

—however arithmetical—namely personal possession by a living Saviour, if it is not the voice of a prophet, is *as* the voice of one of the prophets. If it does not summon to the baptism of Paul, it does to that of Apollos.

W. A. PURTON.

ART. IV.—THE "RANSOM."—MATT. XX. 28.

(Concluded from p. 408.)

I ENDEAVOURED in my former paper to show that, in the saying, "the Son of Man came to give His life a *λύτρον* for many," the word was used in the sense of *kopher* (atonement) or *keseph kippurim* (the price of atonements); and that our Lord referred to the thirtieth chapter of Exodus, where Jehovah claimed as *kopher* the sum of half a shekel from each male Israelite on being enrolled among the congregation of Israel, that there might be no plague among them when they were numbered. Moses was directed to take the money thus raised, and called by Jehovah the price of atonements, as an offering to Jehovah Himself. It is called an offering to Jehovah in verses 13, 14, and 15, and Moses was directed to appoint it for the service of the tent of meeting, that it might be for a memorial of the children of Israel before Jehovah, *i.e.*, before the immediate presence of Jehovah, who was pleased to dwell upon the *kapporeth* between the cherubim, to make atonement for their souls.

If, then, our Lord's hearers, who we must never forget were Israelites, perceived that He thus connected Himself and His life with the sin-offering with which atonement was made on the great Day of Atonement on the *kapporeth*, we must be careful to understand the word "ransom" in the simple Old Testament sense of *kopher*.

It was by taking *λύτρον* in its classical rather than in its Biblical sense, that Origen got the notion that the *λύτρον* was Christ's life paid to the Evil One in exchange for the souls of mankind whom he held in bondage; but if, as we have seen, Jehovah Himself claimed the *λύτρον*, it must have been paid to Him and not to the devil. Clearly it cannot have been paid to both.

Leaving the Pentateuch, can we find any hints of a bargain between the Son of Man and Satan in the New Testament?

I. Can we find in the Gospels any passage in which our Lord speaks of the devil receiving His own life in exchange for the souls which the Lord came to rescue out of his power?

It certainly seems very improbable that we should find such

passages, because Jesus in all His teaching keeps, so to speak, on the lines laid down in the Pentateuch, as they were gradually developed and explained in the Psalms and the Prophets. How often in St. Matthew is He represented as saying "it is written," as if the Old Testament writings and the revelation they contained about Himself were the very guides of His conduct, and supplied Him with His very deepest motives for action? "So it must be, for so it is written," was an ever-present thought to Him whose meat was to do the will of His Father and to accomplish His work.

If He found anything there about giving His life as a *λύτρον* to Satan, why is there not some allusion to it in His first struggle with the Evil One in the wilderness? The devil himself proposed a bargain to Him there. He came, as we all know, to restore fallen man, in spite of sin, to the high destiny for which God had created him. He came that the kingdoms of the world might become the kingdoms of Jehovah and His Christ, *i.e.*, His own. In the first conflict between Christ and Satan, the devil offered those kingdoms to Christ if He would only do homage to him for them. "All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it; if Thou wilt fall down and worship me all shall be Thine." Would Christ have dismissed the devil's offer with the words "Get thee hence, Satan; thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve," if He had already bargained to give him His life? Would Satan have made so foolish an offer? Surely here, when, if anywhere, we might have expected it, there is no hint of such a bargain as Origen implies?

Is there the slightest hint that our Lord was about to give His life as a "ransom" to Satan, in His denial that He cast out demons in the power of Beelzebub; or in the parable, by which He exposed the fallacy of the notion that His miracles were wrought through collusion with Satan? "When the strong man armed (Satan) keepeth his palace, his goods (the kingdoms of the world, and the souls of men) are in peace; but when the stronger than he (the Son of Man) shall come upon him and overthrow him (*νικήσῃ*), He taketh from him his whole armour wherein he trusted, *i.e.*, his power over mankind in consequence of their fall, and distributes (*διαδίδωσιν*) his spoils." Surely the idea of any compromise with the vanquished Evil One is totally at variance with this teaching?

