

Irish Church Quarterly

The Atonement

Author(s): T. S. Berry

Source: *The Irish Church Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 9 (Jan., 1910), pp. 56-70

Published by: [Irish Church Quarterly](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30067265>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 11:49

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Irish Church Quarterly is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Irish Church Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE ATONEMENT.

IN treating of "The Atonement" in his book on *Christianity and the Supernatural*, the Bishop of Ossory writes:

"While faith clings to the doctrine of salvation through the cross of Christ, intelligence fails to see how the death of one person can avail for the pardon of another."

Hence he adds:

"The true conclusion is that an atonement, if it is to be at all, must be transcendent; it must belong to a realm of being to which our minds cannot ascend; it must be in the strictest sense *supernatural*."

The words remind us of Bishop Butler's well-known counsel concerning the same subject:

"It is our wisdom thankfully to accept the benefit, by performing the conditions upon which it is offered on our part, without disputing how it was procured on His."

So far, however, as Bishop Butler's attitude is concerned it may be remarked that throughout the chapter on "A Mediator and Redeemer" there is a constant confusion between vicarious *suffering* and vicarious *punishment*, which are widely different conceptions; and further, that the argument drawn from the prevalence of propitiatory sacrifices all over the world, in proof of the statement that it is against the general sense of mankind that repentance alone is sufficient to expiate guilt, must, when applied to the Christian doctrine of the atonement, be modified by the consideration that, as a rule, these propitiatory sacrifices were prompted by the conception that a malevolent spirit must be appeased lest doom should fall on mankind.

That there is a transcendent element in the atonement no one who has really thought on the subject will deny—that there is in this supreme fact a love unfathomable, a power illimitable, a meaning inexhaustible. But at the same time questions of practical importance are

bound up with the interpretation of the fact, questions as to the character of God, the ultimate purpose of redemption, the part that man has to take in working out his own salvation. The death of Christ was an event, a tragedy which took place on the stage of human history, it was a part of a great revelation. We cannot therefore acquiesce merely in its transcendence so far as our intelligence is concerned: we are compelled to face the problem, Why was it "that Christ must suffer"?

There have been many theories of the atonement: it is not proposed here to add another to their number; but rather to see whether the New Testament does not enable us to reach a partial solution of the problem, a solution which appeals to our intelligence, as well as to our practical experience.

It is well to preface the inquiry by the statement that in this matter pre-eminent authority must be given to the teaching and revelation of Him who is the author and perfecter of our faith. The cry "Back to Christ" has a real meaning when we discuss what formed one chief aspect of His incarnate work. The apostles, it must be remembered, were Jews: they were men whose whole religious consciousness was permeated with the Jewish sacrificial system, so permeated that for years after the ascension they continued to attend and to participate in those sacrifices. The attitude of St. Paul, champion though he was of Christian liberty, was in this respect precisely similar to that of the twelve. The day of atonement was one of the yearly observances at that period. We have no reason to suppose that it formed an exception to those Jewish services in which the leaders of the Christian Church joined. It was not until the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple in A.D. 70 that Christianity was completely emancipated from Judaism. Most of the epistles in the New Testament were written before that date. If therefore any divergence can be detected between the teaching of the Gospels and that of the other books in the New Testa-

ment as to the meaning and purpose of the death of Christ, we must for every reason give the preference to His own utterances. To put the thought in other words, apostolic teaching in reference to the atonement must be made subject to the revelation given by our Lord, rather than be regarded as an absolutely independent source of information, invested with equal authority.

The first point therefore which meets us in our inquiry is, What has our Lord Jesus Christ revealed to us as to the forgiveness by God of human sin?

1. That the forgiveness of God is absolutely free and spontaneous, that it is bestowed without any agency intervening to render its exercise possible, other than the penitent cry of the conscience-stricken sinner. Witness the teaching of the parable of the two debtors, "When they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both"¹; the parable of the unmerciful servant, "And the Lord of that servant, being moved with compassion, released him and forgave him the debt"²; above all, the parable of the prodigal son, the father welcomes, receives, restores the son freely and as the consequence of the love which he bore him.³ It has been said that for two persons free forgiveness is a difficulty, for a king and for a father, because such forgiveness might result in demoralizing consequences for the country and the family. It is to be noticed that our Lord nevertheless represents God precisely under these two relationships when He desires to convey to us the freeness and fulness of God's forgiveness; in the parable of the unmerciful servant God is a king, in the parable of the prodigal son He is a father.

