

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LX.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1928

709TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 5TH, 1928,

AT 4.30 P.M.

ROBERT CALDWELL, ESQ., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Philip J. Le Riche, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., as a Member.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. Canon B. K. Cunningham, O.B.E., M.A., to read his paper on "The Doctrine of Forgiveness through the Cross of Christ."

*THE DOCTRINE OF FORGIVENESS THROUGH THE
CROSS OF CHRIST.*

By THE REV. CANON B. K. CUNNINGHAM, O.B.E., M.A.

WHEN a teacher is addressing simple people he not infrequently sums up the work of Christ in three short sentences:—He came to show us what God is: He came to show us what man might be: He came to bring man into fellowship with God. And the central fact in this making-at-one of God and man, alike in Scripture and in Christian experience, is the Cross of Calvary.

We are indeed aware of a contrast between the experience of those whose burden, like that of "Christian" in Bunyan's great allegory, rolled from off their back—an experience so full of joy and peace and freedom—and the explanations of this

experience—"theories of atonement"—so cold and dull. Though this is so, we are none the less bidden to love God with our minds as well as with our hearts, and as reasonable beings we must let reason have her place in any activity of the whole self, such as is an "act of faith."

Lord Balfour writes somewhere in his *Foundations of Belief*: "Any one theory of the Atonement would be either too narrow for man's spiritual need or too large for his intellectual apprehension"; and we find, when we review the history of Christian thought, that different ages have described their experience by picture-words and phrases which were full of meaning to those who lived in that particular age.

The purpose of this paper is, then, to draw out the permanent truth which underlay these several pictures, and to consider how we, in turn, can best retranslate our experience of forgiveness through the Cross in terms which shall appeal to the heart and mind of the younger people of our own time.

THE OLD TESTAMENT FORESHADOWING.

The sacrificial system of the Hebrew people, so tiresome to British readers, and especially to British schoolboys when studied in detail, is in its broad outline full of teaching and of profound spiritual truth. This is more clearly seen if the results of Old Testament criticism are accepted, for, stated generally, criticism places the Levitical system later than the prophets, and regards that system as enshrining those great spiritual and ethical truths which the prophets proclaimed. What then, broadly, is that system? In the pre-exilic period sacrifice is of two kinds. There are the sacrificial meals (R.V., Peace offerings); the occasions of these were such as bring men together in a festive spirit. In all time, joyful events are regarded as culminating fittingly in a banquet. The Peace offering was the form taken by the festal banquet among a people and in an age permeated by religious spirit; the people and their God held fellowship in the meal. On the other hand, when the predominant feeling was one of grief or awe, the expression-rite was the whole Burnt offering, in which the victim was offered and consumed in fire, betokening man's dedication to God.

The simplicity and joyousness of earlier worship, with its frequent sacrificial feasts, could not, however, withstand the strain of prolonged disaster and adversity. During the exile,

Israel's sense of guilt was greatly deepened, and she came to regard herself as under the displeasure of Jehovah. Thus, on the return, in the priestly code published by Ezra, the early idea of sacrifice as a communion meal or a dedicatory gift is overshadowed by the realization of the need for expiation of sin, and the Sin and Guilt offerings receive the greater emphasis, and find their climax in the striking ritual of the Day of Atonement, when Sin offering is accompanied by Burnt offering. The nation is ransomed, then dedicated; pardoned, then consecrated.

[We should add that the Passover sacrifice stands somewhat by itself, taking features from each of the three more regular types, and being more comprehensive in the ideas which it embodies.]

The point we desire to press is, that the system witnessed in striking manner to the three great needs of man in relation to God in every age and in every land—*Reconciliation, Consecration, Fellowship*. If in Christ and His Cross mankind is to find "at-one-ment" with God, there must be seen to be in Him and His Cross a "fulfilling" of these needs.

Before going further, it is worth while to recall the actions which all classes of sacrifice had in common. These were three:—

(1) The ceremony of the presentation of the victim; the animal is presented at the door by the offerer in token of the *willing* intention, which alone was acceptable, and hands were laid upon it. Did the offerer think "this animal is my substitute"? or did he think "this animal is my representative"? The answer given marks a divide between substitutional and representative theories of atonement.

(2) The act of slaughter—this does not seem to have had any independent significance; the Hebrews did not delight in it more than we should do, but it was the means of obtaining the Blood, that is, the Life (Lev. xvii, 11).

(3) The significant part of the ceremony is not suffering or death as such, but the application of the Blood—the life that has passed through death and is now available as the medium of atonement, and is sprinkled in varied degrees of nearness to God, reaching a climax in the ritual of the Day of Atonement when it is carried within the Holy of Holies.

The symbolism of the Hebrew "Blood" should be carefully explained in teaching the young. Throughout the New Testament,

in the writing of every apostle man is reconciled to God not through the death of Christ, but through the *Blood of Jesus* (e.g. Rom. v, 9; Ephes. ii, 13; 1 Pet. i, 19; 1 John i, 7; Heb. ix, 14). The Salvation Army preacher finds echo in the Church hymn, "Louder still and louder, praise the sacred blood." Such imagery is inartistic, and even revolting, unless we keep constantly in mind the significance of the expression, namely, that it is through the *Life of Our Lord*—a life willingly laid down in sacrificial death and now available for us—that we are brought into fellowship with God.

THE NEW TESTAMENT FULFILLING.

We need not here concern ourselves with the difficult question as to the extent to which Our Lord during his earthly ministry had clearly before His mind the Cross as its close; it is, however, very much to our purpose to note that just as at the commencement of His ministry He went into the wilderness to think out in the light of Scripture the interpretation He was to give to His work as Messiah, so towards the end of His public ministry He went up into the mount and communed with Moses and Elijah as to "the decease which He was about to accomplish." Such "communing" does at the least imply that Our Lord meditated on what the Law and the Prophets had to teach as to the end of the Messiah's earthly career. It is in accord with this interpretation that we read that twice on Easter night Jesus sought to enlighten the puzzled disciples, and—"beginning from Moses"—"in the Law of Moses"—showed them that the Messiah must suffer (Luke xxiv, 27, 44). May we not fairly conclude that Our Lord saw in His Cross a fulfilling of that sacrificial system which was associated with the name of Moses?