Where is there any notion of such a bargain in the words spoken at the close of His ministry, "Now shall the prince of this world be cast forth outside; and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me"? Does not the passage

imply that the Evil One would be utterly defeated, even though his defeat cost the Victor the death of the cross?

Do not the last words of the Son of Man on the cross, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit," prove that He did not give His life a "ransom" to the devil, but to the Father Himself?

Could He have said with truth, the evening before His crucifixion, "The prince of this world cometh, and in Me he hath nothing,"¹ if Satan had a lien on His soul?

Could He have said, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him," when the hour was come for Him to give His life, according to Origen, to the devil?

II. Can any passages in St. Paul's writings, or any of the other writers in the New Testament, be fairly said to sanction this notion of Origen?

Of course the passages that seem to make for his idea are those wherein the word *λύτρον* is present in the composition of the words used by the Apostle. I propose, then, to consider the passages in which the verb *λυτροῦσθαι* and its compounds, and in which the words *λυτρωτής*, *λύτρωσις*, and *ἀπολύτρωσις* occur, to see whether it is necessarily implied from any of them, that Satan really received a *quid pro quo* when the Son of Man, by His death and resurrection, deprived him of his power over the souls of men.

The simple verb occurs in Luke xxiv. 21. It is there used by the two disciples, on their way to Emmaus, who told their companion—the risen Lord—about His own execution by the rulers of the Jews, and added: "We trusted that it was He who *μέλλον* *λυτροῦσθαι* Israel." They simply used the word in the Old Testament sense of deliver; or, if any notion of a *λύτρον* entered into their heads, it was connected with their Lord's words, "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many," and so with the sacrificial sense of the term, and with the *kopher* paid to Jehovah.

The simple verb is again found in Titus ii. 14: "Who gave Himself for us, that He *λυτρώσεται* us from all lawlessness." There is no necessity to read any payment to Satan into this passage any more than in the verse of Psa. cvii. 2: "Let the redeemed of Jehovah say so, whom He hath redeemed from the hand of the adversary," though perhaps, as in the former case, the notion implied in the sacrificial *kopher* may give a deeper spiritual sense to the words.

The third occasion is 1 Pet. i. 18: "*ἐλυτρώθητε* not with perishable things, with silver and gold . . . but with the

¹ "Hic ostendit non creaturarum sed peccatorum principem diabolum?" (Aug., *ad loc.*)

precious blood of Christ." Here St. Peter is evidently comparing the half-shekel paid as *kopher* by the Israelites to Jehovah when Moses numbered them, with the blood, or life, of Christ, the Son of Man, by whose death on the cross the true expiation for our souls was effected. There can be no possible allusion to a "ransom" paid to Satan here.

These are the only instances in which the simple verb occurs in the New Testament.

λύτρωσις occurs (1) Luke i. 68: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He visited and wrought *λύτρωσιν* for His people . . . that we *ῥυσθεντας* from the hands of our enemies might serve Him without fear." The word for "deliverance" is the same as that used in the Lord's Prayer, "rescue (*ῥύσαι*) us from the Evil One." There is no more notion of a "ransom" being paid to Satan than in Moses' song, "Thou in Thy mercy hast led Thy people whom Thou hast redeemed; *γαύθηα*."

(2) Luke ii. 38: Here we read of those waiting for "lutrosis" in Israel—who looked, that is, for the promised Messiah, and all that His coming should involve.

(3) Heb. ix. 12: "Having obtained eternal 'lutrosis.'" The allusion is here plainly, as shown by the context, to the work of the high-priest on the Day of Atonement, who on that day alone entered into the Holy of Holies, and made atonement with the blood of the sin-offering on the front of the *kapporeth*, and so in the very presence of Jehovah. This act of the high-priest prefigured the entrance of the Son of Man with His blood, into the presence of His Father in heaven itself. There can, then, be nothing more intended in this passage than was intended in the atonement as wrought by the sin-offering itself. At any rate, there can be no allusion to Satan.