When we read these stories of the mercy and love of God, the conviction is borne in upon us that to believe in a difficulty in the way of God's forgiveness of the sin of man—in the existence of a barrier that had to be removed before His forgiveness could be bestowed, this is not to supplement, but to contradict Christ's revela-

¹ St. Luke vii. 42. ² St. Matthew xviii. 27. ³ St. Luke xv. 20-24.

tion of the Father in His relationship to His erring children.

It illustrates the baneful effect of certain "theories" of the atonement to note that some writers, finding a difficulty in reconciling their "theory" with the parable of the prodigal son, have argued that the father in the parable is not God the Father, but God the Son.¹ Such a method of exegesis renders apparent the straits to which men are driven when they maintain that a barrier existed which had to be removed before God's forgiveness could be bestowed. Moreover a divergence in character is thereby involved between the Persons in the Trinity—God the Son in His mercy and love standing between sinful man and the justice and righteousness of an offended God. Nay, further, this "theory" destroys the whole conception of the unity of the Godhead, and leads to the pagan idea of ditheism, and ditheism in its most objectionable form.

It may possibly be argued that Christ Himself has said, "No one cometh unto the Father, but through me."² But the context makes it evident that the meaning of these words is, as Bishop Westcott points out, "It is only through Christ that we can, though in God,³ apprehend God as the Father, and so approach the Father."⁴

2. But further, not only does our Lord reveal to us the forgiveness of God as perfectly free, He also holds out His forgiveness as a model which we are to follow in our forgiveness one of another. There can be no question but that we are taught to forgive freely, "If thy brother sin, rebuke him, and if he repent forgive him."⁵ In our relationship to one another repentance is to be the sole pre-requisite of forgiveness. But if something had to be done in order to make it possible for God to forgive, what becomes of the parallel between His forgiveness and ours? To apply this thought to the parable of the unmerciful servant, according to one

¹ See for example a note to this effect in the *Expository Times* for February, 1907.

² St. John xiv. 6.

³ Acts xvii. 28.

⁴ *Com. on Gosp. acc. to St. John*, ii. 170.

⁵ St. Luke xvii. 3.

“theory” of the atonement, the king forgives because another steps in and pays the debt which the servant owed. But in this case would it not become possible for the servant to urge that he likewise would release his fellow-servant as soon as some one had paid him his debt? What the parable really states is that the king forgave freely, without payment or compensation, and that because of this he could say, “Shouldest not thou also have had mercy on thy fellowservant *even as I* had mercy on thee?”¹

This is a point in which apostolic teaching exactly coincides with the teaching of Christ. Notice, for example, the two parallel passages, “Forgiving (χαρίζομενοι) each other, even as God also in Christ forgave (ἐχαρίσατο) you”²; “Forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any, even as the Lord forgave you.”³ According to the witness of Scripture the problem of sin does not consist in the possibility of the forgiveness of sin.

The question then arises, If all this is true, wherein lay the necessity for the death of the Son of God? What did that death mean? In what connexion does it stand to man’s sin and man’s salvation? We can best arrive at the answer to these questions by asking further, If the problem of sin did not consist in the possibility of forgiveness, then what was the problem? What was it that lay at the root of the expressions used by our Lord himself, “that the Christ should suffer”⁴; “that the Son of man must be delivered up”⁵; and the many parallel passages in the teaching of the apostles? The problem of sin according to the New Testament was how, without interfering with the Divine gift of freewill, to eradicate the sinful element out of human nature: how to “*take away*” sin: how to render possible the great climax for the Church, “that [Christ] might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it

¹ St. Matthew xviii. 33.

² Ephes. iv. 32.

³ Col. iii. 13.

⁴ St. Luke xxiv. 46.

