THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE third volume of the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE has been issued, and a copy has been sent for review. It contains 896 pages, while vol. ii. contained 870, and vol. i. 863. Its first word is KIR, its last PLEIADES. There is a map of St. Paul's travels to illustrate Professor Findlay's article PAUL; and a double-page plate of Jewish coins to illustrate Professor Kennedy's article MONEY. The articles chiefly illustrated in the text are LAMP, MUSIC, and PILLAR. There is also a full-page engraving of the Moabite Stone.

After JESUS CHRIST (the glory of this book, as befitting) the greatest biographies are those of PAUL and PETER, and both are found in this volume. The former is written by Professor Findlay of Headingley College, Leeds, the latter by Dr. Chase, Principal of the Clergy School in Cambridge. Other biographies of some length are LOT by Professor Driver, MARY by Professor Mayor, MOSES by Professor Bennett, and NERO by Professor Cowan. With the article on MOSES Professor Bennett has been singularly successful, for it is a most difficult subject. Mr. Bennett has also written the article on MOAB, and given the most exact and complete account of the MOABITE STONE that probably exists.

But there is no need that we should enumerate the articles. The greater are not more faithful than the less, though they are likely to attract more attention, and even the greater cannot all be named. It is enough to say that the geographical work—mainly by Professor Ramsay, Sir Charles Warren, and Colonel Conder—is of more importance than usual in this volume, and that within the limits of this volume fall some of the greatest subjects in Biblical Theology, the subject of the LAW, for example, of which the Old Testament portion has been written by Dr. Driver, and the New Testament portion by Dr. Denney.

One volume yet remains, and with it undoubtedly some of the finest work in all the Dictionary. Its first article will be PLEROMA by Professor Lock. Soon after will be found a great article on Hebrew POETRY by Professor Budde, after that, PRAYER by Canon Bernard of Salisbury, PREDESTINATION by Professor Warfield, PRIESTS AND LEVITES by Professor Baudissin, PROPHECY by Professor A. B. Davidson, PROPITIATION by Professor Driver, who will also write SABBATH and SON OF MAN, PSALMS by Professor W. T. Davison, PSYCHOLOGY by Professor Laidlaw, REDEMPTION by Professor Adams Brown, who will also write SALVATION, REGENERATION by Professor Bartlet, RELIGION by Principal Stewart, ROMAN EMPIRE by Professor Gwatkin, SACRIFICE by Professor Paterson, SATAN by Principal Whitehouse, SEMITES by Professor M'Curdy, SEPTUAGINT by Professor

Nestle, SERMON ON THE MOUNT by Professor Votaw, SHIP by Admiral Blomfield, SIN by Canon Bernard, SINAI by Professor Rendel Harris and Mr. Chapman, SOLOMON by Professor Flint, SON OF GOD by Professor Sanday, and many more.

The first of our Lord's miracles, according to St. John, was the turning of water into wine at Cana of Galilee. And the second was the healing of the nobleman's sick son, which was also wrought at Cana of Galilee. The identity of place is an obvious link of connexion between the two. But in his new volume of *Sermons*, published by Messrs. Oliver & Boyd, Canon Winterbotham endeavours to show that to St. John's mind these two 'signs' had a far more important connexion than that. They had a connexion or sequence, he believes, of a moral and spiritual character. He feels that St. John would not otherwise have recorded them or placed them first in his series of seven. For he did not select his seven at random.

Canon Winterbotham has discovered two notes that are common to these two miracles. The first is *unwillingness*. In St. Mark's Gospel and elsewhere we discover an occasional sign of distress, or of a holy impatience; it is St. John that records the plain expression of unwillingness with which Jesus began that long series of miracles which led Him on to notoriety, to conflict, to crucifixion—the three stages of His martyrdom. It was at the beginning that this unwillingness was shown. 'For, if a man is at all unwilling to embark upon any course of action—a course, I mean, from which there is no turning back—it is at the beginning that he will manifest his reluctance. Afterwards, if he be a true man, he will not express unwillingness to do what has to be done, although an occasional sign of impatience or distress will be likely to escape him.'