The Apostolic Church, into which converts were at first mainly drawn from the Jewish people, would naturally interpret the new experience of pardon and freedom through the Cross of Christ in terms of Old Testament sacrifices, and that is partly why we of another race and mentality often find their language difficult or unreal.

Dr. R. C. Moberley shows that the teaching of the New Testament on the subject groups itself round three ideas—

(1) Ransom, Redemption—a thought which falls into line with the central teaching of the Passover sacrifice.

(2) Our Sanctification, our Righteousness, our Peace, our Life—thoughts which suggest the wholehearted dedication set forth in the Burnt offering of Old Testament times.

(3) The Propitiation for our sins, the Reconciler of man with God, the Sin bearer—and here we find ourselves in the more difficult set of ideas suggested by the Jewish Sin offering.

If we believe that all the groping of man after God in every age is under the guidance of the same Spirit of God, we shall not be surprised to find that now this and now that of those aspects received emphasis at different ages of the Church's life.

We turn, then, to consider in briefest summary form these interpretations of the Cross down Christian history.

THE PATRISTIC PICTURE.

It cannot be said that any particular theory of atonement characterized the Church in early ages. St. Paul's thought and language was not acceptable to the Greek mind ; moreover, the Incarnation rather than the Cross was the centre of thought and controversy. It is significant that the greatest work on the reconciling of man and God in these first four centuries should be entitled by its author, St. Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Verbi*. The language of the Fathers is that of devotion and of Scripture in speaking of the Cross ; and their experience is of "Redemption" and "Ransom" at the hands of a "Saviour." The words spoke to the age. In literal sense, it was one in which life was insecure : "Ransom our captives" is a petition which in some form recurs frequently in the Liturgies. Morally and spiritually, also, it was an age in which men yearned for deliverance.

" On that hard Roman world
Disgust and secret loathing fell :
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell." (*Matthew Arnold*.)

The Gospel was welcomed, as Harnack points out in his *Expansion of Christianity*, in the message of a great Physician come to heal, to redeem, to save ; and one of the last of pagan gods to go down before Christ was Æsculapius, who was, like Christ, adored as the "Saviour god."

We need not concern ourselves with tracing the error into which the Church fell along the familiar road of pressing the incidentals of a metaphor—asking such questions as “to whom was the ransom paid?” and “what was the price?”—and finding itself involved in the horrible doctrine that the Cross was the “mouse-trap” wherein the Devil was snared! The metaphor of “ransom” suggests merely deliverance at great cost, and if we must ask, deliverance from what? the New Testament answer would be deliverance from the power and guilt of sin, or, better, deliverance *for* the unfettered service of God. So the early Church echoed St. Paul: “Our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ” (1 Cor. v, 7).

THE EARLY MEDIÆVAL PICTURE.

The deliverance for all future time of the Church from the doctrine of a ransom paid to the Devil for the world’s salvation was effected by the teaching of St. Anselm (1033–1109), afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. We have passed from the circumstances of the Patristic period to another set of circumstances and ideas which characterized the early Mediæval period—those of Chivalry and Feudalism.

“Chivalry,” writes Buckle in his *History of Civilization*, “was to manners what feudalism was to politics.” Its distinctive notions were “honour” and “satisfaction.” An insult was a stain on a man’s honour, and could only be wiped out by satisfaction, though this was not regarded as payment or any exact equivalent to the wrong done. (See Sir George Peveril’s challenge to Sir Jasper Cranbourne in Scott’s *Peveril of the Peak*, chap. ix.)

The feudal system spoke to men’s mind of overlordship and homage due. Hence the mould in which St. Anselm shaped his great thoughts on Christ’s Atoning work. God is the great Overlord of the world; to Him homage is due, but the homage He asks for is that of a perfectly obedient life. No man has offered the homage, and if we could serve God unceasingly from this hour, we could do nothing to redeem our past years or touch the accumulated debt of mankind. (*Cur Deus Homo* (1098).) Why did God become man?—Because the God-man alone could offer, and did offer, the life of perfect obedience. This, indeed, He owed as man, but He was obedient “*unto death*,” and, being Himself sinless, He did not owe death; this

extra (as it were) he paid for moral damages on the honour of God, due for man's disobedience.

Such in very simple and inadequate form is St. Anselm's theory, and we can appreciate the truth and spiritual value of it with its emphasis not on the death, as such, but on the perfect self-consecration of the whole life, the only one from among the whole human race of whom God could say, "in this I am well pleased." Such thought is in a line with the teaching shadowed forth in the Jewish Burnt offering. We look on Jesus, the one and only "*Spotless Oblation*."

LATER MEDIÆVAL PICTURE.

When we pass to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the ideas colouring the minds of men are no longer those of feudalism, but of Roman Law and Jurisprudence; "satisfaction" is due, not to honour, but to justice; it is not merely a question of satisfaction *or* punishment, but satisfaction by punishment endured, and in theology we meet for the first time with the word "punishment" in reference to the Cross of Christ. We are here obviously on dangerous and difficult ground, and the modern mind is certainly right in insisting—

(1) That any explanation of the atoning work of Christ is to be rejected which implies a dualism in the Godhead—wrath pitted against mercy; the Father of one mind and the Son of another (*cf.* Milton's *Paradise Lost*). Scripture, on the other hand, teaches that the action throughout is of God, who "so loved the world that He gave His Son."

(2) It is impossible to consider Our Lord as in any sense "guilty"—"*maledictum Dei*" is a phrase used by Luther, but is really intolerable.

(3) Punishment cannot be transferred under any system of justice (*see* a classical illustration of this in Scott's *Waverley*, chap. lxviii); vicarious suffering is indeed one of the noblest and purifying forces in the world, but there can be no vicarious punishment, nor can the word be applied to the Cross.

Are we then to throw over the whole idea of "satisfaction" in reference to the death of Christ? The Christian Church is deeply committed to the words: "He made there . . . a sufficient . . . satisfaction for the sins of the whole world"

—the words of our Prayer Book find echo alike in Roman and in Protestant teaching. Modern scholars (Dr. Denney, Dr. Mozley, Dr. Carnegie Simpson, and, perhaps, we may add, Canon Storr) are still found who insist on a deep element of truth underlying the “substitution” theories.

