

LECTURE XLII.

NATURE OF CHRIST'S SACRIFICE.

SYLLABUS.

1. What analogies to redemption in the course of Nature and Providence? Why is not vicarious satisfaction more admitted among men?
Butler's Analogy, pt. ii, ch. 5. Hill, bk. iv, ch. 3, § 1. Watson's Theo. Inst. ch. 20, § 8.
2. Define the terms, satisfaction, expiation, vicarious, atonement, &c., used of the doctrine.
Turretin, Qu. 10, of Loc. xiv, § 1-16. Hodge's Theo. pt. iii, ch. 6, § 3. A. A. Hodge, on Atonement, pt. i, ch. 3. Lexicons. Knapp, § 110.
3. Give the direct refutation of the Socinian theory of Christ's death; and of the Moral Influence, and Governmental theories.
Turretin, Loc. xiv, Qu. 11. Hill bk. iv ch. 2, § 1, 2. Dr. Ch. Hodge, Review of Beman. Dick, Lect. 57. A. A. Hodge on Atonement, pt. i ch. 21.
4. Prove Christ's proper substitution and vicarious sacrifice. (a) From the phraseology of Scripture. (b) From His personal innocency. (c) From the import of the Gentile sacrifices. (d) From the import of the Levitical sacrifices. (e) From the Bible terms describing Christ's death.
Turretin, Loc. xiv, ch. 11. Hodge's Theo. pt. iii, ch. 7. Hill, bk. iv, ch. 3, § 2, 3, 5. Dick, Lect. 57, 58. A. A. Hodge on Atonement, pt. i, ch. 8-12. Ridgley, Qu. 44, § 4 and 5. Watson's Theo. Inst. ch. 20. Knapp, § 111
5. On what features do the value and efficacy of Christ's satisfaction depend?
Symington on Atonement, § 2. Turretin, Qu. 10, § 6-16. Hill, bk. iv, ch. 3, § 1.

TO the question, How shall man be just with God, natural theology gives no certain answer. It seems, if we do not

Redemption Fore- deceive ourselves by attributing to its light shadowed in Provi- discoveries really borrowed from inspiration, dence.

to inform us very clearly that God is just, and man therefore condemned. Having thus shut us up under wrath, its light deserts us, leaving only an uncertain twilight shining towards the gate of mercy and hope. When reason looks into the analogies presented by that course of nature, as unbelief terms it, which is, in reality, nothing else than the course of Providence, she sees that there are certain evils consequent upon certain faults—e. g., sickness on intemperance, want on idleness, bodily death on reckless imprudence; but she also sees that there are certain remedial provisions made in nature, by availing themselves of which men may sever the connection between the fault and the natural penalty. This fact would seem to hint that in God's eternal government there may be a way of mercy provided. But then, the analogical evidence is made very faint by this fact: that these natural reliefs for the natural evils incurred here by our misconduct, are rather postponements than acquittals. After all, inexorable death comes to sinful man, in spite of all expedients.

But the most interesting fact to be noticed in this feeble analogy is, that these partial releases from the natural consequences of our faults, are most often received through a mediatorial agency, and that this agency is usually exerted for us by our friends at some cost to themselves, often at the cost of suffering the whole or a part of the very evils our faults naturally incurred. A man is guilty of intemperance ; its natural consequence is sickness and death, and without mediatorial intervention this consequence would become certain, for the foolish wretch is too sick to minister to himself. But Providence permits a faithful wife, or parent, or friend, to intervene with those remedies and cares which save his life. Now, at what cost does this friendly mediator save it? Obviously, at the cost of many of the very pains which the sick man had brought upon himself—the confinement, the watching, the loss of time, the anxieties of the sick room. Or, a prodigal wastes his substance, and the result is want ; a result, so far as his means are concerned, inevitable. But his friend steps in with his wealth, pays his debts and relieves his necessities. Yet the cost at which he does it is in part the very same incurred by the guilty man's prodigality : decrease of his substance and consequent want. We may say, yet more generally, that the larger part of all the reliefs which Providence administers to the miseries of man's sinful condition, from the cradle to the grave, from the maternal love which shields and blesses his infancy, down to the friendship which receives his dying sighs, are administered through others, and that at the cost of sacrifice or effort on their part for him. Here, then, we have a general analogy pointing to a vicarious method of rescuing man from his guilt, and to sacrifice by a Mediator for him. We have called the evils adverted to in our illustrations, natural consequences of our faults ; but they are not therefore any the less ordained of God, and penal ; for what is the course of nature, but God ordering ? and does not our natural conscience show that suffering can only occur under the almighty providence of a just and good God as the penal consequences of ill-desert ?