'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' It is the language, says Canon Winterbotham, of grieved expostulation. For He knew she loved Him tenderly, though not wisely. She was putting Him under constraint to do that from which He most shrank, and the constraint was all the more irresistible that it was so gentle, so humble. 'How many men there have been whose womankind have placed them in the most false positions, and compelled them to take the most fatal steps, and all with the pleasantest of smiles, with the gentlest of entreaties, with the most disinterested motives!' In the days that came after, when the prophecy was fulfilled that 'a sword shall pierce through thine own soul also,' Canon Winterbotham thinks that its pain was partly due to the recollection that she herself had started Him upon that career of miracles which could have no ending but the cross.

The note of unwillingness is clear enough in the first miracle. In the second it is found in the expostulation, 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.' It is an expostulation that could scarcely have been addressed, Canon Winterbotham thinks, to the distracted father, whose only answer would still be the broken cry, 'Sir, come down ere my child die.' It was not addressed to the father, nor scarcely to anyone then present, but, as it were, to us. 'Out of this page of the gospel story our Lord looks upon us as One who does not know what to do, as One who sees Himself forced to begin at the wrong end, as One who *can* control the powers of nature and arrest the course of disease, but *cannot* alter the perversity, the ignorance, the foolishness of the men for whom He cares. He demands your sympathy and mine. He vouchsafes to let us into the secret of His embarrassment, His sorrow. He bids us see in what a false position He—the Saviour of the world—is placed.'

The second note which Canon Winterbotham finds common to these two miracles he calls *humanity*. Later, however, he calls it indulgence, and indulgence is what he means. He means that in both these miracles our Lord is seen

permitting things that He could not encourage. At the marriage feast they were merry. They were very merry indeed, and drank wine freely. Happily for them the horrid curse of ardent spirits was unknown, their drink was the light wine of the country. Still they drank freely and were very merry. Now it must be evident, says Canon Winterbotham, that our Lord had no personal sympathy with these merry-makers. He would much rather they enjoyed themselves in a better and higher way. And yet He supplied them with more wine, and wine of a more generous vintage than they could afford.

'He came,' says Canon Winterbotham (whose words must be quoted verbatim for a moment, so delicate if not impossible is the situation he has raised), 'He came to reveal the Father to the world, He came to save our souls, to die for them upon a Cross: He began His miracles by giving more and better wine to a company of people who were thinking of anything *but* their souls—who were eating and drinking and making merry! Dear Lord! as He listened to the laughter, and the buzz of voices, and all the well-known sounds of harmless merriment and frank enjoyment, did He not smile and sigh at once, to think how *easy* it is to make these children of men happy, if one has the wherewithal—to make them happy, much as the bird is happy on the bough, or the beast in its stall: how *difficult* it is to make them happy in any higher and more enduring sense? Did He not smile and sigh at once to think that *He* who came to preach the Cross, who came to give eternal life to as many as believed in Him, should have to begin by replenishing the wine-cups of the children of the bride-chamber?'

The greatest snare of the preacher is the desire to be original. The greatest snare of the theologian is to speak of Christ as if He were altogether such an one as ourselves. And when these snares lie together, as they often do, it is only alert unsleeping vigilance that escapes them. For the easiest path to originality is to place our Lord in situations of human weakness or perplexity, to describe Him slowly developing His mental and spiritual capacity, or gradually comprehending the work that He had to do.

But originality is one of the least of human accomplishments. No great preacher was ever original. The Hebrew prophet had to eschew originality as if it had been sin. He had to be in the prophetic succession. He had not only to utter the things which God gave him to utter, but he had to utter the same things as the prophets who went before Him. St. John knew that Caiaphas was a prophet when he said that it was expedient for one man to die for the people, not merely because one man did die, but because Isaiah and all the prophets had prophesied so aforetime. Caiaphas was a prophet because he was in the succession.

The only lawful originality is the preacher's self. It is the only originality that the poet has—the preacher in verse. Did not Shakespeare find all his matter in books that were written before him? And Burns? After showing the extent to which Burns drew upon the store of the past, just as Shakespeare did for his material, Mr. Henley adds, 'He cannot fairly be said to have contributed anything to it except himself.'