In any attempt to penetrate into the mystery of the Cross in its Godward aspect, we would ask that these considerations should be weighed :—

(1) God is indeed Love, but love is in psychological teaching a sentiment and not an emotion. Now, a “sentiment” is an organized system of dispositions and covers many differing “emotions”—*e.g.* love manifests itself in tenderness, in indignation, and also in wrath. The Cross then shows forth God’s eternal antagonism to sin; we dare not say Christ was punished, but should we not say that He entered into, and accepted, the doom which properly follows on sin, especially in the cry of forsakenness; “He was bowed under the burden of the sin of the world.”

(2) By His Cross, Christ paid homage to “the sanctity of the moral order of the universe,” and reveals not only the Love but the Holiness of God. If the cup from which Christ shrank in Gethsemane was merely that of physical death, then Socrates, and not Christ, is the greater figure. But what if the words which St. Matthew ascribes to Christ, “This is my blood which is shed for many *unto remission of sins*,” be true? Then all comparison between Socrates’ cup of hemlock and Christ’s cup of Calvary is silenced.

Assuredly, there is a great multitude in every age who testify in experience that in the text, “The Son of God gave Himself for me,” it is the “*for me*” which has brought peace to their soul; and however difficult it may be for us to express in terms of reason, there is abiding power in the mystery of the Sin offering.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY CONTRIBUTION.

The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed a new orientation in the theology, at any rate, of the Church of England. The Oxford Movement had revived interest in sacramental teaching and practice. The Revised Version of the New Testament, under the influence in this respect of Bishop Westcott,

had emphasized the prepositions "into Christ" and "in Christ," and there was strong reaction from transactional theories of the Atonement. With this background of thought, R. C. Moberley produced his great book, *Atonement and Personality*. The characteristic feature of his contribution is his insistence that the "Christ for us" must find its compliment in the "Christ in us." He points out how the article on "Forgiveness of Sins" in the Creeds has ever been associated, not directly with the Crucifixion, but with the work of the Holy Spirit; if Christ did such and such, it was not as our *substitute*, so that we might not have to do the same, but rather as our *representative*, so that, by virtue of His life in us and we in Him, we, too, might be enabled to do likewise. Pentecost is the completion of Calvary, whereby the Blood of the God-man flows ever through the body here below, cleansing, vivifying, and transforming from strength to strength. Christ is, indeed, our Peace offering and sacrificial meal.

Those who are familiar with the history of the doctrine will have noticed that we have omitted reference to the teaching of Abelard (1079-1142), who was the first great teacher to emphasize what is commonly called the subjective aspect of the Atonement. That the death of Christ was a revelation of the love of God, intended to call forth answering penitence and love in man, is teaching that has often found echo in English theology from William Law to the late Dr. Rashdall, whose Bampton Lecture is a full and learned exposition of this theory. We do not dwell upon it for the reason that all would accept it so far as it takes us; the question remains, can we go further?

THE PICTURES WHICH APPEAL IN OUR TIME.

It will be generally admitted that if we are to make a fresh appeal to the younger generation, it is necessary to bring the terms we use within its sphere of the things that are real.

Obviously, "Forgiveness" can have little reality unless there is a sense of something which needs to be forgiven.

It is a commonplace to say that there is less sense of individual sinfulness, less "conviction of sin," than was the case in the time of John Bunyan or the Evangelical Revival. While this is probably true, it is also true that never before has there been so widespread a recognition of the wrongfulness of things as they are. There is, especially among the young, a divine impatience at the wrongness of the international relationships in Europe and

the industrial life of our own country. I believe the most hopeful line of approach to a conviction of individual sin is to start from the admitted corporate sin, and argue back to ourselves, that it is our own pride, and snobbishness, and self-indulgence, etc., which go to make up what we see and deplore on the large scale.

A passage, read some thirty years ago—I know not in what book—has often recurred to my mind: “When you see a good man borne down and defeated in his fight against evil, remember it is not the men of his own generation who have killed him; it is the stubborn dull resistance which the sloth, and apathy, and selfishness of past generations have woven into the social fabric of our lives. . . .” With this thought we see in Calvary not a single event in the far past, but the inner meaning, the reality of the age-long passion of humanity. From our asylums and workhouses, from the squalor of our crowded streets, from the impurity of our village lanes, from every haunt of misery and crime one pleads, “See how I suffer: is it nothing to you, all ye who pass by?”

An honest mind must recognize that there is much in the world, and, consequently, in our own hearts, which calls for forgiveness. What then is Forgiveness?

To the man in the street, even more to the man in the dock, the word “forgiveness” ordinarily suggests “letting off punishment.” This idea belongs really to the law-court where personal relationship may be said to be non-existent. The prisoner at the bar is not concerned about the grief which his misdoing causes to the worthy magistrate on the bench, he is concerned whether it will be one month or six.

Now, if Theology is to appeal to the modern mind, one thing is clear, it must be translated throughout into terms of personal relationship. Not the judge, and the criminal, and the law-court, not the baron, and his thegn, and the feudal system, but the Father, the Friend, and the Home and the Child—this is the picture which alone can find acceptance.

Forgiveness is, then, nothing more—nor less—than *the restoration of a relationship which has been broken*. If I ask a friend to whom I have done an injury to forgive me I am not asking him not to punish me (on the contrary, I shall be only glad if I may be allowed to do or suffer somewhat in evidence of my sincerity), but what I do want is that our relationship may be as it was before I did the wrong.

At this point we must bring in a consideration of great

importance for the understanding of the Cross. Forgiveness is the restoration of broken relationship, but relationships, as Bishop Temple points out, vary in degree of nearness, and forgiveness must vary in corresponding degree of cost. If my tailor sends in his account, which I have already paid, a second time, I go round and remonstrate. He apologises for the oversight, and I, remembering that I in turn forget at times to sign my cheques, forgive with ease. If there has been real fraud, and the man says he is really sorry, then the angels must "get busy"; but, even so, forgiveness will not cost very much. It does not require me to make the man my friend or to ask him to dinner. I restore to him my custom, and the forgiveness is complete in the particular relation of tradesman and customer—we are as we were before the incident occurred.

