

## THE VALUE OF CHRIST'S DEATH.

BY A. E. THOMAS, D.D., BEREA, KY.

I. It is comparatively easy to outline the value of the life of Jesus. Though none can measure that value, it is possible to state the lines along which it lies.

A quite different task confronts us when we attempt to outline the value of His death. Had we no revelation on the subject we would mark the boundaries of that value by what we can see of its effect on human life and character. There are many who do actually affirm that such are its limitations. There are, however, many statements in the Bible concerning the death of the Son of God which seem to give it a value and significance far beyond what man would of himself have surmised.

Some say that the value of Christ's death lay in its expression of God's love, and its power to bring men to repentance. We may readily grant to such all that they claim as to positive operation remembering that it is written, "God commendeth His own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us", and that Jesus said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself," and we shall yet maintain that we cannot give credit to the Biblical statements of the divine intention in the death of Jesus and stop with that moral influence explanation. Besides, a death has nothing in itself which necessarily shows love. The attendant circumstances must give it that significance. If a father sees his family suffering, is unable to provide for them, and kills himself, it shows not love but cowardice. If a father sees his child about to be crushed by a car, knows that he can only save his child's life by the sacrifice of his own, and does it, that shows love. If, of a father's ten sons, nine were disobedient, the giving the one obedient son to die merely in order to bring

the others to repentance would not be likely to convince the disobedient ones of their father's love but of his folly, and they would be more likely to conclude that obedience did not particularly endear a son to him, though peculiar circumstances might have required him to hold them off till they repented, and therefore in their loss of confidence they would be likely to conclude that his commands had no particular binding power on themselves. For God to have merely given His Son to die that He might induce us to repent, when there was nothing in the nature of the case calling for such a sacrifice other than the hope that such a death would show God's love and incline us to repentance, would have been equivalent to saying that He held us disobedient mortals of more value than His Son, and wanted to show it, which would have properly led us to doubt his divinity. On *a priori* ground before taking up the Biblical statements, having been assured that God gave His Son to die for us in our sins, we could conclude that there was something in our case which made salvation impossible, no matter what we might do, however sincerely we might repent, and however sincerely God might desire to accept that repentance, and that God gave His Son to solve that difficulty, remove that obstacle, open that door. Then, naturally His gift of His Son would show His love and furnish a mighty motive for repentance. We are therefore led to look farther than merely to God's desire that men should repent in order to find the full necessity for the death of Jesus.

II. An important fact appears in the Biblical statements, viz., that sin's offense against the moral order of the universe is such that a penitent sinner cannot be forgiven but for the death of Jesus Christ. This fact at once, and naturally, arouses opposition in the unregenerate human heart. Men do not like it. It is too humiliating. It makes man's sin something very great and awful, and thus is exceedingly displeasing to the natural man. It makes man of less importance in the universe than he likes to think himself. Men are fond of thinking that they are so valuable to God that he will gladly accept and forgive them on the mere condition of their repent-

ing.<sup>1</sup> Hence, when told that they cannot be forgiven except by virtue of the atoning work of God's only Son, they are disposed to rebel against the unpleasant statement. It is "the offense of the cross". But that the forgiveness of the penitent sinner depends absolutely on something wrought by Jesus in His death constantly appears in the Bible. Thus Peter, by the authority of the Holy Spirit, said to the rulers in Jerusalem of Jesus, "And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). Had he meant "which can induce us to repent", he would have said so. A man does not repent in any one's name but his own. He, the sinner, repents of his, the sinner's, sin. If salvation is to be in the name of Jesus, there must be some necessary work which Jesus has wrought, on which the penitent soul must rest. Let us see if this need of Christ's death is real.