The revealed idea of a satisfaction for sin, or vicarious arrangement to deliver man from guilt, has been made the butt of rationalistic objections. The value of this analogy is to silence these objections, by showing that the idea, however mysterious, is not unnatural.

It has been objected by rationalists, that vicarious punishments are not admitted in the penal legislation of just and civilized men ; and if introduced, would strike our moral judgments as wrong and unreasonable. It may be remarked, that among the ancients these arrangements frequently appeared, in the cases of hostages, and *αντιψύχοι*. In modern legislation they appear at

Intervention Usually
Costs a Penalty.

Substitution Unusual
in Civil Law, for Reasons.

least in the case of suretyships for debt. But there are four very good reasons which distinguish between human governments and God's.

1st. It is in my view, unreasonable and mischievous, to reply to objections against the morality of a substitution (Christ's or Adam's) by such a reference to God's sovereignty, as should represent it as irresponsible, not only to man's imperfect conceptions of rectitude, but to the intrinsic principles thereof. What is this but saying that because God is omnipotent Owner, therefore He may properly be unjust. Does might make right?

But it is a very different (and proper) thing to say that, while God as Sovereign, regulates His every act by the same general principles of rectitude, which He enjoins on His creatures, yet He very justly exercises a width of discretion, for Himself, in His application of those principles, which He does not allow to human magistrates, in delegating them a little portion of His power. Deut. xxiv : 16. This is made proper by His sovereignty. (I may righteously do with my horse, what would be cruel in him to whom I had hired him, for a day's ordinary journey—e. g., ride him to extremity, or even to death, to rescue the life of my child.) And by God's infinite knowledge and wisdom, judging the whole results of a substitution as a creature cannot. Hence, the impropriety of vicarious arrangements among men may be compatible with their admission between God and man; and yet no contrariety of moral principles in the two governments is involved; e. g. I delegate to a teacher, at a distance, a portion of my parental power over my child. I tell him he is to consider himself, as to this extent, *in loco parentis*, and govern my boy on strictly parental principles; yet he would be very unreasonable if he assumed power to exercise every kind of discretion as to him, which I might properly exercise.

2d. When men inflict penalties less than capital, one object of the infliction is the reform of the offender; for which a personal endurance of the pain is necessary. But when God inflicts the eternal penalty of sin, He has no intention of reforming the sufferer thereby.

3d. In those cases where human tribunals punish by the loss of life or liberty, the vicarious arrangement cannot be adopted, because no one can be found who is owner of his own life and well-being. But he cannot pay away, in ransom of another, what he has no right to part with.

4th. We found that one of the elements of offence contracted by wrong-doing was the moral turpitude; that and the removal of this by genuine repentance is one of the necessary conditions for pardoning the wrong-doer. Now, a vicarious satisfaction is

Because God is a Sovereign Legislator.

His Object in Punishing Vindictory.

No Substitute Among Men, *sui juris*.

