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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

attended only to the outward practice obvious to the European observer and ignored the meaning which the institution of head-hunting bears to those who practise it. If we turn to this inner meaning, the case becomes less difficult. The essential motive for the head-hunting of Melanesia is the belief that on various important occasions, and especially on occasions connected with the chiefs, a human head is necessary as an offering to the ancestral ghosts. There is little doubt that the custom is a relic of an earlier practice of human sacrifice, and the head-hunting of the Solomons was but little removed from this, for till recently it was the custom to bring home from expeditions captives who were killed when some important ceremony created the need for a head. In other parts of the world there is reason to believe that, where human beings were formerly sacrificed, the place of the human victim has been taken by an animal, and even that the place of a human head has been taken by that of an animal. I have no doubt that it would have been possible to effect such a substitution in the Solomons, that officials with the necessary knowledge of native custom and belief, and with some degree of sympathy with them, could have brought about such a substitution and thus avoided the loss of life and money which has accompanied the suppression of head-hunting in the Solomons. At the same time they would have kept up the interest of the people in their native institutions until such time as the march of events produced new interests, including new religious interests, connected with the culture which was being brought to bear upon their lives.'

One interest would still have to be provided—the interest of canoe-making. 'The substitution of a porcine for a human head, while satisfying many of the ceremonial needs, would leave no motive for the manufacture of new canoes and the maintenance of this industry. Here it would be necessary to provide some new motive for the making of canoes.' Dr. RIVERS suggests the substitution of canoe races. No doubt in such a substitution the native canoe would be displaced by a boat of European build. But as with religion so also with boat-building. The picturesque canoe would disappear, 'but much as this would be regretted by the anthropologist or the artist, the new boat would be probably fully as efficacious in maintaining interest and zest in life and would thus contribute to the purpose which the writers of this volume have before them. Only, it is essential that the change should grow naturally out of native institutions and should not be forced upon the people without their consent and without any attempt to rouse their interest.'

The Nature of Redemption.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I.

THE work of Christ can be described in a number of terms—Redemption, Reconciliation, Propitiation—each of which presents some phase of it; but Redemption seems to be the most comprehensive of all, and in expounding it the others will in proper course receive attention.

1. According to Paul's teaching, redemption is deliverance from the guilt of sin, *or the wrath of God on sin*, the power of sin, or *the flesh*, the *law* as a restraint on, and yet a provocation to, sin, and *death* as the penalty of sin. As such it secures for man forgiveness, holiness, freedom, and blessedness, or, to use more theological terminology, justification, sanctification, emancipation, and glorification. Dealing with these aspects of redemption in the reverse order for a reason which will at once be seen, we may note (1) that the hope of resurrection rooted in the believer's

relation to Christ as the Living Lord robs death of its terrors; (2) that the place of the law in the believer's life is taken by, on the one hand, the new commandment of love to man, and, on the other, the new motive of the constraining love of Christ; (3) that the bondage to the flesh is ended by the believer's personal union with Christ by faith, so that he dies unto sin, and lives unto God in Christ; and (4) that the wrath of God against, the judgment of God on, guilty sinners is not annulled but removed in having its purpose fulfilled in *the righteousness of God*.

2. It is with the exposition of this conception that this article is especially concerned; but before passing from the subject of redemption in its varied aspects, attention may be called to the prominence of the idea of *substitution* in all Paul's thinking about redemption. Christ becomes a curse to redeem men from the curse of the law (Gal 3^{13}). He is born under the law that He may redeem them that are under the law ($4^{4.5}$). He comes in the likeness of sinful flesh that He may condemn sin in the flesh (Ro 8^{3}). God made Him sin (*i.e.* treated Him as a sinner) who knew no sin that we might become the righteousness of God in Him (2 Co 5^{21}). This righteousness of God is the alternative offered to the judgment of God on sin, the wrath of God against sin.

