

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>

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

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

a felt fulfilment of the words: "There am I in the midst of you:" and that is the true secret of common prayer.

T. D. BERNARD.

There is one form of united worship not noticed in this paper, but not to be forgotten in connection with the subject of it—namely, that which consists in the use of hymns. Many of them are genuine prayer, none the less so for being metrical and musical; and no form of prayer better deserves the epithet of common in the sense of creating general participation. But it is a distinct subject, and lies outside these lines of discussion. Nobody objects to *them* as written forms, or proposes that they should be given extempore, or led by the minister and "heard by the people in silence"; and perhaps "brethren" who object to common prayer in prose with those whose conversion is uncertain may allow it in verse. Anyhow, the increased use of hymns is a matter of great thankfulness from the point of view of this paper. It supplies the union of hearts and voices in systems which do not otherwise provide it, and gives new help for it in those that do; and many hymns in general esteem now form a link of common devotion between the Church and Nonconformist congregations. In this respect there is more in common than there was. Let us thank God for it.



ART. IV.—THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

CERTAIN scientific qualifications are required for the successful pursuit of every science, but the highest of all sciences demands qualifications peculiarly its own. Other sciences may follow out their investigations, and successfully pursue their researches under the gaslight of their own laboratories, but true theological science demands, first of all, that its disciples shall come out to seek their learning, and to learn their lessons of true wisdom, under the broad daylight of the sun of righteousness.

And in the inly shining of this light—the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the person of Jesus Christ—the Christian student may find that he has to unlearn much which he thought he had attained to by the light of the fire which had come of the sparks of his own kindling. The truest science and the highest philosophy will lead a man to become a fool that he may be wise.

One of the dangers resulting from the present tendencies¹ of the theological study is the danger, not of too careful or minute examination of the oracles of God, but of allowing our view of great truths, which may be seen clearly in the light of the Gospel of Christ, to be disturbed by attributing undue weight to alleged deductions from minute criticisms of certain isolated portions, such deductions being supposed to add weight to

¹ In Fairbairn's "Typology of Scripture," vol. ii., Appendix C., pp. 531, *sqq.*, will be found some valuable remarks on this tendency.

certain difficulties (intellectual and moral) which are brought forward against what are regarded as the worn-out traditional teachings of Reformation doctrine.

In former papers we have desired to set forth some considerations, the force of which may, we trust, be found to have a reassuring effect on truth-seeking minds which may have been troubled by the influence of these tendencies in their bearing on the doctrine of the atonement of Christ's death, and our justification as sinners by His precious blood.

In the present paper we desire to supplement the arguments already adduced by directing special attention to one or two general observations bearing on the subject.

The sum of direct Scriptural testimony to the vicarious character of Christ's passion is of far greater weight, we are persuaded, than seems now to be commonly supposed. But even if we were to concede the absence from Holy Scripture of that prominence given to clear and distinct didactic statements concerning the Saviour as the representative substitute, as the sin-bearer for the world, which some might think to be required by the importance of the doctrine—we ask to have it well considered that this fact might be accounted for either by the supposition of the teaching being unscriptural and untrue, or by that of its truth being very readily accepted, and therefore universally recognised—a quasi-axiomatic teaching, not so much ostentatiously exhibiting itself on the surface, because deeply underlying the whole tenor of Divine revelation. Hence it becomes a matter of high importance to determine which of these two theories has the best claim to be regarded as the true account of the matter. And for this purpose the following inquiries are pertinent, and their answers may be regarded as affording evidence of great weight on the point we are considering.

I. Do the sacred records of the Old Testament contain instances which can fairly be said either to be a preparation, or to assume anything like a preparedness, for the acceptance of the teaching of substitution and vicarious suffering?

A little consideration will suffice to show the importance of this inquiry. Language *suggestive* of substitution may be said to depend for its natural and rightful interpretation on the prevailing ideas of the people to whom it is addressed. It will convey no doubtful meaning to those to whom the idea of substitution is natural and familiar. It may be far otherwise to any to whom the notion is strange, unnatural and unheard of. And the true weight of the witness from some portion of the language of the New Testament will be affected considerably by the inquiry whether, in the school of Divine teaching, God's people had had anything like a preparation for receiving the truth of substitutional penalty.