### III. From the Nature of God and of His Government.

We can no more fully comprehend all the mysteries of God's moral government than we can the laws which He has given for the ordering of His material universe. Man is never guilty of more sublime folly than when he criticises the conduct and ways of God. We may not be able fully to understand why He does a certain thing. It is altogether likely that we shall never be able to fully comprehend the reasons for some of His acts. Those reasons involve the entire universe and all the coming eternities, and can be fully understood only by an infinite mind. Yet, as He has made us in His image, morally depraved though we are, there are certain rules and principles on which we may be sure that His actions will be based, since they are the principles of evangelizing righteousness, though we must al-

(1) Many well meaning but mistaken Christian workers are fond of appealing to the impenitent to return to God on the ground that "God needs you". This can never be true. God could do all His work without us, and graciously gives us the privilege of associating with Him in it. God existed eternal ages before He created man, and must have been perfectly happy, or He could not have been infinite. While we know that the sin of man causes sorrow in the heart of God, yet it is false to say that He needs man to make His happiness complete. Otherwise the loss of the reprobate would make His happiness incomplete through all the coming eternities.

ways admit that it is quite likely that in particular details we may not know how infinite love, wisdom and justice will apply these principles.

That God is a moral ruler all must admit. There are certain principles which all good governments must follow, and which, since God is infinitely righteous, we know that He will follow. One of these principles is that law must regard the largest interests and the welfare of the greatest number of individuals. The greater must not be sacrificed for the less. If there were but a single person under law, and he broke that law and repented, his would be a unique case. No one else, under law, would be affected by his treatment. He could be dealt with alone. If there is a multitude under the same law it at once becomes apparent that this single sinner can no longer be treated as though he were the only finite being in the universe, or even the only sinner in the universe, but his treatment must take into account its effect on all the rest. This principle must be binding on God as well on any earthly ruler. If therefore pardon of a sinner merely on condition of his repentance would work injury to others greater than the good done to him, and especially if it would undermine the moral government itself and thus work irreparable injury to multitudes, it is at once evident that pardon merely on condition of repentance could not be at all allowed.

#### IV. The Purpose of Punishment.

There are two proper purposes in punishment, when rightly administered, though both are not always to be found in operation in every instance. These two purposes are the reformation of the offender and the prevention of the same or similar acts of disobedience on the part of others. In the punishment of minor offenses the former purpose is uppermost, and in that of major offenses the latter. Thus, when a man is fined five dollars and costs in the police court, the chief thought is the reform of the offender, the prevention of a repetition of the offense on his part. The public is little thought of. The culprit may put his hand in his pocket and pay the fine, and the public be none the wiser, save as a few may read the records

of the court. When the man is sent to the penitentiary for five years, his reformation is still desired, but the purpose is prominent to make such an impression on others of the wrong of the offense and the certainty of punishment as will prevent the evil from spreading. When a man is sent to the penitentiary for twenty-five years, his reclamation is almost lost to view. It is desired, but the chief thought is the warning thus given to other possible offenders in the same line. When capital punishment is to be inflicted, the first purpose is wholly abandoned; "We do not hang a man to reform him", and the second purpose stands alone. This is a necessary principle in good government, hence we may know that it will be followed in God's moral government. His providences, visiting temporal pains and punishments on the lawless soul may be likened to the lighter penalties mentioned above, in which the reclamation of the offender is most desired, and the doom of the incorrigible sinner is like our capital punishment. God will not cast a soul into the lake of fire to reform it.

#### V. The Consequent Necessity of the Higher Forms of Punishment.

It is now easily evident that, since reasons and purposes underlie punishment, while so far as he is concerned a penitent law-breaker might be pardoned simply in view of his repentance, the interests of the community on which an impression is to be made by the punishment of the offender must be considered. Some time since a man who was serving a term in a penitentiary for bank wrecking wrote to me to ask that I intercede for him with the State Board of Pardons. I wrote the board that, from my interviews with the man, I was convinced that he was sincerely penitent, and that further punishment would have no further value for him, but I was compelled to add that another side was to be considered, viz., the effect on the community where his crime had been committed of his being released before his full term had expired. I declined to express an opinion as to that. Every one can easily see that to forgive an offender merely on the ground of his penitence would render all law worthless. Any man, wishing to kill his