3. Paul shows *the universal need of redemption* by an inductive proof in Ro 1. 2. and 3, that 'all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God' (3^{23}), and have been thus 'brought under the judgment of God' (v.^{19}). They are all *guilty* before God. Against them is revealed the wrath of God (1^{18}). This conception of the wrath of God is an eschatological conception. The wrath of God is restrained by mercy in the present order: for He 'passes over the sins done aforetime in his forbearance' (3^{25}), and He shows 'the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering' (2^{4}). The mercy which spares is not, however, the grace that saves, for that has come only in Christ and His Cross. The wrath will be fully disclosed only in the Day of Judgment. As our thought to-day does not move in the same eschatological framework, we must think of God's judgment as the present reaction of His moral perfection against sin in the physical, social, moral, and religious consequences of sin, and of His wrath as the consummation of that reaction in His final decisive dealing with sin, whatever that may be.

4. The measure of God's judgment, or man's guilt before God, is not man's sense of his own guilt, for that is altogether inadequate to the actuality. As God sets the standard of what man ought to be, so God also measures the failure of man to reach that standard. Man is guilty, not as he thinks himself, but as he has fallen short of the glory of God, which means either the perfection of God for which man is destined, or God's approval. Man's need of redemption, then, is not to be limited by his sense of that need, but by his failure to fulfil God's purpose for him of likeness to, and fellowship with, Himself. If we are to understand Paul, we must substitute a religious objectivity for a moral subjectivity. It is not man's conscience, but God's purpose for man, that is the standard by which man is to be judged, as needing redemption; that, too, must be the measure of the forgiveness which in Christ is offered to man. A man's personal blameworthiness may be measured by his conscience, but not the guilt before God which God's forgiveness annuls. Accordingly, the sacrifice which saves must not be measured by even the best man's sense of his sinfulness, but by Christ's consciousness as Son of God of what the judgment of the holy love of God is regarding the sin of the race.

II.

1. We must now concentrate our attention on the conception of *the righteousness of God*, which has as its antecedent *the propitiation of Christ's blood*, and as its consequent the *reconciliation* of man with God with the other blessings described in Ro 5^{1-11}, which follow from that *reconciliation*. (*a*) The righteousness of God is both 'the righteousness valid with God' (Luther) for man's forgiveness, and 'a righteousness agreeable to the nature of God' (Baur) in forgiving. It is not only the divine activity corresponding to the divine attribute, but also the condition before God into which man by that activity is brought when he believes. It is a gift of God to faith, 'the righteousness out of faith' (Ro 10^{6}), and is, therefore, not a righteousness which man can acquire for himself by his works (v.^{3}). It is not man's, achieved by works, but God's, bestowed on faith. It is not contrary to God's own character

so to deal with man, for God displays His righteousness in saving man (cf. Ps $36^{6.7}$ 98^{2} 103^{6}). Because God is righteous, and not in spite of His being righteous, He 'reckons righteous him that hath faith in Jesus' (3^{26}). 'God's righteousness may mean His attribute, His exercise of that attribute, and the effect of that exercise in man' (*Century Bible*, Romans, p. 93). The central manifestation of that righteousness is the Cross. (*b*) As this righteousness of God has been sometimes described as a legal fiction—a make-believe in which God thinks and treats man as other than he is—the misconception must be removed. It is possible only if chapters 3 and 4 are separated from chapter 6, the *legal* from the *mystical* aspect of Paul's theology. In the mystical aspect he is expounding his own personal experience; in the legal he is engaged in an apologetic and controversial task. Both were significant for Paul, but the mystical assuredly had the greater value. We must not separate what Paul only distinguishes. Paul does not represent God as thinking of men who have not kept the law as having met all its demands, as pronouncing any legal judgment upon them as guiltless in respect of the law. Nay, forgiveness involves, and does not exclude, the judgment of guilt. God treats sinners as righteous in withholding punishment and conferring favour, not because they will become righteous by His grace, so anticipating their merits as the ground of His action, but because their faith brings them into such relation to Christ that they will become all that God means them to be. (*c*) Paul speaks of the righteousness of God instead of forgiveness, as we usually do, for two reasons: *Firstly*, as a Pharisee he desired to attain righteousness—the divine approval of his fidelity to the law—but failed. As a believer, God reckons him as righteous, as by his faith placed in that relation to God which he had vainly striven to attain by the works of the law. He could not, even as a believer, abandon the conviction that righteousness is a necessity, a conviction that every man who takes morality and religion seriously as he did must share with him. *Secondly*, the forgiveness which comes to him in Christ is not a *passing over* of his sins in good nature and moral indifference; it is because Christ is set forth as *propitiatory*, consistent with God's own righteousness, His assertion, vindication, and satisfaction of His own moral perfection. The law, as the expression of God's righteousness, is not made of none effect through faith, for God's judgment and wrath, as well as His grace, are confirmed and harmonized in His righteousness as revealed in Jesus Christ. Paul's conscience was fully satisfied in God's forgiveness.