In view, then, of this inquiry,¹ it is impossible to omit reference to the history of the intercession of Moses in Exod. xxxii. : "It came to pass on the morrow that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin. And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said: Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet, now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of the book which Thou hast written." On this narrative it has been observed by Kurtz:²

The meaning of this prayer is that God might accept the punishment inflicted on those who had been executed already (verses 27, 28), as an expiation or covering for the same sin on the part of those who were living still; and that if this did not suffice (since the latter had their own sins to atone for), that He would take his own life, the life of the innocent one, as a covering or expiation. No doubt Jehovah refused to grant this request, and said (verse 33): "Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book;" but the existence of the idea of substitution in the religious consciousness of Moses is, nevertheless, unquestionable. And more than that, the existence of a thought so opposed to human notions of justice in a man like Moses would be perfectly inexplicable and inconceivable, if it could not be traced to the manifestation of the very same idea in the sacrificial worship with the direct sanction of God.³

The life of David affords two very memorable examples which must be briefly referred to. David's great sin, by which he—the man after God's own heart—displeased the Lord; that sin, when the sentence of his own condemnation of that sin has come home to his own soul; that sin, when with broken heart he has confessed: "I have sinned against the Lord;" that sin, when the absolving word of the prophet has declared, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin;" that sin, concerning which he himself has said, "The man that hath done this thing shall surely die;" that sin, concerning which the Lord's word has now declared, "Thou shalt not die"—that sin has yet, in his own

¹ An earlier example in Gen. xlii. 37, xliii. 9, xliv. 32, 33, ought not to be altogether overlooked. The reader may also be referred to Gen. xviii. 26, xx. 7, 17, 18, Josh. vii., Jon. i., for examples of communities affected by the righteousness or sin of one or more individuals. (See also Isa. xliii. 27, 28.)

² See also Delitzsch on Hebrews, vol. ii., p. 458, Eng. Tr.

³ "Sacrificial Worship of O. T.," pp. 106, 107, Eng. Tr. Some striking evidence as to the traditional notions of sacrifice found among the later Jews will be found in D. W. Simon's "Redemption of Man," note xii., pp. 431, 432. He quotes from Moses ben Nachman: "The blood of the sinner ought to have been poured out and his body burnt, as was the blood of the victim poured out and its body burnt." The following is from Rabb. Bechai: "God in His mercy and goodness took the victim instead of, and an expiation for, the offender"—"Blood for blood, soul for soul" (p. 432).

time, and in his own house, to be visited with death: "Because thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die" (2 Sam. xii. 14). Here we see that for David's deadly sin, put away from himself, the son of David, in the innocence of infancy, is to die—is (in some sense) to pay by death the penalty of his father's iniquity, and this distinctly by God's own appointment.¹

Again, when David had sinned in numbering the people, and he besought the Lord to take away his iniquity—"David spake unto the Lord when he saw the angel that smote the people, and said: Lo, I have sinned, and I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done?" (2 Sam. xxiv. 17).

Have we not here an example of a great sin of David, visited not on himself, except so far as he suffered in the sufferings of those that pertained to him, but visited on a people—as regards the matter of this sin—sinless?

Do we not see here the Lord visiting on the flock the sin of the shepherd? *He* has gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on all them the iniquity of only one.

Passing over other instances, and omitting the mention of other ways in which Israel of old was taught to recognise in their God One who, in His jealousy, visited the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and showed mercy unto thousands in them that love Him, we may not altogether omit a passing reference to one very memorable incident, in which we are taught to see not only the people punished for the disobedience of their king, the flock condemned to death for the erring of the shepherd, but also, in the punishment of both king and people, shepherd and sheep, the fulfilment of a Divine sentence, in which is found the most distinct teaching of substitutional penalty and vicarious death. After Ahab had let Benhadad go with a covenant (1 Kings xx. 34), these were the words of the prophet of the Lord: "Thus saith the Lord, Because thou hast

¹ *This* Son of David may doubtless be regarded as a typical shadow of the *true* Son of David, and the death of this innocent infant a foreshowing of His atoning death. And so we may be said to have here that which admits, in an inferior sense, an application of the Apostle's language in Rom. iii. 25. In God's sentence of death on the child of David was that which, in some measure and in some sense, was to show His righteousness, because of the passing over (*πάρεσις*) of David's sin. Compare the LXX. of 2 Sam. xii. 13, 14: Κύριος παρεβίβασε τὸ ἁμάρτημα σοῦ ὅ μὴ ἀποθάνῃς . . . ὁ υἱὸς σοῦ ὁ τεχθεὶς σοι θανάτῳ ἀποθανείτω.