This was the originality of our Lord Himself. Our manuals of Christian Evidence used to contain a chapter on Christ's originality. And as we read we felt the ground slipping away from beneath us. Saying after saying had been traced to some earlier preacher and had to be given away. And it never was impressively shown that Christ Himself remained. He was not original as the modern preacher craves to be. Like Caiaphas He was in the succession. If Caiaphas said it was expedient that one man should die, Jesus said the Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many. 'In the highest plane of human

life,' says Mr. Drummond in his new *Kerr Lecture*, 'in the highest plane of human life, to the cravings of the human heart after God and the truth about God, what Jesus contributed, His most original gift, that which imparted a new vitality to all that had ever been said before, was Himself. But then it follows that His teaching could not but be original. The personality gave it character and power.'

So Jesus becomes our example in His preaching as well as in His life. There are three features of His preaching, says Mr. Drummond, that are of fundamental importance. They are Repetition, Accommodation, and Progress.

The most striking example of Repetition which Mr. Drummond mentions is the Sermon on the Mount. For he believes that what St. Matthew gives was delivered on one occasion, and what St. Luke gives was partly a repetition of St. Matthew's given on some other occasion, and partly new matter given on the same or on some third occasion. And why not? Our Lord's ministry covers three tracts of country and three great stretches of preaching. First there is the public ministry in Jerusalem and Judæa, told by St. John; next a similar ministry in the far north, on both sides of the Sea of Galilee, told by all the Synoptists; and then a ministry south of the Sea of Galilee, and covering both sides of the river Jordan. What was to hinder our Lord repeating in one place the teaching of another?

And if in the examples of repeated teaching or work there are striking resemblances, who will wonder at that? Who would be surprised to find two very similar cases in a physician's diary? In the recent Spanish-American War, two Spanish fleets were destroyed by two American fleets, the one at Santiago in the West Indies, the other at the other side of the world, in Manilla Bay of the Philippines, and under the extraordinary conditions that in the one case no life was lost on the American side, and in the other only one.

Accommodation is an unsavoury word. But there is nothing offensive in Mr. Drummond's use of it. He simply means that Christ took pains to make His purpose clear, His influence tell. Mr. Drummond quotes from Dr. Robertson's *German Student Life*: 'Explain to me Hegelianism, Hermann.' 'You could not understand it, Louisa.' 'Nay, say rather that you are not able to explain it; for it seems to me that what one understands himself, he ought to be able to explain to another.' 'Yes, to one who can also understand; I could not explain it, for instance, to a crow!' 'No, but one crow could explain it to another crow, if he understood it himself. They seem to understand each other's cawing when their college meets in the ploughed fields.' Christ became man for this among other things that He might explain God to us, and He was able to do it so that we understood. He would explain, for example, that God is love, and He gave not a definition of love, but a concrete example. 'Herein is love—that God sent His Son to be the propitiation.'

Christ accommodated Himself to all, outcast and Pharisee alike, that He might do the best for them that was possible. And Mr. Drummond believes it is the missing of this principle of accommodation that has caused Tolstoy to run into his extravagances. 'Sell all that thou hast' was good for the rich young ruler, because riches was the one thing that came between him and eternal life. But the ties of home or the delights of study may mean far more to another man, and that is what he may be asked to sacrifice for Christ.

But the third is the most important of these three features of Christ's teaching—the progressive unfolding of the truth. In spite of all difficulty as to date, duration of ministry, or even sequence of event, Mr. Drummond believes that we can trace the progress of Christ's teaching and see it pass from point to point. In the earlier part the keynote is the Kingdom of God. Then in the

Parables of the Kingdom its pre-eminently spiritual character is suggested, later the Kingdom becomes a comparatively rare term, except in private intercourse with His disciples, or where He is breaking new ground. In its place is found teaching about Himself. Then, when the disciples have realised that He is the Christ, the Saviour of the world, He initiates them into the inevitable issue of His career, the Crucifixion. Last of all come the apocalyptic scenes, crowding the closing pages of St. Matthew's Gospel.

It seems that the doctrine of the Atonement is not now preached as it used to be. Tennyson confesses to God that

> Our little systems have their day,
> They have their day and cease to be.

What are these little systems? Are they the doctrines of Christianity? And is the great doctrine of the Atonement one of them? It was the centre of all belief to our evangelical fathers. But other truths have come to the front in our day—the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of man, the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, our Lord's conception of the Kingdom of Heaven. To the Atonement, says Professor Adeney, preachers in this country make but meagre reference; preachers in America, says Dr. Munger, often leave it untouched. Has the doctrine of the Atonement had its day and ceased to be?