The word "lutrotēs" is found only in Acts vii. 35, where the words show that no payment to Satan can be meant. "This Moses whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? him hath God sent to be both a ruler and a *λυτρωτήν* with the hand of the angel which appeared to him."

The word *ἀπολύτρωσις* occurs ten times in the New, but not once in the Old Testament.

(1) Luke xxi. 28: Our Lord is here speaking of His future presence, and uses the word in respect to the deliverance of believers from their enemies. "When these things come to pass, then lift up your heads, for the *ἀπολύτρωσις* draweth nigh."

(2) Rom. iii. 24: This is the passage in which the word is explained by Origen as a ransom paid in Christ's blood to Satan for the release of his captives. While on the other hand Gregory of Nazianzen says: "Now if a ransom goes by

right to him who holds that which is to be ransomed, I ask to whom was the ransom paid in this case, and for what reason? If you say it was paid to the evil one—shame on the injurious thought! What! the robber receive not merely a ransom from God, but God Himself as ransom. Truly a monstrous compensation for his tyranny, to oblige him to spare such creatures as we are."¹

Let us now consider the passage itself, "For all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, by means of the redemption (*διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως*) that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth as *ἱλαστήριον* (*kapporeth*) by means of faith in His blood."¹ St. Paul had shown in the seventeenth verse of the same chapter that all, Jews as well as Barbarians, were the slaves of sin. In the present verse he is showing how, by God's free grace, all believers had been restored to a state of covenant relationship with God, by means of the "redemption" which is in Christ Jesus. In other words, the believers had been delivered from the state of slavery in which, so long as their sins were unforgiven, they were held bound (here is the *ἄπο*), and they had been brought into a right relation with God, and restored to His covenant; the *λύτρον* being the life of the Son of Man offered to His Father. "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many." That this is the meaning of the passage we may see from the following words, which at once connect the apolutrosis with not only the hilasterion, or *kapporeth*, but with Christ's blood, *i.e.*, His life. "The apolutrosis that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth as hilasterion through faith in His blood." The life of Christ was poured out on the cross when He said, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit," for Christ's spirit and soul no more died than His soul's type, the blood of the sin-offering, was considered dead; and the life of Christ, the antitype of the blood of the sin-offering, was presented by the ever-living Lord when, in His glorified body, He rose from the dead, and stood living at His Father's right hand. Thus the *ἀπολύτρωσις* that St. Paul speaks about is the deliverance of believers from the slavery of sin by the *λύτρον*, or *kopher*, offered by Christ in His own person and presented by Him on the hilasterion in the heavenly presence itself. The whole passage has in view the sin-offering on the great Day of Atonement, and, if read in connection with Christ's words in St. Matthew, identifying Him with the *kopher* of Exod. xxx., contains no notion of Christ having paid the "ransom" to Satan."²

¹ *Vide* Norris's "Rudiments of Theology," p. 303.

² Bishop Westcott in a note about the meaning of the simple verb in the LXX. says that "It is obvious from the usage of the LXX. that the idea

(3) Rom. iii. 23: The Apostle is here showing how believers, in spite of the possession of the Holy Spirit, are distressed in themselves, while they are waiting for the public manifestation of their adoption to sonship by resurrection of the body. "Waiting for the deliverance of our bodies." The *ἀπολύτρωσις* is the deliverance of that which we call our body from its present state of corruption into the likeness of the glorified body of the risen Christ.

(4) 1 Cor. i. 20: "But of Him (God) are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and *ἀπολύτρωσις*. The Apostle is here showing that our acceptance in God's sight is entirely owing to our union or fellowship with Jesus Christ. And as in Rom. iii. the reference is to the delivery from bondage to sin by the *keopher* offered in the person of the Son of Man to God, the language being built upon the sin-offering by which atonement was made on the mercy-seat, we may view it much in the same light here. As in the type the peace-offering denoted the covenant relation between Jehovah and His people—righteousness, the burnt-offering, the necessity of the life of His people being devoted to Jehovah's service—sanctification, and the sin-offering, the necessity of the removal of the unholiness which barred all approach to Jehovah's presence—*apolutrosis*, so in the antitype the lessons of the three kinds of sacrifice were combined in one person, even in the Son of Man, Jesus, who was made unto us righteousness, sanctification, and *ἀπολύτρωσις*. The passage contains no teaching that is not implied in the Pentateuch.