Civil Magistrate cannot Sanctify.

inapplicable in human governments, because the human magistrate would have no means to work genuine repentance in the criminal, though an atonement were offered. But without such repentance, guilt could not be properly pardoned, by God or man, however adequate the satisfaction to justice. Now, God can work and insure genuine repentance in His pardoned criminals, through the Holy Ghost. See Acts v : 31. Hence, He can properly avail Himself of the principle of vicarious penalty. Even supposing a man could be found who had autocracy of his own life, time, and social relations, and who was willing to die for a murderer, when slain, he could not rise again; he would be a final loss to society, and society would gain, in exchange, the life of the murderer, now penitent and reformed, (supposing the magistrate, like God, had regenerating power over him). So, all the result would be, that society would lose a citizen who always had been good, and gain one who was about to become good. The magistrate would not feel himself justified in admitting the substitution, for such results, however it might be generous in the friend to propose it.

Word atonement is used often in the Old Testament, once in the New, Rom. v : 11. The Hebrew is usually כִּפֵּר literally, "covering," because

that which atones is conceived as covering guilt from the eye of justice. The Greek is *καταλλαγή*—reconciliation, as it and its cognates are elsewhere translated. It is plausibly supposed that "atonement" is "at-one-ment,"—i. e., reconciliation. These words, then, are generic, and not specific of the particular means of reconciliation, according to etymology. The word which I should prefer to use, is one sanctioned by the constant usage of the Reformed theologians, "satisfaction." This expresses truly and specifically what Christ did for believers. It points explicitly to the divine law and perfections, whose demand for satisfaction constitute the great obstacles to pardon. It includes, also, Christ's preceptive, as well as His penal, compensation for our debt. We shall see that both Christ's obedience to the preceptive law and His voluntary endurance of the penal sanction enter into His satisfaction, paid as our substitute. The established word, which has been deliberately attested and approved by the Church, is by all means to be retained. Atonement, or reconciliation is related to satisfaction, as effect to cause.

The Reformed divines are also accustomed to make a distinction between penal and moral satisfaction, on the one hand, and pecuniary payment, on the other. In a mere pecuniary debt, the claim is on the money owed, not on the person owing. The amount is numerically estimated. Hence, the surety, in making vicarious payment, must pay the exact number of coins due.

Satisfaction not Commercial.

And when he has done that, he has, *ipso facto*, satisfied the debt. His offer of such payment in full is a legal tender which leaves the creditor no discretion of assent or refusal. If he refuses, his claim is cancelled for once and all. But the legal claim on us for obedience and penalty is personal. It regards not only the *quid solvatur*, but the *quis solvat*. The satisfaction of Christ is not *idem facere*; to do the identical thing required of the sinner, but *satis facere*; to do enough to be a just moral equivalent for what is due from the sinner. Hence, two consequences: Christ's satisfaction cannot be forced on the divine Creditor as a legal tender; it does not free us *ipso facto*. And God, the Creditor, has an optional discretion to decline the proffer, if He chooses (before He is bound by His own covenant), or to accept it. Hence, the extent to which, and the terms on which, Christ's vicarious actions shall actually satisfy the law, depend simply on the stipulations made between Father and Son, in the covenant of redemption.

Yet, we shall by no means agree, with the Scotists, and the early Remonstrants, that Christ did not make a real, and equivalent satisfaction for sinners' debts. They say, that His sacrifice was not such, because He did not suffer really what sinners owed. He did not feel remorse, nor absolute despair; He did not suffer eternally; only His humanity suffered. But they suppose that the inadequate sufferings were taken as a ransom-price, *per acceptilationem*: by a gracious waiver of God's real claims of right. And they hold that any sacrifice, which God may please thus to receive, would be thereby made adequate. The difference between their view and the Reformed may be roughly, but fairly defined, by an illustration drawn from pecuniary obligations: A mechanic is justly indebted to a land-owner in the sum of one hundred pounds; and has no money wherewith to pay. Now, should a rich brother offer the landlord the full hundred pounds, in coin of the realm, this would be a legal tender; it would, *ipso facto*, cancel the debt, even though the creditor captiously rejected it. Christ's satisfaction is not *ipso facto* in this commercial sense. There is a second supposition: that the kind brother is not rich, but is himself an able mechanic; and seeing that the landlord is engaged in building, he proposes that he will work as a builder for him two hundred days, at ten shillings *per diem* (which is a fair price), to cancel his poor brother's debt. This proposal, on the one hand, is not a "legal tender," and does not compel the creditor. He may say that he has already enough mechanics, who are paid in advance; so that he cannot take the proposal. But, if he judges it convenient to accept it, although he does not get the coin, he gets an actual equivalent for his claim, and a fair one. This is *satisfactio*. The debtor may thus get a valid release on the terms freely covenanted between the surety and creditor. But there is a