neighbor or burn his buildings, would say, "I will do this thing, and, if I am found out and convicted, I will repent." Though in every case where the culprit did not repent, the law was fully enforced upon him, the deterrent force for the prevention of law-breaking would be *nil*, for men would not believe, in advance of committing the crime, that they would not afterward repent. To lead a law-abiding life afterward, if this present sin may be committed, seems to the tempted soul an easy thing. To forgive merely on the ground of the repentance of the sinner would be an unjust thing both to those who have not sinned and to him who has. To the former, because their obedience becomes, governmentally speaking, unprofitable, and to the latter, for if he is set free the way is easy to sin again, because he will think that he can repent again. It is also unjust to those who have not yet come under the temptation to break the law, for when such temptation comes, the opposing motives should be as weighty as possible, but by such a course those motives are awfully weakened. This injustice comes because sin is unutterably harmful to the sinner quite irrespective of the governmental dealings with him.

VI. The Necessity for a Substitute.

It is, therefore, evident that what Mr. Finney used to call "public justice", the welfare of the community, demands that if a penitent law-breaker is to be freed from the punishment due him, something must be provided which will produce on the community at least as great an impression of the iniquity, in the sight of the government, of that offense of which he is guilty and of the certainty of the enforcement of the law as would have been produced by his punishment. It goes without saying that God is under infinite obligation to prevent anarchy, and to keep good order in the universe which He has created, and good order cannot be had unless law is enforced. Some seem to think that the analogy will not hold when we consider God's moral government. They think that God's infinity makes Him able to do what man cannot do in the line of remitting punishment. But the difficulty with that position is that while God is infinite, He is dealing with precisely

the same beings which come under the authority of a human government. God must not force men to obedience, since that destroys the value of the obedience. He must deal with men on the plane of motive, and if He takes away one needed motive He must replace it with another of equal value, which is exactly our whole argument. God made man to act on motive. He then applied to man the motives furnished by certain enforcement of righteous law. If He makes an exception to that law enforcement, He must provide in some other way for the motive which has been removed, or confess that the motive was a needless one from the beginning, or open the door to anarchy.

#### VII. The Biblical Statements.

We find God declaring in His written word that He is bound by just this obligation which has been discussed, and that He provided against wrong-doing on His part and encouragement to lawlessness on our part in the forgiveness of a penitent sinner through the death of Jesus. (See Romans 3:25, 26.) "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforesaid, 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." This is a court matter. We are here admitted to the court room of the universe. The question under discussion is: "Can the Judge fairly, as regards all interests involved, and so righteously, pass over the sins which have been committed, merely on the condition of our repentance?" The answer is "No". "Apart from the shedding of blood, there is no remission." The shedding of blood means the giving of life. To have taken part of the blood of a victim offered on the altar would not have sufficed. "For 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 souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life". (Rev. 17:11). The fact therefore is that wholly apart from the question whether men would repent had not Christ died, the sin, repented of and confessed, could not be forgiven had not Christ

died. The same fact is shown in 1 John 1:7, "But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." Here the work of cleansing the soul from sin is an entirely different thing from leading the soul to repentance, for it is the one already clearly penitent, choosing to walk in the light as God is in the light, who has his sins forgiven by virtue of the blood, i.e., the death of the Son of God. The same truth is found in the very idea of redemption through the blood of Christ. See Eph. 1:7, "In whom we have our redemption through His blood". The redemption is said to be wrought through Christ's blood, and is the same as the forgiveness of our trespasses. This is quite a different thing from leading a man to repent of his trespasses. It is evident that after he has repented, he has forgiveness because in some way Christ's death stands as the purchase price of that forgiveness, the redemption of his soul. See Rom. 3:24, "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus": "Justified" is not repentance, but the judicial act by which the sinner is permitted to be treated as though just. This justification comes, we are here told, through the "redemption that is in Christ Jesus". But that redemption, we learned from Eph. 1:7, is "through His blood". Therefore Christ's death, however it may avail as a motive for repentance, and that is certainly not to be minimized, is also in some way necessary as a condition of divine forgiveness being granted to the penitent sinner.