Professor Adeney says (and Dr. Munger agrees with him) that the neglect of the doctrine of the Atonement is due to the difficulty of understanding it. Men do not deny the fact of the Atonement, but they despair now of finding a working theory of it. So they preach the fact and leave the theory alone. But, says Professor Adeney, a fact that is treated in this way, isolated from thought, detached from any system of related facts, unexplained and unjustified, sinks into neglect. Its bare affirmation is no better than the statement of a dead dogma. It gradually withers and finally perishes of intellectual starvation. It is therefore not that the doctrine of the Atonement has had its day and ceased to be. Its eclipse is temporary, and is due to our own intellectual cowardice. We must recover a working theory.

Sometime last year the editor of the *Christian World* requested seventeen representative theologians to write down their theory of the Atonement. What they wrote appeared week by week in the *Christian World*, and now the seventeen articles have been republished by Messrs. James Clarke in a single convenient volume under the title of *The Atonement in Modern Light.* Three of the seventeen theologians are Continental: Professors Fréderic Godet of Neuchâtel, Adolf Harnack of Berlin, and Auguste Sabatier of Paris. Three are American: Dr. Lyman Abbott, Dr. Washington Gladden, and Dr. T. T. Munger. The rest are British: Dean Farrar of Canterbury and Dean Fremantle of Ripon, Professor Adeney of New College, London, Principal Cave of Hackney, Professor Dods of Edinburgh, Dr. Forsyth of Cambridge, Dr. Horton of London, Dr. Hunter of Glasgow, Mr. Campbell of Brighton, Mr. Silvester Horne of Kensington, and Mr. Bernard Snell of Brixton. They may not be representative of the Churches. Perhaps we could scarcely have expected that. But they are representative of theology. Between Dr. Hunter and Dr. Cave there is room for almost every shade of opinion on the doctrine of the Atonement, and almost every shade of opinion is expressed here. If it is possible to find a modern working theory of the Atonement, we should find it in this book.

The word Atonement has two meanings, both of which are found in our Authorized Version. In Ro 5^{11} it signifies reconciliation, in the margin of Job 33^{24} it signifies the means of reconciliation. The difference of meaning arises from the derivation. There was an Old English word, onement, which meant harmony. To set two persons at onement was to reconcile them. When the word

atonement was taken from that idea it meant reconciliation. But meantime a verb 'atone' had sprung up, with the sense of appease or make amends. And when atonement was taken directly from that verb, it expressed not the reconciliation itself, but the means by which the reconciliation was effected. The latter is the sense in which the word is now used in theology. When we speak of the doctrine of the Atonement, we speak of *the means by which* Christ restored the broken harmony between God and man. This was the way in which the editor of the *Christian World* understood the word when he invited his representative theologians to describe their doctrine of the Atonement. And this was the sense in which they all responded, except one.

Dr. Hunter of Glasgow does not believe in the Atonement. He does not believe that there is anything to atone for. Without saying so, he uses the word throughout in the old and obsolete sense of harmony. And he says that as the harmony between God and man has never been broken, there is no room for an atonement, there is no room even for a reconciliation. 'The race of mankind,' he says, 'has never been more one with God than it is to-day.

In Adam's fall
We sinned all

is theory, not fact. The Christian doctrine of Atonement is not bound up with any such unscientific and unhistorical positions. It is the rise, not the fall, of man with which the study of history makes us acquainted.'

Dr. Hunter does not say that we are all in perfect harmony with God. But in so far as we are out of harmony he says that that is due to our imperfect development. Complete harmony is effected through self-development and self-realisation. There is no need for an atonement for sin, since no man has sinned. Professor Harnack says, 'Christianity is the religion of redemption, because it is the religion of forgiveness.' But Dr. Hunter sees nothing in man to forgive. 'The sense of sin,' he says, 'is not the sign of degeneration, but of a moral uprising.' There is no need of reconciliation and no room for Atonement. 'There is no other way of Atonement than the way of obedience—every man's free obedience to the Divine laws of his being and life.'

All the rest believe in the forgiveness of sins. And what is much more remarkable, all the rest believe that in some way or other the forgiveness of sins depends on Christ. The doctrine of 'free forgiveness,' as it is called, is not the doctrine of any of these writers. Dr. Horton used to say, though he has retracted it in this article, and the Dean of Canterbury still says, that we cannot trace the connexion between Christ and the forgiveness of sins, or, in other words, that we have the fact, but cannot discover the theory of the Atonement. But all hold that Christ made an atonement, that He lived and died for our sins according to the Scriptures.

