

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## Notes on Bible Words.

## No. IV.—“PASSION.”

THE word “passion” in our time generally means “anger”; agitation or excitement as the result of injury.<sup>1</sup> In the Bible, and in the Prayer-Book, the word (from *passio*) means “suffering.”

In Acts i. 3: “To whom He showed Himself alive after His *passion*,” i.e., after He had *suffered*. In the Apostles’ Creed, “Suffered (*passus*) under P.P.” Nicene: “He suffered and was buried.” Athan.: “Suffered for our salvation.” In the Litany: “By Thy Cross and Passion.” So the expression “*Passion Week*.”

For dying on the cross, see Acts i. 3, *μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν*; iii. 18: *παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν* (“should suffer”); see also xxvi. 23 (Vulg. *passibilis*). Luke xxii. 15: *πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν*, “before I suffer”; see also xxiv. 46. 1 Pet. ii. 21: *Χριστὸς ἐπαθεν*, *suffered*; see also iv. 1. Heb. xiii. 12: *ἐπαθεν*, “suffered without the gate.” See ix. 26: “He must often (*πολλάκις*) have suffered,” on which Dean Vaughan writes: “If Christ is to *present Himself* again and again He must *suffer* again and again. The annual presentation of the blood on the holy of holies followed upon this annual sacrifice on the brazen altar. So must it be on the antitype. If the *προσφέρειν* in heaven is to be repeated, so must the *πάσχειν* on Calvary.”

In the preceding passages “suffering” is dying on the Cross. The verb elsewhere in the New Testament several times means to *suffer*, to be afflicted—have *painful* experiences.

Next to “passion,” a concordance (A.V.) shows “passions”: (1) Acts xiv. 15 and (2) Jas. v. 17: the Greek is *ὁμοιοπαθῆς*, *suffering the like* with.

(1) “We also are men of like passions with you”: mortals, liable to the suffering of death, like yourselves.—Bishop Jacobson. “The heathen mythology made the gods themselves subject to passions and appetites, and exempted them from nothing but death and old age.”—Bentley.<sup>2</sup>

(2) “A man subject to like passions (sufferings) as we are,” “of like nature,” R.V., *marg.*

Humanity of the Bible. The Bible is largely biographical; tells about human beings; and the most eminent saints are men and women “of like nature”: not beyond the reach of imitation or outside the pale of sympathy. St. James teaches patience: how? He first exhorts, and then points to Job as an example for any and all. He teaches the power of prayer: how? He adds to the

<sup>1</sup> “The common people confine it only to anger.”—Watts.

<sup>2</sup> “The heathen were only too ready to ascribe to their gods like passions, revenge, lust, envy, with their own . . . Translate, ‘We also are men who suffer like things with yourselves.’ The Vulgate, ‘Et nos *mortales* sumus,’ is on the right track; and Tyndale, ‘We are *mortal men* like unto you.’—Archbishop Trench.

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

---

## Review.

---

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

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

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

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

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

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