third plan : The kind brother has some "script" of the capital stock of some company, which, "by its face" amounts nominally, to one hundred pounds, but all know that it is worth but little. Yet he goes to the creditor, saying : "My brother and I have a pride about bearing the name of full payment of our debt. We propose that you take this 'script' as one hundred pounds (which is its nominal amount), and give us a discharge, which shall state that you have payment in full." Now, if the creditor assents, this is payment *per acceptilationem*. Does Christ's satisfaction amount to no more than this? We answer emphatically, it does amount to more. This disparaging conception is refuted by many scriptures, such as Isa. xlii : 21 ; liii : 6. It is dishonourable to God, representing Him as conniving at a "legal fiction," and surrendering all standard of truth and justice to confusion. On this low scheme, it is impossible to see how any real necessity for satisfaction could exist.

The Reformed assert then, that Christ made penal satisfaction, by suffering the very penalty demanded by the law of sinners. In this sense, we say even *idem fecit*. The identity we assert is, of course, not a numerical one, but a generic one. If we are asked, how this could be, when Christ was not holden forever of death, and experienced none of the remorse, wicked despair, and subjective pollution, attending a lost sinner's second death? We reply: the same penalty, when poured out on Him, could not work all the detailed results, because of His divine nature and immutable holiness. A stick of wood, and an ingot of gold are subjected to the same fire. The wood is permanently consumed : the gold is only melted, because it is a precious metal, incapable of natural oxidation, and it is gathered, undiminished, from the ashes of the furnace. But the fire was the same ! And then, the infinite dignity of Christ's person gives to His temporal sufferings a moral value equal to the weight of all the guilt of the world.

Christ, or His work, is also called *λύτρον*, ransom-price ; and the transaction an *ἀπολύτρωσις* or redeeming. The obvious idea here, is that of purchase, by a price, or equivalent, out of bondage. He is also our *ἱλασμός*, or *ἐξιλάσμων*, making for us propitiation, *ἱλαστήριον*. Expiation is the sacrificial and satisfactory action, making the offended Judge propitious to the transgressor. These terms applied to Christ's suffering work, justify us in describing His sacrifice, as His vicarious suffering of the penalties due our sins, to satisfy God's justice and thus reconcile Him to us.

Before proceeding to refute the Socinian theory of the atonement, let us briefly re-state it. The sufferings of Jesus, they suppose, were not penal ; but only natural, such as would have

3. Socinian Theory stated.

been incurred by Adam in Paradise, had he not fallen. Yet God permitted and ordained them, 1st. As an example to teach us patience, fortitude, and submission. 2d. As an attestation of the honesty and truth of His teachings concerning the way of life through imitation of Him. 3d. To make Him a compassionate Teacher, Friend, and Patron to His brethren. 4th. To make way for His resurrection; which was the all-important evidence and warrant to us that eternal life may be hoped for, through repentance and reform. Thus, He died, suffered for us — i. e., *pro bono nostrum* — in a general sense. Thus, He is the Saviour and Redeemer of men — i. e., the Agent of their salvation in a sense. But He made no penal satisfaction for sin.