Now, if we may consider these seventeen representative theologians sufficient to cover all the varieties of belief in our day regarding the Atonement, there are just three ways of stating the connexion between Christ and the forgiveness of sins. The forgiveness of sins follows immediately upon repentance. Probably we are all agreed upon that. Very well, we repent as soon as we see that God loves us. And it is in the life and especially the death of Christ that we see that God loves us. That is the first way.

Mr. Snell says that the work which was given Christ to do was the manifestation to men of the love of God. When He did that He became our Redeemer. The service, says Professor Harnack, which Christ rendered for sinners during His mission had the single object of convincing them that forgiving Love is mightier than the Justice before which they tremble. 'God is love,' he says; 'He has always been Love, and will remain so. The consolation of the gospel of Jesus consists in this, that He has revealed unto us God

as eternal Love. Far be the thought from us that God has been turned from wrath to love, and that something had to be paid or sacrificed in order that He might love and forgive.' 'Christ's Atonement,' says Dr. Gladden, 'is the reconciliation of man to God, and the method of reconciliation is revelation.'

Christ's revelation of the love of God was by means of His life, but chiefly by means of His death. His death has no separate significance, however. Its supreme efficacy lies in the fact that it was the end and climax of His life of suffering. His death, says Mr. Snell, was the culmination of His lifelong obedience, the supreme proof of His fidelity to the Father. He made the complete sacrifice by doing the will of God *to the end.* Not only in His sufferings, says Dr. Gladden, but also in His whole life He reveals God to men. 'Our Lord,' says Dean Farrar, 'did not speak by any means habitually, or exclusively, of His death, but always represented it as a part of, and in one sense the culmination of, His voluntary self-sacrifice.'

So then, according to this theory, the power of the Cross lies in this, that it is the clearest revelation of the love of God to men. Of course its suffering and the suffering of Christ's whole life was real suffering. It is not a mere dramatic spectacle. Dr. Lyman Abbott says that of all theories of the Atonement that which represents the crucifixion of Christ as a dramatic spectacle, devised to produce an emotional effect upon a world of spectators, is the least deserving of intellectual or spiritual effect. But it was only suffering. There was no vicariousness in it. Mr. Silvester Horne expresses the whole theory in an unmistakable illustration: 'One has often said of some rake of a son, If he could only look into his mother's heart and see it bleeding and broken; if he could see his sin in the one who loves him most and best, how his sin has been her crucifixion, then he would be overwhelmed in penitence and shame, and led to reformation. If the world could look into its Father's heart, and see its sins borne by Him, then it would begin to hate sin and come broken-hearted to His love. This is surely the power of the Cross.'

But that theory does not satisfy everyone. Amongst these representative theologians there are some who believe that there is more in the power of the Cross than that. They do not deny the revelation that lies in the sacrifice of Christ. But if it were revelation and nothing more, they doubt if the world would be redeemed thereby. We shall certainly say when we are redeemed that we love Him because He first loved us. But that is not the same as to say we loved Him because we saw that He first loved us.

There is, moreover, this serious objection to the theory that the sacrifice of Christ was simply an exhibition of the love of God. It seems to make the forgiveness of sin too easy. It seems to make sin itself too slight. Now whatever Christ did, He did not belittle sin. Mr. Campbell says that the sense of guilt is deeper now than ever it was before, and that that is due to the influence of Christ. He says that even between the Psalmists and the Christian saints there is in this respect a great difference. The contrition caused by the influence of Christ strikes a deeper note and contains a new ingredient. The sorrow for sin of the Christian saint manifests itself in a larger charity towards others as well as in a keener severity towards self. But it is felt that the immediate pardon of sin upon the sight of the sufferings of Christ could not have produced this deeper sense of sin. If pardon may be had at so cheap a price, sin is not so exceeding sinful. Even the cry of a Hebrew psalmist, 'Against Thee only have I sinned,' would become unintelligible to a Christian saint; it might even be described by him as morbid self-mortification.