We should beware, however, of straining such comparisons. Of the death of Christ it has been well said that "forming as it does that great landmark and division in the course of time, which separates the mature age of the world from its infancy, we may assert of it that it is not only unlike anything which had previously occurred, but also anything which can by any possibility happen a second time in the history of the world" (Shuttleworth's "Three Sermons at Oxford," p. 12).

let go out of thy hand the man whom I had devoted to destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people"—*ἔσται ἡ ψυχὴ σου ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ λαὸς σου ἀντὶ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*—LXX. (1 Kings xx. 42).

These examples will surely suffice to show that the suffering of one for another—the suffering of some for the sins of others, the bearing by some of the penalty of others' sins—was not a notion at all alien to the thoughts and feelings of the people separated from the world, to be specially trained for the coming of the Saviour, and Divinely instructed in preparation for the knowledge of His salvation.¹ And if this were so, is there anything to make us suppose that there could be no connection in their minds between this notion and the teaching of God's ordinance of sacrificial death—the death of a sinless, spotless victim—called by the very name of "*sin*," spoken of as an offering for sin, and enduring (so far) the penalty of sin? It is scarcely conceivable that no such connection could have existed in the minds of those who looked to the Rock whence they were hewn,² and remembered how Abraham their father had been called by God to look on his son—the son of God's gift, the heir of God's promise—bound on the altar, due to the knife and the flame, and then had received him back from death for life, because the Lord *had seen to it*, the Lord *had provided*, and Abraham had offered up on the altar a ram for a burnt offering *instead of Isaac* his son.

And it will not be altogether a worthless testimony to this view of Jewish sacrifice, that good evidence can be shown that so the teaching of sacrifice was understood and interpreted by the traditional doctrine of the Jewish schools (see above, pp. 313, 427).

But we must be allowed to ask special attention to the teaching of the Passover. That the paschal lamb was a sacrifice is now very generally admitted. If it was a sacrifice, indeed, shall we suppose that the sprinkled blood had to say to the destroyer only this: "I am here for a sign to mark for you the doors into which you are not to enter to do your destroying work"? For such a purpose, what need that the sign should be blood, and the blood the blood of sacrifice³—the sacrificial blood of a lamb slain? Can we doubt that the blood on the doorpost had this also to say to the destroyer: "Here you may not

¹ And it must not be supposed that there was nothing in the training in heathenism by which men's minds were prepared for the notion of atonement by vicarious penalty and satisfaction. (See *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, Jan., 1861, pp. 40, 41.)

² See above, p. 206. This sacrifice of Abraham was regarded as the substratum of all sacrifices. (See above, p. 310.)

³ See Kurtz, "Sacrificial Worship," p. 367, and Dr. W. Saumarez Smith, "Blood of New Covenant," pp. 51, 54; Crawford, "Sc. D. of Atonement," p. 501; Magee on "Atonement," pp. 60, 126.

enter, because here your work has been done, and the death of the lamb (whose sprinkled blood you see) has been appointed and accepted by God *instead of* the death of the first-born" ? Is not this interpretation confirmed by the claim which God makes upon the first-born whom He has thus redeemed from death, that they may know themselves, not their own, but bought with a price—even as "the general assembly and Church of *the first-born* which are written in heaven" (Heb. xii. 23) are "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i. 19) ? And is not this view still further confirmed by the provision for redeeming again the first-born of the human race ?¹ And still further by the order for the redemption of the firstling of an ass by a lamb (Exod. xiii. 13), and by the further order: "And if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck" ?² And still further by the order for the taking of the Levites as *instead of* the first-born, and by the words which follow: "And the Levites shall be Mine ; I am the Lord" (Numb. iii. 45) ? Does not the Passover sacrifice stand connected as one link in a chain, the first in a series of redemptions, and redemptions all by substitution ? Can we suppose that it was for nothing that at this great turning-point in their history, and in its yearly commemoration, as well as in duties of daily life, reminding them continually of this event, the redeemed people had perpetually brought before their minds the thought of vicarious suffering, substitutional transfer of penalty, of claim, of obligation ?

We have thus taken a few samples of evidence from the Old Testament. Space will not allow us to add to these, save once more to direct attention to the one prophecy which, in this connection, it is impossible to leave altogether out of view. If it be so, that in Isa. liii. we have set before us the consummation of Messianic expectation, as well as the summing up and explanation of the sacrificial teaching of earlier days, then is it possible, we ask, to deny that we have here that which is suggestive of a great redeeming work, the true account of which is to be found in substitution, the bearing of our griefs, the carrying of our sorrows—by One, the Man of Sorrows—by One who, pouring out His soul unto death, bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors ? What else mean these words: "All we like sheep have gone astray ; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath made to light on Him the iniquity of us all" ?