(5) Eph. i. 14: "The Holy Ghost is the earnest of our inheritance unto (*εἰς*) the redemption of the possession." The allusion is to the message sent by Jehovah through Moses to the children of Israel before the covenant was made at Sinai with sacrifice. Exod. xix. 5: "Now therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me." Out of all the numerous kingdoms of the earth, the Israelites were to be God's costly possession. The LXX. has *laos periousios*, and in Mal. iii. 17 the Hebrew word is translated *περιποίησις*, as it is here. The believers, then, are God's own possession, and the *apolutrosis* that they look forward to is the actual emancipation from the last effects of sin, which will take place when

of a ransom received by the power from which the captive is delivered is practically lost in 'lutroushai.' The conception of redemption lies in the history of Israel. The deliverer of Israel from Egypt furnished the imagery of hope. To this the work of Christ offered the perfect spiritual antitype. It cannot be said that God paid to the Egyptian oppressor any price for the redemption of His people."—"Epistle to the Hebrews," p. 296.

the body is glorified together with the spirit. "Everyone that beholdeth the Son and believeth on Him hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

(6) Eph. i. 7: "In whom, *i.e.*, Jesus Christ—the beloved—we have *apolutrosis* by means of His blood, the forgiveness of the trespasses." This passage, by the use of the word "blood" in connection with "redemption," and also the phrase forgiveness of transgressions, as explaining the redemption by means of His blood, is clearly connected with the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement, on which I have touched so often as the figure of the atonement effected by the Son of Man. The Hebrew *kopher* explains it sufficiently without the aid of the Greek or Latin words.

(7) Eph. iv. 30: "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were sealed unto the day of redemption." The day of *απ.* signifies here the day of the *απ.* of the costly possession spoken about in Eph. i. 14.

(8) Col. i. 13, 14: In this passage the Apostle first speaks of our deliverance from Satan by Christ, who rescued (*ἐρύσατο*) us by His strong arm, as a mighty Conqueror from the arbitrary power of darkness. This deliverance needed no *λύτρον*, and so the word is the same as that in the Lord's Prayer: "*ῥύσαι* us from the Evil One." As Jehovah rescued the Israelites from Pharaoh, so the Son of Man rescued us from Satan's kingdom. And as, then, before the Israelites could be enrolled in Jehovah's kingdom, they had to offer a *λύτρον*, or *kopher*, to Jehovah, that they might partake in the atonement made at the *kapporeth*; so, before believers could be removed into the kingdom of the Son of His love, a *lutron* or *kopher* was required of them, and they possess it in the person of Christ, who is our "ransom," so that by His offering we have our sins expiated, and so removed from the sight of the Holy God, "Who rescued us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, in whom we have deliverance, the forgiveness of our sins."

(9) Heb. ix. 15: "And for this cause He is the Mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the *apolutrosis* of the transgressions." This passage, and the *apolutrosis* of which it speaks, is connected with Christ's atonement, as prefigured by the sin-offering, as clearly appears from the context, so that the *lutron* can only be that spoken of in Exod. xxx. and alluded to by Christ Himself, when He said that "The Son of man came to give His life a 'ransom' for many."

(10) Heb. xi. 35: "Others were tortured to death not accepting their *απ.*" Here the word only refers to deliverance from torture.