Now, an overwhelming indirect refutation of this theory has already been given, in our argument for the necessity of a proper vicarious penalty. Another will be presented under the succeeding head, when we prove that Christ's sufferings were vicarious. But for direct refutation, note:

There can be little reasonable encouragement in the example of one who suffered so bitterly without deserving anything. Such a spectacle, instead of shedding light, hope and patience on the sorrows of believers, could only deepen the darkness and anguish; for it could only suggest difficulties concerning the justice and benevolence of God, and raise the torturing doubt, "Can any one be secure of blessedness, any angel or saint in heaven, or is there any justice and benevolence in God, in which I may hope for release from present sufferings; seeing a creature so holy as Jesus suffered thus? He was enabled to triumph over them at last? Yea, but why did God make Him suffer at all, when He was entirely innocent? I, who am not innocent, may not be thus released after suffering!"

To represent His death as of such importance as the attestation of the truthfulness of His teachings, contradicts good sense and Scripture. All that the death of a martyr can prove is, that he sincerely believes the creed for which he dies. False creeds have had their martyrs. The Scriptures nowhere refer to Christ's death as the evidence of His truth; but uniformly to His works. See John xiv : 11; v : 36; x : 25-38; xv : 24, &c.

The Socinian scheme gives the chief importance to Christ's resurrection, rather than His death, as the means whereby "life and immortality were brought to light." His death was then rather the necessary preliminary step, to make His resurrection possible; that the latter might be, to our faith, the splendid and crowning evidence of a future life for us. Did God, then, kill Jesus, to have the opportunity of raising Him? Since a resurrection is but the repairing of a death, it seems to me that the

Theory Inconsistent.
1st. Because a Guiltless
Sufferer Suggests an
Unjust God.

2nd. Martyrdom only
Demonstrates Martyr's
Sincerity.

3rd. Christ's Death
Purchases Salvation,
not His Resurrection.

whole transaction inspires at least as much terror as hope. He ordained the death of Him who deserved to live ; so there is an instance of severity, if not injustice, fully counterpoising the instance of goodness in raising Him. Again; the Scriptures do not agree to the Socinian view ; for they everywhere represent the benefit we derive from Christ as chiefly flowing from Christ's death. Heb. ii : 14. His resurrection was indeed a glorious attestation ; but it was an attestation of the sufficiency of that death, as a satisfaction to law, and an adequate purchase of our relief.

Again ; the whole plausibility of the Socinian's account of Christ's death and resurrection is ruined by the fact of His pre-existence. For a mere man to rise again after dying, like Lazarus, is an encouraging instance ; but the rising again of a Being who possessed a previous and glorious life besides that of His humanity, presents on the Socinian view no analogy to encourage mortal man to hope for a resurrection. The answer is too obvious : that the strange anomaly of a resurrection in Jesus' case was most probably the result of His glorious, pre-existent nature. Man has no such nature, and therefore should not expect, from such an instance, to imitate Him. As well might a log of wood infer that, because a living creature is seen to rise erect when laid on its back, therefore logs of wood may hope to rise, when laid on their backs. 4th. The Socinian scheme utterly fails to account for Christ's royal exaltation. We do not allude now to the fact that those regal functions (Matt. xxviii : 18 ; xxv : 31, 32 ; Eph. i : 22) could only be fulfilled by proper divinity. On the Socinian scheme, He ought not to have any regal functions. He has not earned them. He does not need them. Sinners regenerate themselves ; and their own repentance and reform are their righteousness ; so that the tasks of the royal priest, interceding and ruling on His throne, are useless and groundless.

Last ; on the Socinian theory, Christ could not have been in any sense the Mediator or Redeemer of Old Testament saints. Their sins could not have been remitted on the ground of Christ's prospective satisfaction for sin ; for, according to Socinians, there was none in prospect. Those saints could not have profited by Christ's example, teachings, and resurrection ; because they were in heaven long before Christ existed. But see Heb. ix : 15 ; Rom. iii : 25 ; Jno. viii : 56, &c.