It is true that God is love and Christ came to declare it. But, as Dr. Forsyth puts it, '*God is Love* has in the New Testament no meaning apart

from the equally prominent idea of righteousness, of God as the author and guardian of the moral holy law.' 'It is an immoral love,' he says, 'that has no moral hesitation about mercy.' In the way of a 'free pardon' of sin there lies the moral law of God. To prevent the sinner from lightly esteeming his sin, to prevent us all from lowering the love of God to a sentimental affection unworthy of even an earthly father, we must believe that satisfaction has to be made to the majesty and inviolability of the law of holiness.

For, after all, it is not forgiveness that is the first consideration; it is restoration to righteousness. In the Cross of Christ, therefore, righteousness must be as clearly revealed as love. 'The question,' says Dr. Dods, 'is not whether God desired to forgive, but whether it was possible for Him to forgive without at the same time introducing to men's minds a deeper reverence for righteousness. Constituted as men are, mere impunity would lead to further transgression, to disbelief in the reality of law and righteousness. Forgiveness, in order to be safe from abuse, must reach men in such a way as shall more deeply impress them with the value of righteousness than their own punishment would have done.'

It might be said that the whole life of Jesus being a manifestation of holiness and of communion with God, would by its exquisite beauty awaken a similar desire after righteousness on the part of all who witnessed it. But even if that were so,—and it is difficult to assert that it is so, in the face of our Lord's treatment when on earth,—still there is something more than that to be done. Says Professor Godet, 'If this homage rendered to the majesty of goodness could exert in human hearts a hunger for holiness, it was not sufficient to repair the outrage offered to the Divine authority by human disobedience. Against this disobedience, flaunting itself so shamelessly in the world, there was need of a further protest than this simple example of a perfectly holy life; there needed a definite repudiation of this revolt of the creature, one which should constitute a solemn disassociation from it of the human will. This decisive condemnation of sin could alone restore to the Divine holiness the glory which had been obscured and the authority that had been disowned.'

So the second theory of the Atonement is that the sacrifice of Christ was a satisfaction to and a vindication of the outraged moral law of God. In the striking language of Dr. Forsyth, it is the theory that 'God took the broken law of His holiness so much to heart that it entailed the obedience in agony and death of the Holy One.'

Are all these writers, then, content with that? No, it is not personal enough. There is danger lest this law of holiness be conceived as absolutely impersonal, even as something outside of God to which God Himself in Christ had to make restitution. That would be a calamity indeed. With one bound we should be back at the oldest heresy again. For if the Son of God had to pay a penalty to an impersonal law, He might with as much dignity pay it to the Devil, as Origen said He did.

Besides, there is in Scripture a very large number of passages which clearly point to a change that has to be wrought in God Himself, or at least in the attitude of God toward us. There is a Greek term which is used five times in the New Testament in the sense of rendering God favourable (Lk 18^{13}, Ro 3^{24}, He 2^{17}, 1 Jn 2^{2} 4^{10}). There are also such moral attitudes attributed to God as indignation and wrath. St. Paul even speaks of men in their natural condition as 'children of wrath.' Manifestly, then, God has to be turned from His wrath. He has to be and is changed from displeasure into pleasure. This is accomplished in the Cross of Christ. So that, while it is never to be forgotten that God Himself set forth Christ to be a propitiation, there is a sense in which He Himself is propitiated thereby.

If the difficulty is raised that to speak of a change in God from anger to delight, is to deny His unchangeableness, the answer is at hand. The change is not in the character of God, but in his attitude towards man. It is His unchangeableness that makes it possible. He is not unchangeable as a stone is unchangeable, His unchangeableness is moral. He is unchangeably righteous. And therefore when the wicked turn from their wicked way, the Lord repents Him of the evil that He thought to do unto them.

More serious is the difficulty that if it is Christ that makes the satisfaction, then it is with Christ that God is well-pleased, and not with the sinner. But to that also the Scripture answer is at hand. Christ identified Himself with sinful man, He condemned sin in the flesh. 'As the Jewish high priest'—we quote this impressive passage from Godet—'who, in the Holy of Holies, before the Ark, symbol of the Divine throne, confessed the sins of the whole people personified in Him; so Jesus, in communion with the human family of which He had by the fact of His birth become a member, Jesus, the only righteous, the only One whose conscience was at the height of the Divine holiness, in the deepest depth of His being, condemned human sin as God condemned it. By an unfathomable prodigy of love He entered into the horror of the sins, of which He was each day witness, as though He had Himself been the responsible author of them; and in the perfect union of His conscience with the Divine holiness, in this *rencontre intime* between God and Himself, He pronounced the condemnation to death of human sin, a sentence destined to be ratified later by the united conscience of all humanity.'

