* we stand in the position of the woman who is released by the *death* of the first husband from the law which forbade her second marriage. Therefore the *death of Christ* has put us beyond the domain of the law" (p. 200). "By the *death of Christ* we are released from the

the death of Christ for us, and our death in His death—stands alone in affecting the matter of our justification, that we should be not under the law, but under grace. As it is by death, simply as death, that the wife is released from the law of her husband, so it is by the death of Christ, simply as death, and because it is death, that sinners are released from the law of condemnation, and from the condemnation of the law.

III. It is but a corollary from this, but it is of sufficient importance to be stated separately, that we set down as a third proposition, That IT IS NOT SIMPLY IN VIRTUE OF HIS HOLY OBEDIENCE IN SUBMITTING HIMSELF UNTO DEATH THAT THE DEATH OF CHRIST AFFECTS THE MATTER OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

In the case of the man and his wife, the death which releases is altogether dissociated in thought from any character of obedience or holiness at all. As little, we may be sure, is the justification of man, the release from the law's condemnation, to be connected with the death of Christ, regarded only as a signal example or a crowning act of His life-long obedience to the will of His Father.

Undoubtedly His sinless perfection, His perfect humanity, His obedience unto death, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, had to do with the redemption of the world, had to do with the atonement for sin. These were necessary conditions to make His death available and efficacious. Let it not be thought for a moment that, in view of Christ's satisfaction for sin, we would depreciate the value of Christ's life or the merit of His holiness. God forbid! Let them be set down to the value of the price, the price at which we were bought. Let even a still higher function be assigned to them if you will. All we contend for is this: That the price was not *paid*, and, therefore, the purchase not made, and, therefore, the ransom not effected, save by the death of Christ. Therefore we were "redeemed to God by His Blood."

No doubt in the history of the death and exaltation of Christ

bondage to which the justice of God bound us; in a way which does not contradict, but manifests, the justice of God; and in order that we may be united to Christ, and thus live a life devoted to God" (p. 201). "Justification through *the death* of Christ . . . is plainly implied in this section. . . We are also plainly taught that Christ died in our place" (p. 201, 5th edition).

In connection with the argument in the text, it is very important to compare Coloss. i. 21, 22: "Now hath He reconciled in the *body* of His flesh, *through DEATH* (*ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*); which corresponds with *ἐξηγοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ* of verse 20.

This witness is surely too distinct to be evaded, too strong to be overthrown.

we are to see exhibited the supreme example of the truth, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." No doubt, also, we are to recognise in the passion of the Lord Jesus that which was infinitely well pleasing to the Father, as the accomplishment of the word, "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God." Doubtless, also, we may well look at the solidarity of Christ with the human nature of the whole race He came to redeem, and the sympathetic oneness which made His perfect humanity so open to the griefs and sorrows, and the weight of sins belonging to His brethren. Beyond question we do well to take all this into view when we contemplate the Cross and Passion of our Redeemer. But none of these things share with His death the efficacy which it has as affecting the justification of man. In this matter the death of Christ may, in some very true sense, be said to stand quite *alone*. It does *not* stand alone in the record of sympathy, and obedience, and sorrow, and suffering, and submission. It is the consummation of a life of perfect devotion, yet it is but the crowning part of a whole. But it *does* stand alone in its solitary glory as affecting directly the matter of the justification of man, making it a marvel, a miracle of grace.

We may think it well to insist on the importance of giving due regard to the moral and spiritual elements in the atonement of Christ, in the sufferings which pertained to His bearing our sins in His own Body on the tree, and receiving in His soul the wages of our sin. But none of these pleadings should be allowed to obscure the truth that the very death of Christ, as death, has a glory all its own—the glory of taking quite out of the way the awful condemnation of the sinner's sin.

Admire as much as you will the heroism of that adorable self-sacrificing love of Him who is very God of very God. Extol as highly as you can the holy obedience which was willing to suffer the untold and unknown sufferings of the cross, to bear even unto death the unutterable load which made Him say, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" But be sure that all this would not have availed; all this, if the testimony of Holy Scripture is true, *did* not avail to accomplish the work which He came into the world to do *without His death*. It is His death which did it all; it is His death which is "for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first covenant;" it is His Blood which is "the Blood of the New Testament." Our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins, is in that Blood—"the Blood of the everlasting covenant." Hear His own words: "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

IV. The next proposition we have to state is this: That THE DEATH OF CHRIST AFFECTS THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN BY AFFECT-

ING THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD, *by reconciling Divine perfections in their bearing on the condition of fallen humanity.*¹

This is a subject which it behoves us to approach as with shoes taken off our feet, desiring, as a weaned child, not to exercise ourselves in things which are too high for us, and deeply conscious how little way our thoughts can reach towards thoughts and ways which are higher than the heavens. Nevertheless, in view of the redeeming work of the Son of God, we do well to lift up our hearts in exulting joy, in triumphant adoration, recognising the truth that in the atonement of our great Melchizedek, mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other.