Against the scheme of Dr. Price, called by Hill the Middle Scheme, (see Hill, p. 422,) these objections obviously lie : that it represents Christ as acquiring His title to forgive sin only by His death. But Matt. ix : 6, says that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive sins before. It speaks splendidly of Christ's suffering in order

5th. Christ, on this Scheme, did not Redeem Old Testament Saints.

The Middle Scheme.

to acquire this title to pardon; but it gives no intelligible account of how these sufferings acquired that title. It is, in this, as vague as Socinianism.

The scheme of atonement with which we have now most concern, as defenders of truth, is that usually known as the governmental scheme—i. e. that which resolves the sufferings and death of Christ into a mere moral expedient of God, to connect such a display of His justice and hatred of sin, with His acts of pardon, as will prevent bad effects from the failure to punish strictly according to law. This view proceeds from that theory of ethics which resolves all virtue into benevolence, teaching that an act is right or virtuous only because it tends on the whole most to promote the welfare of Beings; (and the contrary). (We cannot pause here to debate this theory, but only note how intimately ethics and metaphysics affect Theology). Hence, these divines hold, God has no intrinsic, essential justice, other than His benevolence—i. e., that the whole amount of His motive for punishing sin is, to preserve His moral empire from the mischiefs which sin unchecked would produce. Hence, the only necessity for an atonement which they recognize, is the necessity of repairing that defence against disorder in God's government, which the dispensing with the penalty would break down. They, consequently, deny that Christ was properly substituted under the believer's guilt, that He bore any imputation, that He made a real satisfaction to God's justice, and that the justifying virtue of His righteousness is imputed to men. The author of this system in New England seems to have been the younger Pres. Edwards, son of Jonathan, and its great propagator, Dr. Taylor, of New Haven. This is the system known as the New School, in the North, and advocated by Barnes and Beman on the atonement. It is a striking matter of history, that nearly all the arguments by which Edwards, Jr., sought to remove the old Calvinistic theory, to substitute his, were unconsciously Socinian.

If the necessity of satisfaction is proved from God's essential justice, as we have attempted, this view of the atonement is proved false. Again: if we shall succeed in proving that Christ's was a proper, vicarious sacrifice, this, also, overthrows it. Third: we have seen that this New England plan rests on this proposition; that a governmental policy of repressing sin, is the only ground of God's justice; resolving all right into mere utility. The abominable consequences of this ethical principle have been shown; they are such that the principle cannot be true. We might add that man's intuitive moral judgments pronounce that sin is wrong, not merely because it tends to injure well-being, but wrong in itself; and that the very wording of such a statement, implies a standard of wrong and right other than that of mere utility.

Governmental Influence Scheme.

Refutation.

This ethical principle being untrue, the plan falls with it.

But further, for direct refutations: This plan of atonement leaves us practically on Socinian ground, as to man's justifying righteousness. If imputation is denied, and if Christ wrought out no proper satisfaction to justice for the believer's sin, to be set over to the believer's account for his justification, there is no alternative left; the advocates of this plan are shut up to the Arminian definition of justification, as an imputing of the believer's own faith (along with the repentance and holy living flowing therefrom) as the ground of the sinner's repentance; as his righteousness. Accordingly Messrs. Barnes, &c., do explicitly accept this. But we shall show, in the proper place, that such a justification is unscriptural. Justification is no longer properly through Christ, saving faith would no longer be such a coming to Christ directly, as the Scriptures describe it; and the whole tenour of Bible language concerning His divine righteousness, concerning His being the immediate object of faith, &c., &c., would be violated.