But then, if this is true, the other great step is true also. If God made Him to be sin for us, we are made the righteousness of God in Him. If it is a substitution at all, it is a double substitution. He who once saw Jesus under the curse of the Law, now sees us in Him free from the curse of the Law. Only, as Christ's act was a moral one when He associated with us in our sin, ours must be a moral choice also when we are found in Him. 'He who aspires to salvation,' says Dr. Godet, 'must associate himself by faith in that travail of soul accomplished in the heart of Christ when He consented to be made sin for us; he must look upon his sin with the same sense of reprobation; unite himself with the sorrowing confessions of Jesus, with His humble appeal to the Divine mercy, when, before His Father, He judged sin as God judges it, and pronounced its sentence of death as God Himself pronounces it.'

For, as the Dean of Ripon says, 'the effect of the Atonement is not primarily to save men from punishment and misery and to bring them into happiness, but to save them from alienation, and to bring them into moral union with the righteousness and the love of God.' This vital point is strongly and often urged by Professor Sabatier. 'It is not enough,' he says, 'that Christ dies for us, it is also absolutely necessary that, as St. Paul says, we die with Him, that our faith and repentance make redemption actual in our conscience, effacing in us, as by a death, the consequences of sin, and creating in us, as by a kind of moral resurrection, a new life.'

This is the third theory. It seems to enjoy all that the first enjoys—the power of Christ's example. It seems to preserve all that the second urges—the vindication of the moral law. It adds to these God's personal interest in the Atonement. It tells us what the Atonement did for God as well as what it did for man. Its chief exponent in this volume is Professor Godet of Neuchâtel.

One thing remains. What did this penal substitution of Christ consist in? Did He endure an exact equivalent of suffering for all our sin? Mr. Campbell says, and puts his words in italics, that 'every consequence of human sin is felt in the experience of Christ.' Dr. Horton asks, 'Why should it be thought a thing incredible that in a three hours' agony of the spirit of such an one as

Jesus, something should have been effected which would apply to all time, even retrospectively, to all the human race with which He was connected, to the whole creation in which it took place?' The words of both theologians are carefully chosen. They exclude the gross and terrible pictures drawn by the imagination of an older and still popular theology. But they are needless, and perhaps misleading. As Dr. Forsyth expresses it, 'We are now agreeing to see that what fell upon Christ was not the equivalent punishment of sin, but the due judgment of it, its condemnation.'

Was it that punishment for sin which deserved to fall on us? Professor Sabatier claims it as a special advantage of the ethical or 'example' theory, that it does not separate the penalty from the sin. The sinner bears his own punishment. He says that it would be unjust to punish the innocent; and, more than that, impossible, for the simple reason that an innocent person cannot have the conscience of a guilty one. Now, it has to be confessed that the idea of the Father having punished the Son, is a familiar one in popular penal theology.

> He knew how wicked man had been,
> He knew that God must punish sin,
> So, out of pity, Jesus said
> He'd bear the punishment instead.

But it is only a misrepresentation. It is no more essential to the penal theory than to the ethical. As Dr. Forsyth reminds us, we must distinguish between that which touched Christ's consciousness and that which touched His conscience, between that which is penal and that which is penitential. The suffering which Christ endured was penal in that it was due to sin, but it was not penitential, for it was not due to His sin. There is no such thing, says Dr. Forsyth, in the moral world as substitutionary punishment. We still bear the punishment of our sins, and the worst punishment we can bear is to see the penalty we brought on Christ—whether we see it with faith in a saving way, or without faith to our deeper condemnation.

But more than that, and of much more practical moment, our Lord's Atonement did not consist in the sufferings which He bore. 'It is absolutely imperative,' says Mr. Silvester Horne, 'that we should be clear in our minds that the vital and effectual factor in the Atonement is not the sufferings of Christ, but the love and holiness of Christ.' 'The element of reparation in the Death of the Cross,' says Professor Godet, 'did not consist in the unspeakable sufferings which accompanied it. That lay in the silent and absolute submission with which they were endured.' Mere suffering, suffering merely undergone, does not reconcile, it is suffering accepted as just. 'The child who revolts against its punishment has offered no reparation at all.'