Again we must confine ourselves to the witness of one only text, though the teaching of that text cannot fairly be cut asunder from the argument of which it forms part.²

We quote Rom. iii. 23-26 from the Revised Version, which few will now dispute as giving, in the main, the true sense of the original: "For all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His Blood, to show His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of His righteous-

¹ See the valuable sermon of Bishop Andrewes on Ps. lxxxv. 10, 11, A.C.L., vol. i., Serm. xi., p. 175 *sqq.* See especially pp. 181, 184, 185.

Olshausen well says: "Here righteousness and grace melt into an ineffable unity, as they are one in God Himself; for the forgiveness of sins on account of the death of Christ is *οὐδὲ κατὰ νόμον, οὐδὲ κἀτα νόμου, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ νόμον καὶ ὑπὲρ νόμου*; i.e., not according to the law, for by that each was to bear his own sin; nor yet against the law, since in the sufferings of Christ satisfaction was rendered to its demands; but above the law, because grace is mightier than righteousness; and for the law, because it is itself established thereby" (On Rom., p. 152, edit. Clark, 1849).

² Let the reader read carefully the preceding context, especially verses 19, 20, 23; and then in the chapter following let him mark well the teaching of verses 5-8, especially the expression, *πιστεύοντι ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦτα τὸν ἀσεβῆ*, and compare with this the LXX. of Exod. xxiii. 7, *οὐ δικαιοῦσαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ ε. δ.*, and of Isa. v. 23, *Οἱ δικαιοῦντες τὸν ἀσεβῆ ε. δ.* (with which compare Prov. xvii. 15 and xxiv. 24); and he can hardly fail, we think, to wonder that any expositor should fail to see here anything "of the idea just and yet a justifier." Moule excellently says: "'And' here plainly = 'even whilst,' the Cross reconciled two seeming incompatibles—jealousy for the law and judicial acquittal of the guilty" (*in loc.*).

St. Bernard says: "Sed quæ, inquis, justitia est ut innocens moriatur pro impio? Non est justitia, sed misericordia. . . At vero si justitia non est, non tamen contra justitiam est. Alioquin et justus et misericors simul esse non potest" ("De laude Novæ Militiæ," cap. xi., § 23, op. tom. i., c. 559, 560, edit. Venet., 1750).

ness at this present season ; that He might Himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.¹

It is needless to refer to the difficulties which some have found—perhaps we should say which the necessities of their controversial position has compelled them to find—in the natural interpretation of St. Paul's language here. It has a meaning which is obvious, we think, to the apprehension of every ordinary understanding. It declares concerning the death of Christ that it was in order to the justification of men consistently with the justice of God.²

It is a text of special importance, because it furnishes the clearest connecting link between the moral and the ceremonial law of God in their bearing on the acceptance of man as righteous in God's sight. In whatever sense we understand the word *ἱλαστήριον*, the teaching will be found to be substantially the same.³ God's justice in justifying the sinner is vindicated

¹ Let it be well observed how the teaching of the Apostle *before* this has been leading up to a clear view of the truth that God is *δικαιος καὶ κατακρίνων*—yea, condemning *because* of His justice. In i. 18 we have the *wrath* of God revealed against all ungodliness (*ἀσέβεια*) and unrighteousness. There the heathen are set before us as knowing the *just* judgment of God (*τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*), that they which commit such things are *worthy* of death (*ἄξιοι θανάτου*). Then a man's true judgment of transgression comes home as *condemnation* to himself (*σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις*), ii. 1. And we are taught to recognise that God's judgment on such is according to *truth* (*τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν*), and it is implied that man's only hope is in some *escape* from this true and just judgment of God (verse 3). Then we are taught to be surely expecting a day of wrath and revelation of God's *righteous judgment* (*δικαιοκρισία*) (verse 5). And again we are taught to regard God as *righteous* in taking vengeance (*ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν*) (iii. 5). And further, we have set before us the purpose of the law (holy and just and good), that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world stand *guilty* before God (*ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ*) (iii. 19).