See again Isa. 53:6, last clause: "And Jehovah hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." The only reasonable inference is that all our iniquity was laid on Christ. But, in order to lead a sinner to repentance, it is not necessary that another bear the entire weight. I have known of a young man who had gone far in sin, and was led to repentance by awaking to the fact that he was breaking his godly father's heart. No one would say that all his sin against God and man was laid on or was borne by his father. His father was unable to know fully the depth of his son's sin against God. Yet the sight of his



father's sorrow led the son to repentance. Something deeper than that must be intended by the passage under consideration.<sup>2</sup>

#### VIII. Propitiation.

Another class of statements in the Bible present Christ as a propitiation for our sins. What does "propitiation" mean? The verb, *hilaskomai*, means to appease, to soothe, to offer an appeasing or expiatory sacrifice. The publican prayed, "May God be appeased to (in view of) me, a sinner" (Luke 18:13). In Heb. 2:17 we read, "Wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation (an expiatory offering) for the sins of the people." These are the only cases in the New Testament where the verb is used. In the first we have the publican, penitent, asking that in some way God might have mercy on him. There was no question as to his repentance; the only question was whether for a penitent sinner pardon could be found. In the second passage we have Jesus undergoing preparation to do the same thing for the people which the publican wanted done for himself. The verb must have substantially the same meaning in both cases, and that meaning is the regular one, to make some provision by which from a justly offended God a repentant sinner might obtain pardon. Two derivatives from the verb are used, each twice, in the New Testament. One is *hilasterion*, which in the Septuagint is used to translate the Hebrew word which in our English version is rendered mercy-seat, and is used in the same manner in Heb. 9:5, "overshadowing the mercy-seat", which, the context shows, is undoubtedly the proper rendering. The mercy-seat, in the Mosaic tabernacle, had no significance as inducing men to repent. It was the place where God would be found gracious, and ready to accept the penitence of his people. The other case where this

(2) If any one questions the application of this passage to Jesus, it is enough to recall the fact that Phillip, so under the control of the Spirit that he was, a little later, caught away bodily, preached Jesus to Candace's officer from vs. 7, 8 of this chapter. See Acts 8:32-35.

word is used, Rom. 3:25, will be considered later. The other derivative, *hilasmos*, is used in 1 John 2:2, "and He is the propitiation for our sins", and 4:10, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." From what we have already seen of the meaning of "propitiation", it is evident that in these passages the attention is not at all called to the work of inducing repentance on the part of the sinner, but the work of providing pardon for the penitent sinner. Propitiation looks not at all toward the sinner, but toward deity, to make pardon possible. The last case to be considered is Rom. 3:25, 26, "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation (*hilasterion*), through faith in 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." It is thus evident, even without a further study than of the meaning of "propitiation", that the thing intended here is the impossibility of God's making His righteousness seen and believed by the on-looking universe if He passed over the sins done aforetime, though the sinner might be penitent, and though God might be willing to exercise forbearance, save as the crucified Son of God should be seen and believed on by that penitent soul, and the consequent necessity of the death of Christ, because that and that alone could enable God to do what we needed and He desired without a shock to the moral universe. The heathen notion has always been that when a deity is offended by human action it is necessary to make an offering to him in the shape of a sacrifice, or of one's own suffering or hardship, which may soothe the deity and induce him to lay aside his anger. This idea was involved in the Mosaic code, but in this way, that the demand for holiness in that code was intended to make it evident that ordinary sacrifices, such as man could make, were inadequate to make a proper atonement for sin, and as a means of propitiating a properly offended deity were entirely insufficient. Not that God's righteous indignation against a sin could ever, by any

sacrifice, be appeased, that He could be bribed to lay it aside, but that sin could not under any circumstances be pardoned by God on such a basis as sacrifices made by man. "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (Heb. 10:4). "So that the law is become our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal. 3:24). We are not now discussing the need of this propitiation, but noting the Biblical statements of the fact. It is evident that man had nothing wherewith to make a propitiatory sacrifice. His present duty, each moment, demanded all his powers. There was never a surplus, and could not be, to make a propitiation in view of "sins done aforetime". Now we find God Himself making this propitiation, not to soothe His own anger, for an angry God would not do that, but to make it possible to do in justice what we needed to have done, and what He wanted to do, and at the same time to show His righteousness, show that He was righteous because He had taken the necessary steps to make it just and fair to forgive the sins of the sinner who believed on Jesus. What a picture of human sin and divine love! A perfect moral order, and we had broken it. Led by grace we have repented, yet God cannot rightly forgive. We cannot give, do, sacrifice anything which will make it just for God to forgive us. God Himself makes the sacrifice.