If, however, one whom I love betrays my trust and brings dishonour on my name, then forgiveness is going to cost much, just because our relationship has been so close; it must cost passion on both sides—the passion of repentance in the wrongdoer and the passion of suffering on the part of the forgiver. This, which is not theology but experience of ordinary life, enables us to understand how much it must cost God to forgive. The relationship into which He would draw His children to Himself is unimaginably close; He will have no half-forgiveness; His love is greater than that of Mother or of Friend.

Men ask, if God is Love, why cannot He forgive us, as it were, "out of hand"? Why bring in a Cross at all? The answer can be given along more than one line of thought:—

(1) If God merely "let bygones be bygones," men, so casual as we are, would suppose God did not really care about sin, that His Love was indifference to evil. The Cross of Christ forbids any such thought. Beholding the Cross, we see what it cost God to forgive. Hearing that repeated cry (imperfect tense) "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," we can never pretend that God does not mind about sin.

(2) The Cross is needful because, as Abelard truly taught, it is suffering Love which constitutes the strongest motive to repentance.

Does it then appear that what man can offer is Repentance, as though by this "work" we merited God's forgiveness! But the old-fashioned evangelical view seems to have more to say

for itself in reason and psychology. Repentance includes three elements :—

(1) A man must see and hate the sin of which he repents. But this is just what we can never adequately do. The punishment of sin is sinfulness. The more a man indulges in it, the less he can see it in its true nature. H. G. Wells pictures an island in which all the inhabitants are blind ; it is visited by one man possessed with sight ; the people disbelieve him, hate him, and ultimately put him to death. The story might be an allegory of the Cross. Only the sinless, Himself without sin, could see sin in all its ugliness.

(2) In repentance a man must resolve to separate himself from his sin. But how can I separate myself from that which is now myself ? The drunkard in Rip Van Winkle says of his last glass, " I will not count it this time," but in every part of his body and spiritual make-up it was counted.

(3) In repentance a man must make reparation for his wrongdoing. But how can we ever overtake the consequences of any sin ? They have passed far beyond our reach into other lives and characters. " Can you undo " ? asked the dying sergeant, as he told the padre of a lad whom he had seduced into evil. The padre's answer was the only possible one : " No, I cannot undo, but God, revealed in the Cross of Christ, can forgive."

So we bring Dr. Moberley's teaching of self-identification with Christ (the need of being " found in Him " even for our repentance) and St. Anselm's teaching on the one life of perfect obedience, and Dr. Temple's teaching on the cost in pain of any act of forgiveness, to reinforce the simple teaching of Abelard ; and when we have tried to say all that we know, we confess that we have understood but a tiny part of the love of Him who " deviseth means that he that is banished be not an outcast from Him."

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN : As Chairman of this meeting, it is my duty—and it is also a great pleasure—to convey to Canon Cunningham the warm thanks of the Officers and Members of the Victoria Institute for his kindness in preparing and reading the paper which we have just heard. The subject is one of the highest importance to all

who profess and call themselves Christians. Personally I have to thank Canon Cunningham for much blessing received in reading up afresh the teachings of Scripture concerning the Atonement made by our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in order that I might be better fitted this afternoon to fill the post to which the Council of the Institute called me. I am free to say that by re-reading Scripture on the subject under consideration, I have felt myself greatly benefited; and I have been much encouraged by examining afresh my own moorings in connection with this fundamental doctrine. Canon Cunningham's paper has, therefore, been to me the cause of, if not also the channel of, much blessing, and for this I desire heartily to thank him. I have, therefore, great pleasure in conveying to the Canon the sincere thanks of the Institute and of all present.

It also falls to my lot to lead off in such discussion as may follow on the subject before us, and on the way in which it has been dealt with by the author. The paper readily divides itself into *three* sections, each consisting of four pages. I should like the last four pages to be considered very carefully in relation to their suggested method of approaching the young people of the present day when dealing with this great subject. The second four pages (pp. 152-5) treat largely of various theories that have been advanced from the eleventh century till the present day. These theories do not greatly appeal to me, and of each one of them it may be safely said, as Lord Balfour puts it, that "any one theory of the Atonement would be too narrow for man's spiritual need." In my judgment, each of these theories advanced can be rightly so characterized "too narrow!"

I will, therefore, confine myself to the section of the paper comprised in the first four pages, in which the author deals with his subject from two points of view—first, "The Old Testament Foreshadowing," and, second, "The New Testament Fulfilling." If I understand the author aright, the Old Testament foreshadowing of the Atonement contains very shadowy (if not very shady) teaching! The author divides the Old Testament period into three—namely, a pre-exilic, an exilic, and a post-exilic period—and it would seem that in the pre-exilic period there was not much in Scripture that had any reference, near or remote, to the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. The only two sacrifices named as being then in vogue

were the Peace-Offering—characterized as a festal-banquet, at which the people and their God held fellowship (there is nothing of Sin in this)—and the Burnt-Offering, made when the people felt themselves oppressed by a feeling of grief or awe, which led them to conclude that they ought to dedicate themselves as a people to God (there seems to be little of Repentance in this, and less of Sin). According to the author, there was no Levitical system, as we understand it, in those days. The system, so called, came into existence after the later Prophets had proclaimed great spiritual and ethical truths, which came to be enshrined in a system. I am not prepared to accept this rearrangement of Scripture, which practically does away with the Mosaic Institutions, and makes them really a sacrificial system associated only with the name of Moses. I cannot accept the statement made regarding the priestly code published by Ezra.

The second period is the exilic, during which Israel's sense of guilt was greatly deepened, and she began to regard herself as under the displeasure of Jehovah; and the third is the post-exilic, when this sense of guilt overshadowed all their earlier offerings, and the people began to realize the need for expiation of sin. Thus there were instituted in this post-exilic period the Sin-Offering and the Guilt-Offering, and perhaps others. As I read Scripture, these are not the facts.