Last: the overwhelming objection to this plan is, that according to its definition, the sufferings of Christ would be no governmental display whatever of the evils of sin, or of God's determination to punish. These divines avow that Christ is a Person possessed of a pre-existent, divine, holy and supreme nature, not only guiltless, but above law; and of a pure and sinless humanity, the voluntary assumption of which only placed Him, by His own consent, under law, for a particular atoning purpose. His mediatorial person stood forth as the exemplar of sinless purity and perfection, to all creatures, in both its natures; and in every relation; attested by holy writ, by the voice of God speaking His divine approval from heaven in tones of thunder, by the reluctant tribute of His enemies, by the haughty Pagan who condemned Him, by the very traitor who betrayed Him, as he appears scathed with the fires of his own remorse, before his plunge into hell, and confesses that he had "betrayed the innocent blood." All heaven and all earth testified to the Son of Man, that He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" testified to the universe. And yet, the universe is invited to come and behold this Being, the only innocent Man who had appeared since Adam, delivered to torments more cruel than any of Adam's guilty sons had ever endured, "delivered by the determinate counsel" of His Father, while without guilt, either personal or imputed! Is this a glorious display of justice? Does this illustrate the evil of sin, and the inexorable connection which God's benevolence requires Him to maintain between sin and punishment? Does it not rather confound all moral distinctions, and illustrate the evils of holiness, the cruelty and injustice of the Hand that

It gives us no Righteousness Imputed.

It is False on its own Showing.

rules the world? There is no explanation of Christ's suffering innocence, which does not involve an insuperable contradiction, except the orthodox; and that, we admit, involves a great mystery.

Each of the false schemes attempts to express what is true. But ours really includes all that theirs claim, while it embraces the vital element which they omit, vicarious penal satisfaction.

Orthodox View includes All the others.
And note: It is only by predicating the latter, that the moral influences claimed by the inadequate schemes really have place. Says the Socinian, Christ's suffering work is not vicarious, but only exemplary, instructive, and confirmatory. Says the modern "Liberal Christian;" it was intended only for that, and to present a spectacle of infinite tenderness and mercy, to melt the hearts of transgressors. Says the New Haven doctor: It was intended for those ends, and also to make a dramatic display of God's opposition to sin, and of its evils. But we reply: If it was not a vicarious satisfaction for imputed guilt, then it was not consistently either of the others. But if it is vicarious satisfaction for guilt, then it also subserves, and admirably subserves, all these minor ends.

4. Bible proofs of true Theory. We now proceed to the centre of the subject to establish what has been several times anticipated—Christ's proper vicarious suffering for imputed guilt.

1st. From various sets of Bible phrases, exceedingly numerous and varied, of which we only present specimens. Thus:

He is said to have suffered and died "for us," "for the ungodly." Rom. v : 6, 8 ; and "for our sins." 1 Pet. iii : 18. *περι ἁμαρτιῶν*. Socinians say: "True, He died in a general sense for us, inasmuch as His death is a part of the agency for our rescue: He did die to do us good, not for Himself only." The answer is, that in nearly every case, the context proves it a vicarious dying, for our guilt. Rom. v : "We are justified by His blood." 1 Pet. iii : 18. "The just for the unjust." (*ὕπερ ἀδίκων*.) Then, also, He is said to be a *λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν*. Matt. xx : 28. This proposition properly signifies substitution. See Matt. ii : 22 for instance.

Again: He is said to bear our sins, and equivalent expressions. 1 Pet. ii : 24 ; Heb. ix : 28 ; Is. liii :

Christ bore our sins, &c. 6. And these words are abundantly defined in our sense by Old Testament usage. (cf.) Num. ix : 13. An evasion is again attempted, by pointing to Matt. viii : 17, and saying that there, this bearing of man's sorrows was not an enduring of them in His person, but a bearing of them away, a removal of them. We reply, the Evangelist refers to Is. liii : 4, not to liii : 6. And Peter says: "He bore our sins in His body on the tree." The language is unique.

Another unmistakable class of texts, is those in which He

Christ made Sin for us. is said to be made sin for us; while we are made righteousness in Him. See 1 Cor. i : 30 ; 2 Cor. v : 21. A still more indisputable place is where He is said to be made a curse for us. Gal. iii : 13. The orthodox meaning, considering the context, is unavoidable.