And, now, what do we claim to have established by all this ? We claim that these instances suffice at least abundantly to

¹ In this case by "corruptible things, as silver and gold," as in contrast with "the precious blood" (Numb. iii. 47, xviii. 15, 16).

² See also Numb. xviii. 17.

establish the fact that there had been, before the coming of Christ, a preparation for the acceptance of the teaching of redemption by vicarious suffering for sin, the substitution of the sinless for the sinful in the bearing of the penalty of transgression.

We proceed to another question.

II. Is the language of the New Testament such as accommodates itself to the theory of vicarious suffering being a thing strange and unknown, or, rather, to the theory of its finding ready acceptance in the minds and hearts of those who accepted as their Saviour the crucified Son of God?

It appears to us that we are saying far too little when we affirm that the second theory is justified and supported by a mass of evidence whose cumulative weight can never be outweighed, while the other theory must stand condemned as utterly untenable and incredible altogether.

Need we refer again to the sayings of our Lord Himself? Is it possible to deny that there is something more than suggestive of substitution in the language which spoke of giving His life a *λύτρον* for many?

In the apostolic Epistles let the passages which speak of Christ's *dying for us* be viewed in connection with those other texts which speak of His *dying for our sins*, and let these again be seen in the same view with the language which declares the truth of the ordained connection between *sin and death*, and still further let all these be set beside the teaching of Christ's *bearing our sins in His death*, and we feel sure that the combination of this testimony can only be made to fit in with the theory of a substitutionary character being recognised at once in the Christian view of the death of Christ.

And what shall we say of St. Paul's words—*ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων* (1 Tim. ii. 6)? This language is all the more forcible in its bearing on the point before us, because it is not so much a didactic assertion, as part of an enforcement of recognised elementary truths of the faith, for which St. Paul was ordained a preacher and an apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.

Add to all this just one text from the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the writer assumes rather than teaches the connection between the appointment of Jewish sacrifice and the death of Christ, and the bearing of both these on the death of man: "Now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. ix. 26-28).

We have touched, we need hardly say, on but a very small

part of the evidence afforded by the New Testament—evidence which should be viewed, not so much in its separate items, as in its united combination. And we need have no hesitation in contending that it can never be made to fit in with any other assumption than that which avails to bind and hold all together in one harmonious whole—the assumption that the notion of vicarious penalty entered into the elementary ideas connected with the atonement of Christ in the view of the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles.

Another important question must wait for consideration in our next number. N. DIMOCK.



ART. V.—FOLK-TALES.

IN a volume just published¹ Mr. Wratislaw has penetrated into the obscure realm of Slavonic life and literature, and has presented to the English reader what cannot but prove to be a most welcome addition to his folk-lore library. Now that Mr. W. R. S. Ralston is no longer amongst us, we suppose there is no one more entitled to speak upon Slavonic subjects than Mr. Wratislaw, and it is pleasing to think that, just as we are mourning the severe and almost irretrievable loss of one great scholar in this branch of study, we have such good proof, as this book affords, that the breach is not likely to remain unfilled. “Le roi est mort; vive le roi!” is a motto true of others than political kings, and if it somewhat saddens the personal view of life, it is the only condition under which life could be carried on. Mr. Wratislaw will, we feel sure, understand how it is that we feel bound to preface our welcome of his book with these few allusions to such a man as Mr. Ralston, for those of us who knew him had learnt to admire him for more qualities than those of scholarship only.

The sixty folk-tales here collected and translated consist of seven Bohemian stories, two Moravian, four Hungarian-Slovenish, two upper and lower Lusatian, one Kashubian, and four Polish stories, as representative of the Western Slavonians; three White Russian stories, four Little Russian stories from Galicia, five Little Russian stories from South Russia, and two Great Russian stories, as representative of the Eastern Slavonians; five Bulgarian stories, five Serbian stories, two Serbian stories from Bosnia, five Serbian stories from Carniola, five Croatian stories, and four Illyrian-Slovenish stories, as repre-

¹ “Sixty Folk-Tales from exclusively Slavonic Sources.” Translated; with brief introductions and notes, by A. H. Wratislaw. London: 1889, (Elliot Stock); 8vo., pp. xii., 315.