What a need is here of real propitiation ! And such a propitiation as shall cause that God shall be righteous and yet not condemning the unrighteous ; such a propitiation as shall make a way of escape from His righteous judgment, and reveal God as just and yet at the same time justifying him that believeth in Jesus !

See Heurtley's valuable "Bampton Lectures," p. 105, Oxford, 1846 ; and Davenant, "De Justitia," vol. i., pp. 158, 228, 242, 246 (Allport's translation, 1844).

And is there anything in all this which should be regarded as inconsistent with the love of God ? Is it not rather the glory of Divine love that is thus seen as love even for the just objects of His wrath and indignation ? love, which at such a price brought reconciliation to the unreconciled ?

² *πρὸς ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δικαίον καὶ δικαιῶντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.* Compare iv. 11 : *εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων* . . . and 16 : *εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβίαιον τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ποντὶ τῷ σπέρματι.*

³ Dr. Gifford has very well said : "He is Himself just, and justifies the believer in Jesus. His is at once a sin-condemning and sin-forgiving righteousness" (Speaker's Com., N. T., vol. iii., p. 92). But the follow-

—is justified—by the death of Christ; and Christ's death regarded as thus vindicating God's justice in justifying, is a propitiation, is that which answers to the true idea which had been educated in the Jewish mind by the teaching of the propitiatory, by the central doctrine of sacrificial death, and by the great central prophecy concerning the Servant of Jehovah, the Man of Sorrows, bearing our sorrows and dying for our sins.

We are concerned at present with the moral law alone. It is

ing extracts from Beet's Commentary are specially commended to the reader's attention: "Paul here asserts plainly that God gave Christ to die to make the justification of believers consistent with His own justice. Therefore, without the death of Christ their justification would have been unjust, and therefore impossible" (p. 120). "That the need for the death of Christ as the means of our salvation lay in the justice of God, is taught in Scripture only in v. 26. It is, however, the only conceivable explanation of the doctrine proved to have been taught by Christ. For the word 'propitiation' implies, and the express and frequent words of the New Testament declare, that Christ's death stood in special relation to our sin. . . . And if our sins erected a barrier to salvation, which could be removed only by the death of Christ, that barrier must have been in the justice of God; for justice is that Divine attribute which is specially concerned with man's sin" (p. 123, 5th edit.).

Monsell says: "The assertion that sin sets God's justice in opposition to His love is inaccurate. . . . There is no practical contradiction between justice and love, because the cross accomplishes the ends of both" ("Redemption," p. 109).

This is, doubtless, quite true; and we need not question that mercy and truth (even the truth of judgment) are but different rays of glory proceeding forth from the truth "God is love." Nevertheless, their effects are very different, and the cross cannot be seen as truly accomplishing the ends of both, except as they are seen *apart from the cross* as in "practical contradiction." Mr. Monsell goes on to say, "God is Light, and God is love, and on the cross the two inscriptions are alike conspicuous." May we not add that in order to read those two inscriptions aright, we should add a third, "Our God is a consuming fire"?

Dr. Dale very well says: "Not a solitary instance can be alleged in which to propitiate, or any of its derivatives, when used in relation to the restoration of kindly relations between man and man, denotes that by which a change is produced in the disposition of a person who has committed an offence; it always refers to that which changes the disposition of the person who has been offended; and when used in relation to offences against the Divine law, it always describes the means by which the sin was supposed to be covered in order that the Divine forgiveness might be secured" ("Atonement," pp. 162, 163).

Is not the same truth really conveyed in the truth so familiar, yet so little regarded in the fulness of its meaning, that "Christ died for our sins"?

"He died voluntarily; 'died,' not because He had committed any crimes for which He deserved death, but 'for our sins.' We may wonder how it should be possible for Him to have died for our sins; we may contend that it was unjust; but that St. Paul declared that this was one of the fundamental truths which he had 'received' from heaven to make known to mankind, is incontestable" (Dale, "Atonement," pp. 206, 207). See 1 Cor. xv. 3.

unquestionably an unjust thing, an unrighteous thing¹ for a judge to justify the ungodly; but Christ died for the ungodly, and then faith is to believe in God Himself, the Judge of all the earth, as justifying the ungodly—*i.e.*, doing just that which in His law He strictly and distinctly forbade His judges to do. The judgment of God is “according to truth” (Rom. ii. 2) against those who commit sin; but all have sinned, and yet are justified freely—*i.e.*, for nothing—through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