I have set before my readers all the passages where the idea of λύτρον is implied, and I can see no hint in any of them that the λύτρον was paid to the Evil One; on the other hand, as we might naturally have expected, they are all built upon the teaching of the Pentateuch, so as to be readily understood by those acquainted with its teaching, and at the same time are so worded as not to mislead those heathen readers who understood *lutron* in the same sense that we ordinarily attach to the word "ransom."¹

I cannot help thinking that the way to learn to grasp the idea of the atonement is by the careful consideration of Jehovah's own teaching on the subject contained in Exod. xxx., where atonement money, λύτρον, is connected with *koopher*, and, secondly, with *kapporeth*, the *ἱλαστήριον* on which Jehovah was pleased to dwell, and so, thirdly, with the sin-offering, or rather the blood or life of the sin-offering, with which once in every year; on the great Day of Atonement, expiation was made for the souls of the Israelitish nation and their sins which barred their approach to the Holy Jehovah were covered.

Christ by His use of the λύτρον (*koopher*) certainly meant us to do so. And so doing we see at once that He, our "ransom," having poured out His life on the cross: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit," offered Himself to Jehovah, and not to Satan. And if you ask why did He thus offer Himself as a "ransom," still we must go to Exod. xxx. for our answer: "For the service of the tent of meeting, and that it may be a memorial before the Lord for the children of Israel, to make atonement for your souls."

In that chapter we have the Divine teaching about atonement, the type and figure of the true atonement, and by

¹ As regards the truth underlying patristical explanation of the classical meaning of "lutron," Bishop Westcott says in "The Epistle to the Hebrews," p. 296: "The discussions which have been raised on the question 'to whom the ransom was paid' are apt to be misleading. The deliverance of man from the debt, the captivity, the bondage of sin—however we express the image—could only be through the satisfaction of the claims of a violated law. These claims, regarded under the light of punishment, present a twofold aspect. To him who rebels against the Divine law they are simply pain; to him who humbly submits himself they are a salutary discipline. The first aspect includes the truth which was expressed by the patristic conception that Christ paid the ransom of man to the devil; the second includes the truth expressed by the later view that the ransom was paid to God. Each view, however, is essentially incomplete, and it is perilous to attempt to draw conclusions from limited interpretations of Scripture."

There is a very excellent note on the subject of Christ's redemption, as viewed in relation to the dominion and works of the devil, in Dimock's "Death of Christ," p. 123.

carefully getting at the idea contained in the words for service and for a memorial of the children of Israel before Jehovah, for both *ziccaron* (memorial) and *abodah* (service) have their meanings connected with sacrifice, we may obtain a more practical and faithful notion of the atonement than we can derive from the classical meaning of the word "ransom."

ROBERT HELME.



ART. V.—THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.

(Concluded from page 441.)

OUR first observation here is that the eagerness with which Ignatius invited martyrdom rather represents the fanatical spirit of Tertullian and the Montanists than that of the immediate successors of the Apostles. It is in direct opposition to the doctrine laid down in the letter on the martyrdom of Polycarp, in the words, "We do not approve of those who voluntarily offer themselves, for this the gospel does not teach us to do" (C. iv.). We have no earlier instance of the contrary teaching than that of Tertullian, represented in the tractates "*De coronâ militis*" and "*de Fugâ in persecutione*," both the products of his new Montanistic teaching. This, and the extraordinary knowledge of angels and supercelestial beings, and the resemblance of the acts of Ignatius' martyrdom to those of St. Perpetua and Felicitas, who are admitted both by Roman Catholic and Protestant critics to have been Montanists, lead us to conclude that a Montanistic spirit pervades the Ignatian legend, and that so great a departure from the Apostolic principles could hardly have been made immediately after the Apostolic age. But the edict of toleration which had been published by Trajan at the very moment when Ignatius' persecution began, presents no less a difficulty, as this must have been in as full force at Antioch as in Rome, and in all the cities which Ignatius is said to have passed through during his journey to Rome. The personal controversy which he is alleged to have had with the Emperor bears also a suspicious affinity to those which St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John are described, in their spurious acts, to have maintained with the emperors Nero and Domitian. In all these apocryphal writings, some king or ruler is brought face to face with the martyr, and the fiction of a personal tribunal takes the place of the regular courts of the empire. All intermediate jurisdictions are passed