⁵ Ibid. 7.

should be holy and without blemish"¹; for the individual that he might attain "unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."²

Every statement made by our Lord concerning the purpose of His death seems to centre in the thought of its efficacy in delivering man from the bondage and corrupting influence of sin, "The Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many."³ The word "ransom" (λύτρον) implies a setting free from captivity. The words find their parallel in the Revised Version reading of Rev. i. 5, "Unto him that loveth us and loosed (λύσαντι) us from our sins by his blood." "The Son of man must be lifted up, that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life"⁴; "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself"⁵; "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone, but if it die, it beareth much fruit."⁶

There is one statement in the recorded sayings of our Lord which at first sight may look like an exception to the general scope of His teaching, as to the object to be accomplished by His death, namely the words used in the account of the institution of the Eucharist as given in the first Gospel, "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many *unto remission of sins*."⁷ As regards these words, it is to be noted in the first place that they are absent from the account of the institution given by St. Mark, which is so closely followed in the first Gospel. The words therefore *may* be one of the editorial comments, of which there are many in this Gospel. But if the words are a correct reproduction of what our Lord said, what do they mean? "Remission" (ἀφεσις) is kindred in meaning to "ransom" (λύτρον); it signifies a releasing from bonds, from captivity. A man is not loosed from sin by the gift of pardon. Pardon, as generally interpreted, signifies the remission of penalty. Much of the confusion of thought that has

¹ Ephes. v. 27.

⁴ St. John iii. 14f.

⁶ St. John xii. 24.

² Ephes. iv. 13.

⁵ St. John xii. 32.

⁷ St. Matt. xxvi. 28.

³ St. Matt. xx. 28.

marked the interpretation of the doctrine of the atonement has sprung from the idea that the primary purpose of the incarnation was to deliver man from the penalty due to his sin. Scripture, on the contrary, is emphatic in its witness that it was to "save his people from their sins" that the Son of God came into the world. There is, indeed, as will be pointed out later on, a fuller and deeper meaning in the word "forgiveness" than the remission of a penalty. But in the meantime it is to be noted that a man is only then loosed from his sins, when, through a power imparted to him, and with the co-operation of his own will, he is enabled to vanquish sin, to rise superior to its enslaving influence, and thereby to be finally set free from its existence in any part of his nature: "If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."¹ This liberty, the release from sin, is brought about by the imparting to man of a Divine life. Blood, as Bishop Westcott has pointed out, is the Scripture synonym for life. The blood of Christ corresponds to the sap in the vine tree, which creates and sustains life in the branches. It is this imparted life which cleanses us from all sin.²

There is a law which has many aspects, that life springs out of death. To one aspect of this law our Lord refers when He compares His death to the decay, the death, of the outer covering which encloses the germ of life in the grain of corn. It is the process of decay which sets the germ free—it is the prelude to the giving forth of life. Again, it is in this law that we find at least a partial explanation of the apparently gigantic waste in nature: the waste is to a great extent only apparent: much of what seems fruitless helps to build up and nourish life. Animal life is largely sustained by food which involves death in order that it may become the support of life. And in the great crowning act of self-sacrifice there evidently was an inevitable necessity that He in whom was life must give up life,

¹ St. John viii. 36.

² See Westcott on 1 St. John i. 7, and the additional note.

in order that thenceforward He might give out life. This was the solution of the problem of sin, the problem as to how sin, having once entered into human experience, could be completely destroyed and banished. No other solution was possible. Punishment of sin could never annihilate sin. For though the fear of punishment may deter a man from an act of wrongdoing, it has no power to cleanse the inner springs of thought and desire. Divine teaching concerning the bitterness of sin and the beauty of holiness could not rid man of sin. Teaching can point out the right path, but it cannot enable weak humanity to walk in it. In this, according to St. Paul's view, lay the ineffectiveness of the law. It was "weak through the flesh."¹ Under it the experience of even the noblest soul was, "to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not."² It was only by making men "partakers of the divine nature"³ that at-one-ment, i.e. perfect sympathy and fellowship between God and man could be effected. Herein lies the key to many of the mistaken views as to the great object of redemption. It has frequently been supposed that the one great necessity was to appease the wrath of God and to render it possible for Him to remit the doom of sin. The New Testament, on the contrary, sets forth the purpose of redemption as being to effect oneness between God and man, by eliminating from our nature every element antagonistic to the Divine Image in which we had been created, and by developing a character that would ultimately realize the ideal, "We shall be like him for we shall see him even as he is."⁴ Here it is that the fuller meaning of the word "forgiveness" comes in. "Man," writes Bishop Westcott,⁵