Again : He is said in many places to be our Redeemer—i. e., Ransomer—and His death, or He, is our Ransom, Matt. xx : 28 ; 1 Pet. i : 19 ; 1 Tim. ii : 6 ; 1 Cor. vi : 20. It is vain to reply that God is said to redeem His people in many places, when the only meaning is, that He delivered them; and that Moses is called the redeemer of Israel out of Egypt, who certainly did not do this by a vicarious penalty: Christ's death is a proper ransom, because the very price is mentioned.

Christ's work is shown to be properly vicarious, from His personal innocence. This argument has been anticipated. We shall, therefore, only tarry to clear it from the Pelagian evasion, and to carry it further. Pelagians, seeing that Christ, an innocent being, must have suffered vicarious punishment, if He suffered any punishment, deny that the providential evils of life are penal at all; and assert that they are only natural, so that Adam would have borne them in Paradise; the innocent Christ bore them as a natural matter of course. But what is the course of nature, except the will of God? Reason says that if God is good and just, He will only impose suffering where there is guilt. And this is the scriptural account, "death by sin."

Further, Christ suffered far otherwise than is natural to good men. We do not allude so much to the peculiar severity of that combination of poverty, malice, treachery, destitution, slander, reproach and murder, visited on Christ; but to the sense of spiritual death, the horror, the fear, the pressure of God's wrath and desertion, and the satanic buffetings let loose against Him. (Luke xxii : 53 ; Matt. xxvi : 38 ; xxvii : 46). See how manfully Christ approaches His martyrdom; and how sadly He sinks under it when it comes! Had He borne nothing more than natural evil, He would have been inferior to other merely human heroes; and instead of recognizing the exclamation of Rousseau as just: "Socrates died like a philosopher; but Jesus Christ as a God," we must give the palm of superior fortitude to the Grecian sage. Christ's crushing agonies must be accounted for by His bearing the wrath of God for the sins of the world.

Another just argument for Christ's proper vicarious sacrifice is brought from the acknowledged belief of the whole Pagan world, at the Christian era especially, concerning the meaning and intent of their bloody sacrifices. No one doubts that, however

2nd. Christ Bore Impu-
ted Guilt because Per-
sonally Innocent.

3d. Christ a Sacrifice.
Pagan Sense of Word.

mistaken the Pagans are, they have always regarded their bloody sacrifices as proper offerings for guilt. Now, we use this fact in two ways. First. Here is the great testimony of man's universal conscience to the necessity of satisfaction for human guilt. Second. The sacred writers knew that this was what the whole world understood by "sacrifice." Why, then, did they call Jesus Christ, in so many phrases, a sacrifice? Did they wish to deceive?

We find another powerful Bible proof, in the import of the Levitical sacrifices. This argument is contained in two propositions. First. The theological idea designed to be symbolized in the Levitical sacrifices, was a substitution of a victim, and the vicarious suffering of it in the room of the offerer, for his guilt. (See Levit. xvii : 11 ; Levit. i : 4, *et passim* ; xvi : 21). Second. Christ is the antitype, of which all these ceremonies were shadows. (See Jno. i : 29 ; 1 Cor. xv : 3 ; 2 Cor. v : 21 ; Heb. viii : 3 ; ix : 11-14, &c., &c.) Now, surely the great idea and meaning of the types is not lacking in the antitype ! Surely the body is not more unsubstantial than the shadow ! This important argument may be seen elaborated with great learning and justice, in the standard works on Theology, as Dick or Ridgley, in works on Atonement, such, especially, as Magee ; and in works on the sacred archeology of the Hebrews, such as Outram, Fairbairn, &c. Hence few words about it.

The value of Christ's work may be said to depend on the following circumstances :

5. Conditions of Efficacy of Christian Atonement. The infinite dignity of His person. (See Lect. xxxix.

The possession of the nature of His redeemed people.

His freedom from all prior personal obligation to obey and suffer.

His authority over His own life, to lay it down as He pleased.

His voluntariness in undertaking the task.

His explicit acceptance by the Father as our Priest.

[These have been already expounded].

His union with His people.