Coming now to "The New Testament Fulfilling," I feel myself as much at a loss to endorse the statements of the paper here as in the previous section. The author evidently thinks that it is a very difficult question to determine whether, during His earthly ministry, our Lord had clearly before His mind the Cross as its close. Apparently, being in doubt as to this, our Lord retired into the wilderness *to think the matter out in the light of Scripture*—to think out what interpretation He was to give to His work as Messiah *so as to conform it to what He found to be taught in the Scriptures*. Even when drawing near to the time when He was to be offered up, it would seem that our Lord was not convinced that He had properly gripped the teaching of the Law and the Prophets with regard to the end of the Messiah's earthly career. Consequently, He went up into the Mount *to commune with Moses and Elias*, to be Himself enlightened as to the deace which He was about to accomplish; and having been so enlightened, He returned to show to His

disciples that His Cross was meant to be a fulfilling of that sacrificial system which was associated with the name of Moses !

If these are correct deductions from the paper, one wonders why our Lord should put Himself to the trouble to climb a mountain, with a view to ascertain from two men the meaning of His own life, especially as neither of those men had apparently anything to do either with the sacrificial system or with the prophecies upon which the system was based. Without irreverence, one might ask why did not our Lord confer with Ezra ?

I cannot agree with the doctrine of the Atonement as herein explained. From all eternity, our Lord knew what lay before Him. He was party to the Covenant made with His Father with a view to man's redemption. He knew and taught that He was sent by His Father to be the Saviour of the world. He knew and taught that His death would be the means by which men should be reconciled to God. He knew that there were divine necessities that had to be met, as well as human barriers that had to be removed, and He had constantly His eye on the Dial of God, waiting for the hour when He, through the Eternal Spirit, should offer Himself a sacrifice for the sins of men. Both by His life of holy obedience, but more especially by His Atoning Sacrifice, our Lord met and satisfied the wrath of God and revealed the righteousness of God. By the life and death of Christ, in a way not fully understood, the wrath of God against the sins of men was neutralized—the barriers between men and God were removed—and the righteousness of God was set free to be bestowed upon men believing in Jesus Christ as the One who had reconciled them to God by bearing their sins in His own Body up to the tree.

Personally, I believe that Jesus Christ has done for me, both in His life and in His death, something which I never could have done for myself ; something which none other than Jesus Christ could have done, and something which even Jesus Christ could have accomplished *only on His Cross*. The Son of God "loved me and gave Himself up for me."

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : The author of this thoughtful and attractive paper has followed a sound method in giving an historical review of his subject, followed by a philosophic analysis. In each of these sections of the paper, however, I suggest that there are

certain defects. At the beginning of the historical section will be noticed the pre-supposition that what is to be recorded is a history of *experience*. Further, an historical statement should take cognizance of all the facts. The author describes only the "gropings" of various ages, tacitly assuming that there has been no direct communication from God, the Person immediately concerned, upon the subject of "Forgiveness." When dealing with Old-Testament times, he accepts a reconstruction of the history as it has reached us, carried out in conformity with certain philosophic pre-suppositions.

Turning to the philosophic section, it is suggested that the analogy of a court of justice is illegitimate, because it is not stated in terms of personal relationships. But society is composed of persons, and a court of justice represents social relationships. Further, God is not simply a person among persons: He is also the substratum of moral values. It is suggested that forgiveness is the restoration of broken relationships rather than remission of punishment. But surely this interruption of relationships is itself penal. The pain experienced by one who forgives an injury done by one near and dear to him is given as an illustration; but part of this pain would be experienced, whether the injured party forgives or not. The remainder is due to the repression of vindictive feelings, which are not present with God.

We are often reminded of the difficulty of the transfer of punishment from a guilty to an innocent party. Would not this difficulty be removed if we could suppose that the two individuals become one? The Scriptures frequently use language implying some kind of identification between Christ and believers.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: We must always, with Christian courtesy, thank those who so kindly come and give us of their time and talents; but, having done so, I must say I entirely disagree with the general tone of this lecture.

On such a subject as "The Doctrine of Forgiveness through the Cross of Christ," we should have expected to find voluminous quotations from Holy Scripture.

But although the lecturer refers to the "results of Old-Testament criticism" (p. 149), the "Oxford Movement" and "sacramental teaching" (p. 155), and "the Creeds" (p. 156), and quotes from such Modernists as Dr. Denney and Canon Storr (p. 155), Matthew Arnold

(Rationalist) (p. 152), and even H. G. Wells! (p. 159), yet the quotations from Scripture are amazingly few.

The result of all this is naturally very serious. The lecturer, for example, distinguishes between the *blood* of Christ and the *death* of Christ (pp. 150 and 151), and even says "man is reconciled to God *not* through the *death* of Christ, but through the blood of Jesus." We have only to refer to one or two quotations, among many others, from the Scriptures, to see how incorrect that statement is. For example, Rom. vi, 23, declares that "the wages of sin is death"—not merely blood, and the only reason why we read so much about the *blood* of Christ in the Bible is because, as we learn from Lev. xvii, 14, "it is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof." Hence, when the *Victim's blood was shed*, it meant that the *Victim's life was taken*: in other words, death had taken place. So that, if we may reverently say so, however much blood had flowed from the Saviour's veins, if He had not actually *died* there could have been no atonement for sin. So that, in spite of what the lecturer tells us, the Bible declares: "we *were* reconciled to God by the *death* of His Son" (Rom. v, 10).

But the paper contains even more serious statements still. On p. 154 the Canon says: "There can be no vicarious punishment, nor can the word be applied to the Cross!" And, again, on p. 156: "If Christ did such and such, it was *not* as our Substitute!" Then I ask the Canon to tell us what is the meaning of 1 Pet. iii, 18: "Christ also suffered for us, the Just for the unjust?" Is that not substitution? And Isa. liii, 5: "He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed." If these words mean anything, then Christ's sufferings upon the Cross *were vicarious*, and it *was* as our *Substitute* that He died. Indeed, that is the great central doctrine of the Bible. Blur that Truth, and you close the only door of hope for sinful humanity!

Again, on p. 151, on what authority does he say: "Christ went into the Wilderness to *think out* . . . *the interpretation He was to give to His work as Messiah?*" The Bible does not say so. Matt. iv, 1, tells us that "He was led up of the Spirit into the Wilderness to be tempted of the Devil." And, as for our Lord learning anything from Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration, as is suggested on p. 151, surely the Canon forgets that whatever Moses and the

Prophets knew or wrote, they wrote under the direct guidance of His Spirit. So that our Lord had certainly nothing to learn from them, but everything to teach them.