The Apostle will not suffer us to forget that the law is the law of God, and what is done against the law is done against God Himself. So by the law is the knowledge of sin, and the law worketh wrath and the law condemns sinners. That is: sinners under the condemnation of the law are under the condemnation of God, of God whom truth and justice condemns. Yet God in time past has forborne, has passed over transgressions, with no manifestation of the awfulness of His righteous judgment. How is this? The New Testament answers: God has set forth “in this present time” the death of Christ to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood—to declare His righteousness,² that He may be seen justly to do that which otherwise He could not justly do, and not only may be *seen* to do it justly, but may justly do it—that He may be just, and yet at the same time be the justifier of everyone that is by the faith of Jesus (τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ).

¹ So Bengel: “Summum hic habetur paradoxon evangelicum. Nam in lege conspicitur Deus *justus et condemnans*; in evangelio, *justus ipse et justificans peccatorem*.”

² “Most modern theories, if we mistake not, are substantially the same, to wit, the spiritual resurrection of humanity through Christ. By the holiness He so painfully realized, and of which His bloody death was the crown, Jesus has given birth to a humanity which breaks with sin and gives itself to God; and God, foreseeing this future holiness of believers, and regarding it as already realized, pardons their sins from love of this expected perfection. But is this the Apostle's view? He speaks of the demonstration of *righteousness*, and not only of *holiness*. Then he ascribes to *death*, to *blood*, a peculiar and independent value. So he certainly does in one passage, but more expressly still in the words, v. 10: ‘If when we were enemies, we were reconciled (justified, v. 9) *by His death* (His blood, v. 9) much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved *by His life* (through Him, v. 9).’ It is *by His death*, accordingly, that Jesus reconciles or justifies, as it is by His life that He sanctifies and perfects salvation. Finally, the serious practical difficulty in the way of this theory lies, as we think, in the fact that, like the Catholic doctrine, it makes justification rest on sanctification (present or future), while the characteristic of Gospel doctrine, what, to use Paul's language, may be called its *folly*, but what is in reality is Divine wisdom, is its founding justification on the atonement perfected by Christ's blood, to raise afterwards on this basis the work of sanctification by the Holy Spirit” (Godet on Romans, vol. i., pp. 273, 274).

Godet has well said :

It was a great problem, a problem worthy of Divine wisdom, which the sin of man set before God—to remain just while justifying (declaring just) man who had become unjust He has exercised the Divine privilege of pardon only through means of a striking and solemn manifestation of His righteousness. He would really have given up His justice, if in this supreme moment of His manifestation He had not displayed it brightly on the earth.—Eng. Tr. “On Rom.,” vol. i., pp. 267, 268.

V. There remains yet one other proposition to which we desire to direct very special attention. It is this: THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE CROSS OF CHRIST AND THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN MUST, ACCORDING TO THE TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE, BE QUITE SIMPLE AND VERY OBVIOUS. Again we confine ourselves to the teaching of only one text. The Galatians were in great danger of being turned aside from the simple faith of the Gospel, the faith of the Divine method—the miracle of Divine grace in the matter of their justification; justified by a just judge, yea, by a righteous and holy God, whose holiness and righteousness had condemned them. The Apostle can put it down only to some strange infatuation, as the bewitchery of an evil eye—this turning away from the truth when they had had the Cross of Christ set before their eyes. “O foolish Galatians,” he says, “who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth crucified?” (Gal. iii. 1).

The Apostle’s language evidently supposes that this direct bearing of the death of Christ on the matter of the justification of sinners is of such a nature that the one is necessarily seen in the true view of the other. The exponents of a new scientific theology are now endeavouring to explain the connection between the death of Christ and the justification of man. In able and laborious treatises we have set before us various methods by which they are painfully seeking to avoid and steer quite clear of the ideas conveyed by *substitution*, *imputation*, and *vicarious penalty*. These divines have perhaps satisfied themselves, possibly may have satisfied many minds by elaborating methods which have the merit at least of ingenuity, and certainly display much deep, serious, earnest, and anxious thought. But *one* thing they undoubtedly lack; that is, simplicity. To understand them confessedly demands long-continued, diligent, and careful study. We are admonished that to be masters of their teaching requires strained attention, if not sustained efforts of intellectual power. We are exhorted not to reject them without having first given ourselves to the diligent perusal of the volumes in which they are commended to our acceptance. Probably many of our readers have been admonished by men of the higher intellectual calibre not to