#### IX. Illustration.

It is not possible fully to illustrate God's great and gracious methods by any analogies from human ways. Still, they may serve to direct our thoughts and our gaze along the road on which the whole truth lies. Let us suppose that a man has been guilty of murder, and has been sentenced to death. He is sincerely, heartily penitent, not merely in view of the punishment which he would gladly escape, but in view of the sin, for which he finds no excuse, and for which he condemns himself. The government, possessed of no desire for vengeance, but concerned in upholding public order, would gladly pardon him, if a way could be found to prevent the salutary law from being undermined in the estimation of others. If now an entirely innocent, law-abiding citizen, against whom there is and can

be no charge, of proved and tried loyalty, shall offer himself to die in the culprit's stead; if the culprit shall openly acknowledge that he goes free not from any merit of his own, or from any plea which can be made in extenuation of his guilt, but wholly because a righteous man has taken his place and borne his iniquity, and if he shall solemnly covenant to lead a law-abiding life henceforth, the government may safely pardon him. Others are not likely to take liberties with the law in such a case. Suppose, instead of one criminal, that there are ten. If it would have been difficult to find one righteous man to die for the one criminal, it will be vastly more difficult to find ten. If, however, the only son of the governor of the state, himself being approved in the eyes of all as a wholly law-abiding citizen, shall offer to die for them, his prominence will make the expiatory value of his death greater than that of the death of one, and might avail for the ten criminals, on the same conditions as those stated above. Again, if there were twenty-five criminals instead of ten or one, the voluntary death of the only son of the president of the United States might avail for their pardon, always on the same conditions, open acknowledgment of being saved because of the expiatory death and open avowal of full intention to lead a law-abiding life henceforth.

Now the case comes to a world of criminals, whose crime is treason against the holy government of God, and whose doom is eternal death. There is but one in the universe of sufficient prominence to make atonement for their sin, the spotless Son of God. His death can do it. He took our place, not by His bodily death on the cross alone. That was a sign of something greater. We read (Heb. 2.9), "But we behold Him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God He should taste of death for every man". He did not merely taste bodily death, but drank the full cup. In the moment, however, when He cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" He tasted eternal death for every man, and became "the propitiation for our sins; and

not for ours only, but also for the whole world." His prominence and value in the universe are such that His tasting eternal death was sufficient to accomplish for all mankind what we have supposed the actual death of the righteous man accomplishing for the condemned murderer. No finite being, though an archangel, could make expiation for the sins of a soul doomed to eternal death without incurring the full penalty, eternal death, himself. Infinite justice could not allow this. The soul saved would be saved to an eternity of sorrow and anguish in view of the price by which he had been saved. The prominence of the Son of God, His perfect holiness, His infinite hatred of sin, His infinite sorrow in view of man's condition, His infinite love for the Father, made it possible that His temporary exile from His Father's throne, His humiliation among men, His agony in Gethsemane, His death on the cross, and above all, His tasting the bitterness of eternal death, of which His bodily death was a sign, made it possible for Him, without His endlessly bearing the sinner's doom, yet to make a greater impression upon the on-looking universe of the awfulness of sin and the certainty of enforcement of law than if sinners had suffered the proper punishment themselves. The universe of obedient finite beings is richer in appreciation of the weight of moral obligation for the suffering of the Son of God than it would have been if all sinners had suffered. If any should take liberties with this atoning work, they must bear the penalty of their own sin, for God has not another Son to die, and Jesus must not be made to suffer twice. But there is not the millioneth part of the danger that such an atoning work will be trifled with that there would have been without it of reckless disregard of all law had the just doom of sinners been carried out. Now, the conditions of salvation are, reasonably, as given in the Bible, open acknowledgement that salvation comes only through the death of Christ, and whole-hearted devotion to the law of God for all eternity.<sup>3</sup>

(3) We may note two classes of biblical statements which receive endorsement and explanation from this study of the atonement.