"needs forgiveness, redemption, reconciliation. Forgiveness in order to be complete involves not only the remission of the penalty of the deed, but the removal of the direct results of the act on the doer. As long as a debtor finds that his debt is remembered, though the

¹ Romans viii. 3.

² Romans vii. 18.

³ 2 St. Peter i. 4.

⁴ 1 St. John iii. 2.

⁵ *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John.* Note on The Idea of Sin in St. John.

payment of it will not be exacted, forgiveness is not complete. The exercise of such a power corresponds with a new creation. . . The gift of God is eternal life, 'and this life is in his Son.'¹ The possession of such a life is the destruction of past sin, and safety from sin to come.² By incorporation with Christ the believer shares the virtue of His humanity."³

In connexion with this thought it is important to notice that St. Paul uses the term "redemption" as equivalent to "the forgiveness of sins": "in whom we have our redemption (*τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν*), the forgiveness of our trespasses" (*τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων*), or in the parallel passage, "the forgiveness of our sins" (*τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*).⁴ It is evident that St. Paul uses both expressions in the sense of deliverance, release from bondage, true liberty.

It may be well at this point to consider another word, not indeed used by our Lord, but occurring more than once in the Epistles, the word "propitiation." As popularly understood this word is interpreted as signifying the means through which God is induced to lay aside His hostility and restore His favour to sinful men. But this is a heathen and not a Scriptural idea. It has been already pointed out that in the heathen world propitiatory sacrifices sprang from a conception of God as a Being endued with infinite power to hurt mankind, unless by gifts and offerings He was induced to stay the manifestation of His wrath. Neither the Old nor emphatically the New Testament gives any countenance to such a thought. What, then, is the Scripture use of the word "propitiation" and the cognate verb? Bishop Westcott has put together the various Scripture passages in which either the noun or the verb occurs. He adds:

"These constructions stand in remarkable contrast with the classical and hellenistic usage, in which the accusative of the person propitiated is the normal construction from Homer downwards; a usage which prevails in patristic writers. They show that the

¹ 1 St. John v. 11.

² 1 St. John iii. 9.

³ St. John vi. 51, 57.

⁴ Ephes. i. 7; Col. i. 14.

Scriptural conception of *ἱλάσkesthai* [to propitiate] is not that of appeasing one who is angry, with a personal feeling, against the offender; but of altering the character of that which from without occasions a necessary alienation, and interposes an inevitable obstacle to fellowship. Such phrases as 'propitiating God' and God 'being reconciled' are foreign to the language of the New Testament. Man is reconciled.¹ There is a propitiation in the matter of the sin or of the sinner. The love of God is the same throughout; but He 'cannot' by virtue of His very Nature welcome the impenitent and sinful; and, more than this, He 'cannot' treat sin as if it were not sin. This being so the *ἱλασμός* [propitiation] when it is applied to the sinner, so to speak, neutralizes the sin. In this respect the idea of the efficacy of Christ's propitiation corresponds with one aspect of the Pauline phrase 'in Christ.' The believer being united with Christ enjoys the quickening, purifying action of Christ's 'blood,' of the virtue of His life and death, of His life made available for men through death."²

It has seemed desirable to give this quotation in full, partly because of the common misunderstanding of the Scripture use of the word "propitiation," and partly because the book from which the quotation is made may not be within reach of all who are interested in this subject.