think of condemning these treatises till they have thoroughly mastered their meaning and made themselves perfectly conversant with the depths of their difficulties, the intricacies of their arguments, and the full force of their reasonings. But surely all this, and just this, is their condemnation—their condemnation as attempts to set before us the Scriptural view of this all-important subject. The connection, according to St. Paul, certainly requires no such exercise of mental power or intellectual vigour. To see the connection requires only, in his view, the enlightened eye of simple faith. Not to see it—to fail to see it—requires to be accounted for, and can be accounted for only by the power of some blinding bewitchery of evil. Let anyone, after laboriously endeavouring to apprehend the connection between the death of Christ and the justification of man, as set forth in some modern works of much ability, turn to the language of the Apostle and inquire how this teaching will fit in with the question here asked. Surely an ordinary mind will say, “I can see very well how suitable the question is, if I take as the explanation of the connection the language of the Apostle himself, ‘Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;’ but if the connection were such as I apprehend it to be in the view of our modern scientific theologians, then the Apostle’s language can have no meaning, and his question implies what is altogether a mistake.”

It is not meant, of course, that there are not depths and heights of Divine wisdom in the doctrine of the Atonement which pass human understanding. But it is meant that there is an aspect of the Atonement turned towards the human heart which in its Divine simplicity adapts itself to our human needs, and makes the Cross of Christ its own messenger of God’s peace to the soul, its own teacher of what the soul needs to know of God’s method of justifying the sinner. The present paper is confined to a view of our subject in relation to the moral law. And we must now draw to a conclusion.

Our aim—imperfectly attained—has been to suggest reassuring thoughts to those who have found, in the beautiful and elaborate theories of scientific theology, not enough left of the *reality* of Atonement to satisfy their spiritual necessities. Human explanations of the Atonement we are not concerned to defend. The truth of Atonement completed we are bound to uphold. It is one thing to attempt to work out a complete human system of the doctrine of satisfaction—a system built up of the ingenious thoughts of men, and made to stand four-square to the line and the measure, the rule and the plummet of the human understanding. It is another thing to defend intact that which is of the essence of the Scriptural teaching of reconciliation, revealed for

the true spiritual life of our soul. Rash interpretations, probable explanations, uncertain deductions, unwarrantable additions to the teaching of Holy Scripture (made sometimes by faithful and holy men) may be all left on one side; but we may not abandon anything of the truth, to which God's Word and God's Spirit bear witness, for the putting on of the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

To a soul convinced of sin condemnation is an awful reality indeed; and condemnation makes death to be a terrible reality; for death in the full meaning of the word is indeed a thing full of terrors, and its terrors are the terrors of condemnation, delivering the soul into the hands of him that hath the power of death; that is, the devil.

And those who through this fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage will not find full release and joyful deliverance by being told merely of the mercy of God. The mercy of God has not obliterated the truth that "Death has passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." The mercy of God has not availed to withhold the issue of the holy law of God—the law of condemnation. The mercy of God has not consumed the justice and holiness of God Himself; and it is God's holiness and justice which have condemned the sinner, and have shut him out in the darkness of the shadow of death. The awakened sinner knows the truth of his outcasting and condemnation. It is an awful fact. It is a terrible reality.

But if the mercy of God does not avail to meet the sinner's need, what then can suffice? We answer: The deliverance which the mercy of God has provided—a great accomplished fact, a grand objective reality, sin's burden borne away, the glorious victory gained, the great adversary laid low, the door opened wide, the awful debt paid, the curse of the law all taken away, its condemnation quite exhausted—and all this by death.

By death! by what death? Is not death the very cause of all the misery, of all the bondage, of all the woe? Yes; and therefore our deliverance is by the death of One who had died our death for us. It is the death of the very Son of God, who has so entered into fellowship with our nature and our fallen condition—made of a woman, made under the law—that in His death our debt to sin has been paid for us; and the law of God, and the justice of God, and the holy truth of God, have had fullest satisfaction—satisfied, oh! not by the mere "Amen" of penitent humanity—confessing (like Achan) the justice of God's condemnation, acknowledging the debt to be due, the sentence to be righteous, the awful judgment to be according to truth—but by that which calls out the "Amen" of Divine Truth, testifying that all has been paid, that man's sin has *had*

its condemnation, and the sinner's curse has been taken out of the way; the "Amen" by whose power the palace of the strong man armed has been broken up, and a highway of peace and life for man made through the very portals of Death and of Hades. This is the reality of that perfect finished work which in all ages has moved the hearts of Christian men to sing to the Redeemer: "When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers."