I am sorry to have seemed somewhat severe on one who has evidently given much time and thought for our benefit ; but really I regard this lecture as very unsatisfactory, because *very unscriptural*. Indeed if the doctrine set forth in this paper is, as Canon Cunningham says, the doctrine of forgiveness through the Cross, then all I can say is, it is *not the doctrine of the Bible*, and, therefore, is not the message to give to young or old men in this or any other age.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES pointed out that the use of the word "at-one-ment" led to confusion and to a faulty and defective view of the Atonement as presented to us in Holy Scripture. The Godward aspect of the Cross, propitiatory and expiatory, was not expressed by "at-one-ment." "Reconciliation," as in Rom. v, 11 (R.V.), was the manward aspect of the finished work of Christ, and quite distinct from the "propitiation" of Heb. ii, 17 (R.V.). God was glorified by the Sacrifice of the Cross (John xiii, 31). There is, alas! in these days a tendency to omit the Godward aspect of the Atonement. He felt sure that Canon Cunningham regretted this, as we all do.

Lieut.-Col. F. A. MOLONY said : It would seem that our lecturer's question on p. 151, which runs : " May we not fairly conclude that our Lord saw in His Cross a fulfilling of that sacrificial system which was associated with the name of Moses ? " should certainly be answered in the affirmative ; as John the Baptist pointed to Jesus and said, " Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." As the lamb had always to die sacrificially, this was a prediction that Jesus would also so die to take away the sin of the world. As John the Baptist foresaw this, we must conclude that Jesus knew it also.

As regards what the paper says on p. 151 about the Transfiguration, and our Chairman's criticisms thereon, I note that St. Luke's account reads that Moses and Elijah spake to Jesus " of His decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem." None of the three accounts say that Jesus told them about it. Hence it seems to me that our lecturer's remarks are well within the implications of Scripture.

I had the advantage of hearing Canon Cunningham speak at greater length on this subject at Cambridge, and, in conclusion, he said : “ The meaning of Christ’s Cross in experience will always be greater and deeper than the intellectual ability to express it,” and, “ We may well contrast the fullness and naturalness with which the whole heart goes out to Jesus Christ, who made the great sacrifice, and the cold, dry theories which seek to explain it.”

MR. PERCY O. RUOFF said : It is difficult to understand why the spiritual truth of the sacrificial system of the Hebrew people is more clearly seen if the results of the Old Testament criticism are accepted (p. 149). The key to the interpretation of this system appears to be given within the Epistle to the Hebrews principally, and this Epistle nowhere favours the conclusions of the critics.

With reference to the statement on p. 151, that Christ “ went up into the Mount and communed with Moses and Elijah as to His ‘ decease which He was about to accomplish,’ and that such communing does at the least imply that our Lord meditated on what the Law and the Prophets had to teach as to the end of the Messiah’s earthly career,” the lecturer seems to have overlooked the words of the Lord in Matt. xvi, 21, viz., “ From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto His disciples how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.” These words were spoken prior to the Transfiguration, and by their directness show clearly that our Lord had full knowledge of His end, and communicated the facts attendant upon His decease and Resurrection to His disciples.

The Canon, on p. 157, urges that “ the most hopeful line of approach to a conviction of individual sin is to start from the admitted corporate sin, and argue back to ourselves,” etc. This conviction is different in kind from the conviction of sin referred to in the Scriptures. This latter is produced by the Spirit of God convicting the individual of personal transgression and sin, and bringing him face to face with God. An acute apprehension that the “ times are out of joint ” never did, and never can, produce the cry of the heart, “ What must I do to be saved ? ” It is my firm belief that the factors are the same in every age, viz., the personal sinfulness of man, the holiness of God, and the work of the Spirit of God in producing

conviction of sin. Any other conviction may produce an external reform, but will not change the heart and turn it to God.

Mr. HOSTE failed to see how the rearrangement of the Old Testament writings by the Higher Critics could be viewed as a gain, as the lecturer seems to maintain on p. 149 ; even if this could be justified on any but subjective grounds. Certainly an author who could feel gratified to anyone who made "printer's pie" of his pages, and reversed the order of his chapters, would not be hard to please. One cannot suppose that the Author of the Greatest Book in the world will take it as anything but a disservice. As a fact, the Prophets continually refer *back* to the sacrifices (which had, it is true, been much abused in practice), so it is not clear how the sacrifices can have come later than the Prophets. We must suppose they looked back prophetically ! (See, *e.g.* Isa. i, 11-14 ; Amos v, 21-26.)

As for the *at-one-ment* theory of the Atonement, it seems to be based on an *ad captandum* appeal to the original meaning of the English word, but, as the lecturer doubtless knows, the Hebrew word *kah-phar* means primarily "to cover," and then secondarily "to appease," "make satisfaction," seeing it only then that sin can be righteously covered. When we say in everyday parlance that a "man has atoned for his offence," we do not mean he has "at-oned it," but "made satisfaction to the law for it."

I think what the Canon says, on p. 154, as to the impossibility of considering our Lord in any sense "guilty" is most important. The sin-offering was "most holy" (Lev. vi, 25). Never was the Lord more Holy than on the Cross. "He suffered once for sins," but it was as "the *Just* for the unjust" (1 Pet. iii, 18). If a magistrate, as reported not so long ago in the papers, paid the fine of a man he had just found guilty of shooting a tame pigeon, he did not become guilty of the offence, though his purse suffered.

May I ask for an explanation of a sentence at the top of p. 151 ? "Throughout the New Testament in the writing of every apostle man is reconciled to God, not through the death of Christ, but through the *Blood of Jesus*." Then follow five references, none of which seem to speak of reconciliation, nor can I find any apostle, but Paul, who deals with the subject of *katallag e*. In Rom. v, 10, we are specifically said to be "reconciled by His *death*" ; and again, in Col. i, 20, we read "reconciled in the body of His flesh through *death*." Not that

it really makes any difference, for though blood in the veins is the life (Gen. ix, 4), the blood poured out always, I believe, in Scripture means "death"; "He poured out His soul unto death" (Isa. liii, 12). The blood of the kid on Joseph's coat of many colours spoke to Jacob of his son's death (Gen. xxxvii, 31-33). The bread and the wine in the Lord's supper "shew His death" (1 Cor. xi, 26). I cannot find anywhere in the Levitical sacrifices the thought of the blood of the victim becoming in itself the life of the offerer.