It will help to emphasize the witness of the New Testament to the nature of the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ if we notice the main argument in reference to this subject worked out in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There was no New Testament writer whose mind was more steeped in the symbolism of the Levitical ritual than the author of this Epistle. If we believe that the author was St. Barnabas we can readily understand that, being himself a Levite, a strain of thought drawn from this source would naturally mark a treatise written by him. He sets the sacrifices of the old covenant over against the sacrifice of Christ, and as he compares the one with the other the great point of contrast is that the old sacrifices could

¹ 2 Cor. v. 18 ff.; Rom. v. 10 f.

² *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John.* Additional note on 1 St. John ii. 2.

not "take away" sin. They served to bring the worshipper who presented the sacrifice back into a state of ceremonial cleanness, they "sanctified to the purifying of the flesh," but so far as the inner life was concerned, the moral and spiritual nature, these sacrifices left the worshipper just where they found him. On the other hand the blood, the imparted life of Christ, purges the conscience, the whole inner realm of thought and desire, of will and affection, "from dead works to serve the living God."¹

The written evidence of the New Testament is supplemented by the witness of the two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself. Each of them has life as its central meaning, the one grafting us into the body of Christ's Church, whereby we partake of His life, the other continually preserving and strengthening this life, as He in whom is life communicates Himself to those who are His members. "This is he," writes St. John, "that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood."² We cannot doubt that the apostle had the two sacraments in his mind. Water and blood both purify—the former outwardly, the latter inwardly. United together they effect that which is described in the words, "These are they which . . . washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."³

There are few conceptions upon which Scripture lays greater stress than the conception of sin. The variety of words employed to express its different aspects witnesses to this fact. Sin is a violation of righteousness (*ἀδικία*), an act of ignorance (*ἀγνότης*), a missing of the mark (*ἁμαρτία*), a deed of senselessness (*ἄνοια*), a disregard of law (*ανομία*), more than that, an infringement of law (*παρανομία*), a moral defect (*ἡττημα*), a debt (*ὀφείλημα*), a disobedience to God's voice (*παρακοή*), a wandering from prescribed limits (*παράβασις*), a stumbling upon the road of life (*παράπτωμα*). The inevitable result of sin was severance between man and

¹ Heb. ix. 13 f.

² 1 St. John v. 6.

³ Rev. vii. 13 f.

God. So long as the faintest trace of sin remains there cannot be full fellowship between him in whom it exists and the all-holy God. How could the barrier be removed? Man must himself co-operate, but the originating and the effective power could be that of God alone. "Ye know that he was manifested to take away sins. To this end was the Son of God manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil."¹

There is, we repeat it, no doubt a transcendent element in the atonement, but here is a great fact appealing alike to our intelligence and our experience—God, in the person of the eternal Christ, assumed our nature, lived, died, rose again and liveth for ever in order that He might, by the gift to man of Divine life, destroy in our nature the poison of sin and uplift us into full likeness to God, full fellowship with Him. Thus on the one hand Christ was manifested, according to the splendid phrase in the Epistle to the Hebrews "to put away," to annihilate, sin (*εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας*)²; and on the other hand, that "we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, might be transformed into the same image from glory to glory."³

It may present itself as a difficulty to some minds, why according to this view there was need of the death upon the cross? Could not the Son of God have become to mankind the author of eternal life without dying a death so painful, so humiliating, so protracted? Even if death was a necessary step to giving out life, could not the purpose have been accomplished by a death more easy, more painless? In answer to this difficulty, we must bear in mind man's part in the tragedy of the cross. That supreme event was the signal illustration of the utter antagonism of evil towards good. It was the fulfilment of Plato's remarkable prophecy, "The just man will be scourged, racked, fettered, will have his eyes burnt out, and at last, after having suffered every kind of torture, will be

¹ 1 St. John iii. 5, 8.

