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.


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 papa 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
shrunken from judicial murder . . . . had Satan shrunken 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 forgive-
ness is utterly undeserved, and that repentance cannot justify—that the sin
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 any-
thing 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 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 pan victoria 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 fails 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.**


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.


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