(a) Those of which Rom. 4:25 is an illustration. "Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification."

X. God not a Slave to His Own Laws.

Some may say that God makes a sacrifice to meet the demands of a code of laws and a moral government of His own creating, and hence is a slave to His own machine. It is true that God has organized a moral government, and has promulgated a code of moral rules for our direction. But God did not make the distinction between right and wrong, nor the moral law of unselfish love. No one ever did. It lies back of God, logically, and is co-existent with God in time. God cannot break that moral law without sinning. Since He has brought us into being and given us a moral nature, He is under obligation to care for our highest interests. These interests cannot be conserved without a safe, solid, moral government. That government must not be shaken in order to forgive our sins. The important thing in the universe is not the pardon of our sins, but the moral order, making it possible for God to offer to His creatures the highest possibilities which they are capable of using and enjoying.<sup>4</sup>

Had Jesus not been raised from among the dead, manifestly, so that all might be sure of the fact, the sense of justice of every moral being would have been outraged by the thought of a sinner, however penitent, being saved at such a cost. Though Jesus had gone to be with the Father, we would not have known it, and men would have been utterly unable to believe in an atonement wrought out at such cost. The resurrection is not merely an endorsement of Christ's divinity, and so an establishment of our hope and faith, it is absolutely essential to all working value of the atonement.

(b) Such passages as Rom. 10:10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation", receive an explanation from this study. Open confession would be a proper expression of love and gratitude on the part of each saved soul. But, as the murderer, saved by the death of the righteous man, could not properly be set free unless he were ready openly to acknowledge that he was saved by the death of another, and unless he were ready to promise unswerving obedience to the law thenceforth, and so do his part to prevent the moral order from being overthrown, so the redeemed soul must do his part in preserving the universal order. Open confession is necessary to prevent abuse of the scheme of salvation.

(4) The moral order exists for the welfare of the moral beings, not the reverse. As between the salvation of a sinner, however, or a world of sinners, and the moral order, the latter is the more important, because upon it depends the welfare of the moral universe.

That most important demand must not be disregarded in order to bring a seeming good to the individual, though it should be remembered that the highest good to the individual is wrapped up with the conservation of the moral order. We have a right, reverently, to say that there is as real and great an obligation resting on God to keep the moral government and law from being weakened by the forgiveness of our sins in an improper manner as upon us to obey the regulations which He, obedient to the demands of the moral law upon Himself, has, in infinite wisdom, formulated and made known to us. Moral beings must be moved by motives, and not even God Himself can prescribe the way in which motives shall operate without destroying the freedom of the will and so the moral agency of the soul. It is an absolute necessity that a moral government over beings disposed to sin, or in any danger of sinning, must do its work by means or sanctions, rewards for obedience and penalties for disobedience, without which the law is mere good counsel, and there is no true government. Where the deterrent effect of punishment is needed, not even God can leave moral beings in possession of their freedom of will, and at the same time let them see that on the mere condition of their repenting He will pardon their sin, and then expect to preserve obedience to His righteous law in the universe. To repeat what has been said before, even though the impenitent were duly punished, men desirous of sinning would do so with the definite expectation of repenting later. The argument for present sin seems weighty, and the prospect of future repentance and obedience sure. God knew, when He began creating moral beings, that the problem of sin would come, and, again reverently, we may say that He was bound, before beginning such creation, to ordain the atonement, and He did so. He is not a slave to His own laws, but in His infinite love He chose to create moral beings though knowing that the certain necessities of the case would require the death of His Son to enable Him rightly to pardon a penitent sinner.

Wherefore, the denial of the substitutionary value of the death of Christ, so common today, is not merely a denial of the

plain teaching of the word of God and a contravention of the established methods of administering government in all enlightened nations of the world, but it is as truly a denial of everlasting principles as it would be to deny the axioms of mathematics. If a sinner is ever to be safely pardoned, it must be by virtue of the death of the Son of God.