² Heb. ix. 26.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 18.

crucified.”¹ There is more than one meaning in the words of St. Paul that “Christ died *for our sins*.”² Coming as He did at a time when spiritual life was at a low ebb ; coming to a nation in which among the ruling class the forces of prejudice, of religious formalism, of self-seeking were dominant, it was inevitable that the manifestation of perfect righteousness must provoke the counter manifestation of supreme malignity.³ Thus, so far as the power of evil operating through human instrumentality was concerned, the cross was the natural outcome of a deadly hostility, the fulfilment of the words, “The prince of the world cometh; and he hath nothing in me.”⁴ On the part of the sinless Sufferer it became the manifestation of an unswerving loyalty to the law of righteousness, an uncompromising obedience to God, an obedience unshaken by the cost which it involved, as it displayed itself before those who were determined to gain their own ends and to be guided by their narrow prejudices. “He became obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. He learned obedience by the things which he suffered.”⁵ There is no intimation in Scripture that the *manner* of the death of Christ was of Divine appointment. The *fact* of His death was the inevitable result of that Divine law by which life issues out of death. So St. Peter could speak of our Lord as being “delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.”⁶ The mode of His death, the cross, was overruled so as to be the occasion of demonstrating the infinitude of the love of God and the perfection of obedience to the law of righteousness manifested by Him who came to reveal God.

It only remains to examine two passages in the New Testament which seem at first sight to be out of harmony

¹ *Republic* ii. 362.

² *1 Cor.* xv. 3.

³ This point is well worked out in Beibitz, *Gloria Crucis*, chap. ii.

⁴ *St. John* xiv. 30.

⁵ *Phil.* ii. 8; *Heb.* v. 8.

⁶ *Acts* ii. 23.

with the view of the nature and efficacy of the atoning work accomplished by our Lord which has been here advocated. The first passage is, "He is the mediator of a new covenant, that, a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance."¹ Here the important words are "a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first covenant" (*θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων*). There is no exception here to the general drift of the teaching of this epistle. The meaning of the writer can be expressed in this way, "A death having taken place with a view to setting men free from transgressions which had been committed under the first covenant." That is, under the first covenant men sinned and there was no power to deliver them from sin. Under the new covenant this power is available; it is the result of the life-giving sacrifice of Christ.

The second passage is more difficult, "[Christ Jesus] whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season, that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."² No doubt these words appear to convey an aspect of the atonement which finds no support either in the teaching of our Lord or in the rest of the New Testament. And it must be noted that in this epistle St. Paul is, to a considerable extent, dealing with positions taken up by the Jews of his day, and answering their objections by arguments which would essentially appeal to the Jewish mind. If, however, the surface meaning of this passage represents the conviction of the apostle's mind, we must repeat what has been already urged, that even apostolic teaching on this subject must be interpreted in the light

¹ Heb. ix. 15.

² Rom. iii. 24 f.

of the revelation of Him who alone knows God Himself, His character, and His redemptive purpose, with an absolute and perfect knowledge. But the question arises, Is the surface meaning of these words the true expression of the Apostle's thought? Frequently in this epistle we are obliged to go far beneath the surface in order clearly to grasp the force of the words. And the following suggested paraphrase serves at least to bring this passage into harmony with the general scope of New Testament teaching on this subject:

"God appointed that Christ Jesus should bring about perfect union and full fellowship between man and God. This purpose Christ accomplished by His sacrifice of Himself. It is thereby made manifest that God is not indifferent as to whether or not man attains to that righteousness which must be in him in order that he may have true fellowship with God. It might have been supposed that such was the case at the time when man sinned and no power was put forth to deliver him from the bondage of his sin. But now it has been made evident that God, whose own character is righteous, has ever purposed to lead man to the attainment of righteousness. For this righteousness has been made possible for him through his union by faith with the Son of God, the Redeemer and Deliverer of mankind."

Whatever view may be taken of this special passage, the purport of the general teaching of the New Testament appears unmistakable. Atonement involves the destruction of sin, the development of the Divine Image in mankind. The twofold process is rendered possible by the gift of Divine life. This life became available through the death and resurrection of the incarnate Christ. He is "the Lamb of God which *taketh away* the sin of the world."¹ He "gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity."² He "suffered for sins . . . that he might bring us to God,"³ and present us "holy and without blemish, and unrepensible before him."⁴

T. S. BERRY.

¹ St. John i. 29.

² Tit. ii. 14.

³ 1 St. Peter iii. 18.

⁴ Col. i. 22.