Unless the death of our Lord was *imperative*, to meet the Holy claims of divine righteousness, I fail to see how the Cross of Calvary was a revelation of the love of God. Certainly to the man in the street outside Jerusalem on that first "Good-Friday," to be told that that crucified One was the Son of God, delivered by His Father in order to show His love to us, the whole thing would have been an enigma. It would have spoken of God's cruelty, rather than His mercy; but when we learn that Christ died for our sins, that God might be able at this infinite cost to offer forgiveness to all, then the idea of His love is comprehensible. But it humbles the natural heart too much to be told he deserves the judgment of God for his sins, so he will not admit that Christ suffered what he deserved.

Mr. F. C. WOOD: I agree with Canon Cunningham, that there is "a contrast between the experience of those whose burden, like that of 'Christian' in Bunyan's great allegory, rolled from off their back . . . and the explanations of this experience, *i.e.* 'theories of atonement,' so cold and dull." There is indeed a vast difference. I have tried to read some of these "theories," only to leave off with very little profit and much mystification. In 1873, I entered into the experiences of "Christian," of having a veritable load of sin roll instantly from me, never to return, by coming to Christ, and Him crucified. From that moment I began to feed upon every Scripture which referred to His atoning death, both in the Old Testament *in prophecy*, and in the New Testament *in fulfilment*. I do not like "theories," especially on such a centrally solemn subject, but prefer to go straight to Scripture for the teaching needed, as long experience has taught me that it contains all that it is necessary to know.

The Canon refers to the Day of Atonement, and rightly so, because apart from that solemn day, with its special observances, the Doctrine of Forgiveness through the Cross of Christ cannot be properly

understood. I do not consider, however, that the expression "at-one-ment," suggestive as it is of after-results, gives us the true meaning of the word. "Atonement" means "to cover," and that covering was by blood, however unpleasant the word may be to the modern mind, and the teaching about blood runs through the whole of Scripture. If we desire knowledge concerning Atonement, the Forgiveness of Sins, and the Cross of Christ, we cannot do better than go to Lev. xvi and xvii to get the original instructions given by the Lord to Moses, and to the Epistle to the Hebrews for the inspired explanation of those chapters. Both portions speak freely of Atonement, Sacrifice, Blood, Forgiveness of sins, and the death of Christ, and this latter as absolutely fulfilling the others. I quote from Leviticus, as coming direct from Jehovah through Moses, and not from any post-exilic writer. No book in the Bible contains so many of the actual words and commands of the *Lord*, not even any of the Gospels, and no Book in the New Testament contains so much of the Old—especially concerning priestly and sacrificial teaching—as does the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The importance of Atonement is seen by the fact that these precise and emphatic instructions given to Moses in Lev. xvi, contain the expression "make an atonement" (or similar words) 18 times, and definite instructions, preceded by the word "shall," 51 times. The chapter begins with "The Lord spake unto Moses," and ends with "as the Lord commanded Moses." As an indication of the divine ordering of things, the Fast was to be kept on the *tenth* day of the *seventh* month, both perfect numbers; and there were to be *seven* sprinklings of blood in the holy place, and *seven* upon the altar. The Atonement was to be made for the high priest and for his house, for the scapegoat which bore away all the sins of the people, for the holy place (because of the people's sins), for all the congregation, for the altar, for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the priests, *eight* in all. The purposes of the Atonement are stated to have been firstly, "because of the *uncleanness* of the children of Israel, and because of their *transgressions* in all their *sins*; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their *uncleanness*" (v. 16); and, secondly, "to cleanse *you*, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord" (v. 30). These two verses clearly state the purpose of the Atonement (*i.e.* the covering), and seem to relate, firstly, to

God's share in it, because of His holiness and honour, and, secondly, for the people's deliverance and forgiveness.

It is very suggestive that the two offerings relating to sin were offered first, and the two for burnt offerings secondly, and that all four had definitely to do with making Atonement. Including the "scapegoat," there were *five* animals in all (the number of grace), as Jehovah was the source and originator of all these typical ceremonies and rites. But Lev. xvi is incomplete without chap. xvii. In the former chapter, "blood" is mentioned nine times, and in the latter thirteen times, and the vitally important statement is made, "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your soul: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul" (xvii, 11). To minimize this vital truth, or to pass it by, is to incur a great responsibility, as "the blood which maketh atonement" is the basis of forgiveness. "Thou hast borne away the iniquity of thy people, Thou hast covered all their sin" (Ps. lxxxv, 2). And, again, "This is My blood of the new covenant, that for many is being poured out, to remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi, 28, Young's translation).

I must quote the Epistle to the Hebrews on this important subject: "Into the second (tabernacle) went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people" (ix, 7) "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" (ix, 12). "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (ix, 14). "Death (having taken place), for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (ix, 15). "Where a covenant is, there must of necessity be the death of the covenant victim" (ix, 16). "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission" (ix, 22). "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these" (ix, 23). "Once in the end of the ages hath He appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of Himself" (ix, 26). "Christ was once

offered to bear the sins of many" (ix, 28). "When He cometh into the world, He saith . . . a body hast Thou prepared Me" (x, 5), *i.e.* for sacrificial purposes. "This Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God" (x, 12).

In this remarkable chapter, which appears to be an inspired commentary on Lev. xvi, the word "blood" occurs *twelve* times.

It only remains to indicate the main teachings of Heb. ix. Sinful man cannot enter into the presence of God, who is essentially holy, apart from blood, which represents life given up; and that in the very nature of things, must be the blood of a sinless substitute. That this atoning blood of Christ crucified, brought about remission of *sins* for all that trust in Him, as well as the putting away of *sin*, by His bearing of *sins*, and being made *Sin* for us—*i.e.* in the behalf of, or the interests of, us. That this voluntary offering by Christ of Himself obtained for us eternal redemption, with the promise of an eternal inheritance. That His blood also sealed and ratified the New Covenant, and that the Father, Son and eternal Spirit were each engaged in that great work. That this atoning sacrifice was made in a perfectly human, but sinless, body, specially prepared; and that its spacious effects are seen in a true believer by the Lord's will being written in the heart.