What did the penal substitution of Christ consist in? It consisted in His obedience. No doubt the obedience of Christ, under the conditions in which it was rendered, involved suffering, suffering even unto death. He was made sin for us. The wages of sin is death. The sting of the suffering of sin is alienation from God. 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' The abandonment to which God delivers over the sinner had at that moment become Christ's portion.

Still, it was not the suffering but the obedience that made the restitution. 'Non *mors* sed *voluntas* placuit,' says St. Bernard. 'There is a vast difference,' says Dr. Forsyth, 'between suffering as a condition of Atonement and suffering as the thing of positive worth in it, the thing which gives it its value. We are beyond the idea,' he hopes, 'that there was any saving value in the mere act of dying, apart from the spiritual manner of it. It is not a mere fact,' he says, 'but the person in it, that can mediate between soul and soul.' In this, says Professor Sabatier, there lies the vital distinction between the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifices of the Law. 'In the old sacrifices the victim is devoted to death *contrary to its will*; it is recalcitrant under the knife of the sacrificer. In the sacrifice of Calvary the Victim is not

devoted; He devotes Himself.' And if we should fail to see how this perfect obedience of Christ can be of any advantage to us, Professor Adeney suggests the analogy of intercessory prayer. 'Why should a mother pray for her son, except that the devotion of one soul may bring blessing to a kindred soul? But St. Paul goes farther in profound mysticism, teaching that faith in Christ is union with Christ, and never dissociating the work of Christ for us from the life of Christ in us.'

The Judaean Ministry of Jesus.

By the Rev. T. D. Bernard, M.A., Canon of Wells.

How little is known of the first stage of our Lord's ministry! and yet how decisive it proved! It was the first act in the grand sad drama, and the earnest of its end. 'He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.' Then was tested and proved His relation with 'the Jews' at the centre of their national life. Then were laid the foundations of all else that happened at Jerusalem, and of all that was done there at the last; and the issue of that effort was the departure to the freshness and freedom of the Galilean life and of the ministry which we know so well. Yet the evangelists who record that ministry make no mention of the previous work, and scarcely give an intimation of it. Only we are told that 'when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, He departed into Galilee' (Mt 4^{12}, Mk 1^{14}, Lk 4^{14}). 'He departed,' but from what place? and where had He been, and what had been His work up to the time that John was cast into prison? It is left untold; yet the same writer records the words, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together?' in a narrative which has made no previous mention of any work at Jerusalem or even of any visits there. These are tokens of the larger knowledge present to the mind of the evangelist, and of his definite limitation of purpose.

It is in the Fourth Gospel, which records later scenes in Jerusalem, that we have the mention and the estimate of this earlier ministry. Yet even there it is given briefly, and in an almost casual manner, which scarcely impresses its real importance. The general account of it is little more than the setting of two selected incidents, the act and prophecy in the temple, and the interview with Nicodemus. It may be useful to offer now some considerations on this general account, and hereafter on each of these incidents.

There is nothing accidental in the brief manifestation of the Son of God. Christ presents Himself to His people on a deliberate plan, but one that judicially adapts itself to the response or the perversity of men. His mission in the flesh has the same starting-point as His message in the spirit, 'beginning at Jerusalem.'

He had gathered disciples and confirmed their trustful faith by the first miracle, significant of the change He came to make, and which, being wrought in a family circle, was also a gracious farewell to private life.

'After this He went down to Capernaum, He, and His mother, and His brethren, and His disciples: and they continued there not many days.'

Having chosen this place to be the centre of work in Galilee whenever He should return, He proceeded to open His mission to His people at the headquarters of the nation, amid the concourse and animation of the Passover. Here was the first ministry. Its activity and effect are told us, but not the details. Passing by the two incidents which are related, and leaving them for separate treatment, we observe a frequent mention of the signs which He did, in 'beholding which, many believed on His name,' which convinced the more candid of the Pharisees that He was 'a Teacher sent from God,' which impressed also those who came from other parts; as later on we read that 'when He came into Galilee the Galileans received Him, having seen all the things that He did in Jerusalem at the Feast; for they also went unto the Feast' (4^{45}). The signs were, as always, and as indeed we are told, the accompaniments of the teaching, and of the proclamation of the coming