All this is simple, but all this will be found to involve the idea of *substitution* (or representation¹), *imputation* (in some sense), and *pœna vicaria*. And will anything less than this—anything which refuses to accept this idea—meet the dire needs of an awakened soul? Nay; will anything less than this meet the requirements of Holy Scripture? Will anything which rejects this satisfy the language of the New Testament, or fulfil the idea which the teaching of the New Covenant has taken from the old—the teaching of the word *ἰλαστήριον*?

But the argument from the ceremonial law must be reserved for another paper.

The moral law has brought righteous condemnation, judgment according to truth, on the whole race of mankind, that every mouth might be stopped, and all the world stand guilty before God. And then for guilty, condemned sinners, comes a free justification from the God whose justice and holiness condemned. They are justified freely (*δωρεάν*)—*i.e.*, for nothing. In other words, they are justified when they know themselves to be justly condemned. But how can this be? Truly we marvel not that the thoughts of men pronounce this to be marvellous—that proud thoughts of self-righteous men pronounce it to be incredible in its wonder. Yet the sinner convinced of sin sees in this that which avails, as nothing else avails, to meet his case; and the believing man sees in this that, the very wonder of which makes it credible. For he sees it as that for which the Son of God was manifested in the flesh. He sees in it the direct result of the death of the Incarnate Word of Him who was manifested to destroy the works of the devil. He sees his own wondrous justification, in the light of the truth, that "God made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." And believing now the miracle of Divine grace, and fully satisfied that now God can be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, assured that there is no condemnation to them that

¹ In some respects we are inclined to think "representation" the preferable term. We believe it more fully expresses not only the patristic idea, but also the teaching of Holy Scripture. But then it must be "representation" with a fulness of meaning. The idea must be seen as *adding to*, rather than *deducting from*, the idea of "substitution."

are in Christ Jesus, he passes at once—passes by a present, immediate passing—passes from being under the law to being under grace—passes from a state of condemnation to a state of justification—passes now through the opened door, from out of the kingdom of darkness into the salvation of which God spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began, that we, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life.

N. DIMOCK.

ART. VI.—THE LAW OF THE SABBATH. (PART II.)

IN our present paper we push our inquiries into the New Testament. Our task has to include, *first*, an investigation into the meaning of the term "Sabbath," in the various places in which it is found; *secondly*, the attitude of our Blessed Lord towards the Sabbath; *thirdly*, the attitude of the Apostles, especially of St. Paul, towards it.

I. First, as to the meaning of the term "Sabbath" in the New Testament. The word "Σάββατον" is simply the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew word. The usage of the plural "τὰ σάββατα" is of uncertain account. It *may* have sprung from the similarity of the sound of the Chaldaic form Šabbatha,¹ with the neuter-plural termination. The two Greek forms are employed promiscuously to denote the seventh day, and the seven days taken together. The plural is the commoner, when denoting the week. In the following passages the plural occurs in the sense of *a week*: St. Matt. xxviii. 1; St. Mark xvi. 2; St. Luke xxiv. 1; St. John xx. 1 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. The singular is found only twice in this sense; viz., St. Mark xvi. 9; St. Luke xviii. 22. The explanation of the plural is that it indicates "the space of time lying between two

¹ שַׁבָּתִים or שַׁבָּתַיִם. This applies to its usage for *the day*. The plural as referring to the week is accounted for below. The heterodolitical dative, σάββασι, is found in several places as a variation with σάββατοις, as in St. Matt. xii. 1, 5, 12; St. Mark i. 21. Σαββάτοις is found in the Septuagint, 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4, viii. 13; Ezek. xlvi. 3. Also in Josephus, Ant. xvi. 6, 4. From σάββατον we find only gen., sing. and plur., and dat., sing. and plural. v. Winer, Gr., pt. ii., sect. viii.

As an alternative with the transliteration of σάββατα from שַׁבָּתַיִם, Winer suggests, that the plural may be formed after the analogy of names of festivals, e.g., Saturnalia, Panathenæa. Considering the presence of this form in the Septuagint, this seems hardly a commendable alternative.

It is, perhaps, not easy to say why the plural (used for "Sabbath") is found chiefly in the first two evangelists, the singular in the last two.