

precept (ver. 16) the example (ver. 17) : a man of like nature, subject to the same sufferings as you are, prayed—see what his prayer *did!* But everywhere in the Bible, practice photographed, so to say (having the master charm of reality), is that of a human being with wants and feelings like our own.

---

## Review.

---

*The Finding of the Cross.* Part I. The Atonement. Edited by the Rev. JOHN WAKEFORD. Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

IN this small treatise there is manifest a spirit of earnest and reverent inquiry which is much to be commended. Assuming, as it would seem, that the "Protestant" view of the atonement has suffered damage from the assaults of modern thought, the writer evidently desires to propound another view, which will be defensible against the force of all the battering-rams of sceptical investigation. We cannot feel surprised that he should be dissatisfied with the attempts made by some recent writers who have been labouring in the same field. Of these one after another has been sensible, apparently, that there was something unsatisfactory in the theories connected with previous efforts in the same direction. And we think there has been in consequence something of a gradually nearer approach among these theologians to the Scriptural doctrine of reconciliation. The essay edited by Mr. Wakeford appears to be the newest phase of this process. And accordingly we welcome in it what we hope we do right in regarding as the nearest approximation to the truth.

Nevertheless, we cannot regard the work as satisfactory. There is a simplicity in the Scriptural doctrine of atonement which is certainly not to be found in this treatise. If we mistake not, most readers will rise from the perusal with very confused notions as to what Mr. Wakeford's view really is. Some, we believe, after studying it with some care, will question whether Mr. Wakeford himself quite clearly apprehends the doctrine which he desires to set before us.

There is recognised, no doubt, an objective reality in the atonement effected by Christ's death, and we are thankful to see the statement of the truth of Christ's going into the depths *instead of many* (p. 63, see also p. 38). Yet there seems to be sometimes a want of clear distinction between the atonement itself as the object of faith, and the effects of the atonement as the subjective results of that faith. And there is certainly not a clear view of the important distinction between the incarnation and the atonement.

Both these errors (from our point of view) Mr. Wakeford, or the author, will doubtless regard as essential elements in the "Catholic view" of the atonement. He draws a sharp distinction between the Catholic doctrine which he considers himself as upholding, and the Protestant doctrine for which he has something of a feeble apology, indeed, in p. 53, but some very severe words also.

We presume that the teaching of a *pœna vicaria* is the Protestant dogma which he rejects as "revolting to morality, contemptible to reason, and degrading to the spirit" (p. 53). But if death is the penalty of sin, and if Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, we find it hard to

reconcile this rejection with the testimony of God's Word. And though the term "Catholic" is of very elastic signification, we can scarcely in any sense acknowledge *that* as Catholic teaching, which rejects a doctrine so clearly enunciated (in substance) by, *e.g.*, such Patristic authorities as Chrysostom and Augustin, and so distinctly asserted by one of the most Popish of Popes (Innocent III.), and so firmly upheld by the most Romish of scholastic theologians (Thomas Aquinas), and not less clearly taught by Eastern divines.

We venture, too, to ask what Catholic doctor will be found to support the assertion, "Had Judas repented of his treason, had the chief priests shrunk from judicial murder . . . had Satan shrunk from his last infamy, God's will of conquering evil had been gained without the Cross . . . in either case for Christ a victory" ? (p. 34). Mr. Wakeford will find, indeed, abundant teaching that God could, by His almighty power, have rescued the sinner, man, from the power of the Evil One without the death of Christ, but he will find it constantly asserted or implied that this would have involved a sacrifice of Divine justice.

God had pronounced His sentence—the sentence of death upon sin—the sentence of judgment "according to *truth*" (Rom. ii. 2). And His plan of restoration is not by putting aside and dishonouring His sentence of death, but by triumphing over the death of the sentence.

Mr. Wakeford says : "It was always of God and in God to forgive His creatures on repentance" (p. 30). But repentance just in proportion as it approaches true and perfect repentance, feels and knows that forgiveness is *utterly undeserved*, and that repentance cannot justify—that the sinner repented of *ought not by rights*, ought not according to *truth and justice*, to be forgiven without penalty endured.