I think a further quotation from Scripture will in other words sum up the whole—"Justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath foreordained to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time His righteousness: that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. iii, 24-26).

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

Major L. M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S., wrote: I hope that I misunderstand Canon Cunningham's ideas, for they seem to me to have little in common with Scripture testimony. Thus Canon Cunningham appears (p. 149) to favour placing the Levitical system later than the Prophets. I trust that he does not actually favour this, for all Scripture testimony is to the contrary, and no one but

a Modernist could respect the writers of the Bible if they could lie as this theory implies that they lied.

Canon Cunningham's three statements (p. 148), describing what he regards as the work of Christ, seem sadly to water down the kind of statement by which our Lord Himself was apt to sum up the purpose of His coming. Whether we take John iii, 16, or Matt. xx, 28, we find emphasis laid, in Scripture, upon the fact of sin, upon the fact of death as God's Judgment on sin, and upon the fact of man's need of a sacrificial death to redeem him from that death. Canon Cunningham, like most fashionable theologians of the day, says little about sin, and still less about any judgment on sin. (The punishment of sin, he tells us on p. 159, is "sinfulness." According to Scripture, it is "death.") To declare, as he does, that the early Christians dwelt upon the Incarnation rather than upon the vicarious Atonement, is beside the point for his purpose. The central aspect of the Cross was, to the early Christians, indisputable. The only possible question was, as to the nature of Him who died upon that Cross. The fact of payment being granted, the only question was as to how much had to be paid for our Salvation. The sceptical mind of 2,000 years ago was offended at the idea of a dying God, just as that of to-day is offended at the idea of an angry God. The Scriptures themselves, however, are clear enough both as to the vicarious nature of the Sacrifice, and as to the Deity of Him who was sacrificed. (Even Canon Cunningham admits that the early Christians clearly saw their "RANSOM" at the Cross. I fail to see the idea of "ransom" anywhere in Canon Cunningham's own theories—compare p. 151 of his paper with pp. 158 and 159.)

The distinction which Canon Cunningham would draw (pp. 150 and 151) between "blood" and "death" seem forced. Blood certainly did, to the Jew, stand for life; but, for that very reason, the shedding of blood implied death, to the Jew, even more clearly than it does to us. The blood of Abel did not complain of life, but of slaughter (Gen. iv, 10), and the Blood of Christ, which was *shed* for us (Matt. xxvi, 28), is the basis of praise ascribed to the Lamb that was *slain* (Rev. v, 12). And why was He slain? Isa. liii, on the inspired testimony of Philip, refers to our Lord (Acts viii, 32-35); and vicarious suffering and death—the doctrine of substitution—is as clearly expressed there as in our Lord's own later statement (Matt. xx, 28).

But all Scripture testifies of substitution. Without substitution, how are we to explain the repeated references, in Scripture, to our justification. For the Modernist may indeed, like the Moham-medan, persuade himself into a hope of *forgiveness*; but forgiveness is not justification. For a man to be *justified*, his debt must be paid in full, either by himself or by a willing substitute. Nor is Paul's meaning to seek, on the basis of substitution, when he says that if Christ be not risen our faith is vain (1 Cor. xv, 17), and we are yet in our sins; although on a basis of mere "forgiveness" such a statement is a sheer anomaly. If Christ died *as our Substitute*, then the fact that He had not yet risen would imply that a balance of our debt still remained undischarged; and for that unknown balance we ourselves might still be liable. The Resurrection of the Christ, however, as Paul elsewhere points out (Rom. iv, 25), was to our *justification*, for it proved the completed payment of *our* debt.

The doctrine of substitution is of the essence of Scripture, and no man ever yet felt the burden of his sins roll off, as did Bunyan's Pilgrim, apart from that doctrine. If the very Son of God died *in my stead*, then (backed by the fact of His Resurrection), I know that the very Justice of God, instead of being my Accuser, is enlisted upon my side; for a Just God could not punish me over again for a sin already expiated by Another.

Without the Substitution of the Christ, the Justice of God is ranged against me, "forgiveness" or no "forgiveness." The *Substitution* of Christ, however, turns that most terrible of all opponents into the greatest of all my champions—a miracle of satisfaction denied to all who would look upon the Cross without seeing their SUBSTITUTE there.

There is much else against which I must protest in this paper, *e.g.* the assertion that our Lord went into the Wilderness in order to "think out" the "interpretation He was to give to His work" (p. 151). We have no right whatever, by fictions of this sort, to deny the truth of our Lord's repeated declarations that He did not speak His own words, whether previously "thought out" or not, but the words which His Father gave Him to speak.

Similarly, Canon Cunningham's statements (p. 154), that "It is impossible to consider our Lord as in any sense 'guilty,'" and that "Punishment cannot be transferred under any system of justice," are easily refuted both by Scripture and by common sense. Our

Lord, who knew no sin, was definitely "made sin" for us (2 Cor. v, 21); and that punishment may be transferred under certain circumstances is allowed whenever, *e.g.* one person is allowed to clear a debt for another. Canon Cunningham himself is forced to admit (p. 155) that our Lord "entered into, and accepted, the doom which properly follows on sin," a circumstance which seems impossible to justify, unless our Lord did accept punishment, as guilty, in our stead. Since we know that our Lord laid down His life of *His own free will*—since it could not have been forcibly taken from Him (John x, 18)—we must either regard Him as our Substitute or degrade Him to the level of a suicide. His Passion falls from the status of our Ransom, as He himself called it, to the level of a mere gesture.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

From my suggestion, on p. 151, that our Lord "saw in the Cross a fulfilling of the sacrificial system which was associated with the name of Moses," it would appear that, with a good deal of the criticism to which the paper has been subjected, I have no quarrel.

My intention was to suggest that, whereas New Testament writers expressed their experience of Forgiveness through the Cross in terms of Jewish sacrifices, other ages have likewise clothed that experience in other imagery; so it is our duty to-day to express this same experience (an experience which I share with my critics) in language that will be living and real to those of our own time and country.

The Spirit of God, I would ask my critics to remember, abides with the Christian Church to the end of time, leading us into fuller truth, and surely into fresh interpretations of the truths already received.