And here we regret to find ourselves coming across another view of Mr. Wakeford, or the author, from which we are compelled to express our dissent. He fails to recognise in the atonement of Christ's death anything which affects conflicting attributes of the Deity in their relation to man. So, at least, we think we must understand him. He says : "You cannot separate the Divine attributes so that love should pay what justice demanded" (p. 25, see also p. 52). To see God's justice satisfied by the righteous-making *effects* of the Atonement *in us* will never satisfy the teaching of either the Scripture or the Fathers on this point.

This brings us to another matter. We are in agreement with Mr. Wakeford in his desire to rescue from contempt the teaching of the Fathers generally on the subject of the *λύτρον* as having been, in some sense, taken by Satan. But what was it that put mankind under the holding and dominion of Satan—under the power and reign of death and of Hades, and so gave Satan a claim to receive a *λύτρον* ? What but the righteous condemnation of the Holy God, whose condemning law is holy and just and good ? And what, then, is it that delivers from death and from him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil, but that which takes away our condemnation and makes satisfaction to the law of God, and to the God of the law ; in other words, satisfies the justice of a justly condemning God ?

Mr. Wakeford will find that, according to the teaching of the Fathers, the death of Christ is *therefore* Satan's *λύτρον*, because it is the sinner's reconciliation to God, and because Satan's claim and hold upon us are the claim and hold which he has as the executioner of the penal justice of God. Mr. Wakeford himself says "the devil is God's gaoler" (p. 25). In taking Christ's life Satan took that which is the price of our release, because the death of Christ is the *pæna vicaria* of our sin. Thus the teaching of the scholastic divines that the ransom was paid to God and not to Satan, if we are disposed to call it more accurate than that of some of

the Fathers, was, in truth, the manifestation of a verbal rather than a real antagonism to the "Catholic" doctrine which had preceded it.

There are other points in this treatise which we think open to criticism. But it must suffice to have indicated the most prominent features of the teaching which seems to us to be erroneous and misleading.

We will add that the book contains not a little which is truly said and well said, and very ably said. The following quotations are by no means the only passages well worthy of attention in connection with the subject of redemption :

"From the beginning the end was present to Him whose knowledge is not as ours, and between whose word and deed there is no pause or difference" (p. 7). "The incarnation, the atonement, the body of Christ, are seen before the foundations of any worlds are laid. . . . There can be no creation with no thought of Christ in view" (p. 8). "The whole series of attacks on the atonement as the substitution of an innocent victim falls to the ground if we view it from the standpoint of eternity" (p. 47). "The knowledge of the cross comes to us in the fulness of time. It was present to Father, Son and Spirit from the beginning" (p. 48). "Those who cavil at the atonement, who say that the God of Truth in it declares the guilty innocent, and the innocent guilty, shut their eyes to the mystery of the Person of Christ" (p. 49).

N. D.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*In the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Read and others v. the Lord Bishop of Lincoln. Judgment, Nov. 21, 1890. Pp. 122. Macmillan and Co.*

THIS judgment has been perused, no doubt, by all our readers, and by some of them studied, and perhaps keenly criticised. Whatever else may be said, it will be admitted on all sides to be a most interesting and valuable summary of facts and opinions, and a singularly able historical argument, while certain passages are deeply impressive.

*Monasticism in England before the Reformation. A Lecture, By LEWIS T. DIBDIN, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Chancellor of the Dioceses of Exeter and Rochester. London: W. Gordon, 1, Red Lion Court, E.C.*

This is by far the best thing, so far as we know, about English monasticism, and certainly in many respects it stands quite alone. It is a little book, but wonderfully full; readable from beginning to end; fresh, liberal, and incisive. What makes it so emphatically a book for the day is the concluding passage. We quote as follows:

"Men were taught that there was a higher life possible for men than that which the Creator inaugurated in Eden. A new ideal was preached. It was a very different thing from mere self-sacrifice, from the use of the world without its abuse, which was taught. Holy men formed a lofty conception of human life divorced once for all from the entanglements and cares of the world, and devoted wholly to the worship and service of God. This conception was recommended to mankind by its