2. The consequent of the righteousness of God, or justification by faith, is *reconciliation* between God and man. (*a*) 'The blissful effects of justification partially possessed and gradually to be realized are reconciliation with God, the enjoyment of God's favour, the gladness inspired by the hope of sharing in the holiness and blessedness of God, and the confirmation of this hope in the endurance of trial cheerfully, and the discipline of character which this endurance involves' (Ro 5^{1-4}; see *Century Bible*, Romans, p. 146). These blessings are assured to the believer by God's Spirit filling his heart with the sense of God's love, shown in Christ's death. What God has done in that death is the guarantee that He will do even what may be greater in the life of Christ in the believer. Confident of the future, the believer can now rejoice in this communion with God (vv.$^{5-11}$). All this man experiences when his estrangement from God ends, and he gives up his distrust of and disobedience to God. As man's reconciliation with God is a subjective effect of the objective fact of justification, statement passes into appeal in Paul's exposition. Believers are exhorted to have peace with God, and to rejoice in hope of the glory of God, and even in their tribulations (vv.$^{1-3}$). The question which now concerns us is this: Is this reconciliation only on the part of man, or is it mutual? It is true that throughout the N.T. men are exhorted to be reconciled, but that is because God in Christ is preached as reconciled inasmuch as He is 'not reckoning unto men their trespasses,' and this is surely 'the word of reconciliation' (2 Co 5^{19}). V.^{21} in this passage states the divine fact on which the human duty in v.^{20} depends. A reconciled God calls on men to be reconciled. For regarding the reconciliation as mutual the following reasons can be given: (i) In Ro 11^{28} 'enemies' and beloved are contrasted in such a way that the former must be regarded as objects of God's hostility as the latter are of His affection. (ii) In Ro 5^{10} it is stated that 'we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son' even 'while we were enemies'—that is, before the process of

man's reconciliation to God had begun. (iii) If God's wrath may be spoken of, surely no less His reconciliation. (iv) This conclusion also follows from the description of Christ's death as *propitiatory*, which can only mean that God is set forth in that death as propitiated; that is, Christ's death as an adequate and effective manifestation of God's righteousness makes possible a change not in God's disposition or purpose towards men, but in His attitude; the pain of His judgment on men is changed to the joy of His favour to men.

3. While it may be admitted that the word *redemption* does not necessarily mean deliverance by *ransom*, so that it is not necessary for us to ask what was the ransom, or to whom was it paid, as one of the earliest of the theories of the atonement did; and that the word reconciliation, even if mutual between God and man, does not itself raise the problem of expiation or atonement; yet the term, *the righteousness of God*, as describing the gift of God to man in Christ, does indicate that forgiveness will come in such a way as not to be inconsistent with God's holiness and His consequent judgment on sin. As God's judgment in the past had been tempered with mercy, as forgiveness was now being offered without judgment on men, that necessary connexion between God's holiness and His judgment on sin might be put in doubt. That doubt must be removed so completely and finally that no possibility of misunderstanding might remain; that doubt is removed by the revelation in Christ Jesus, 'whom God set forth *propitiatory* through faith by his blood' (3^{25}). (*a*) The Greek word, ἱλαστήριον, is usually a noun, meaning 'the place or vehicle of propitiation,' but originally it is the neuter of an adjective. Although in the LXX and He 9^5 it is used for the lid of the ark of the covenant, on which the Shekinah rested, and which was sprinkled on the Day of Atonement with the blood of the sacrifice, yet, strong as are the arguments for this meaning, on the whole it is improbable that Paul would have introduced an allusion so obscure to the majority of the readers without some fuller explanation. No evidence of the use of the word in the sense of propitiatory victim has been produced; and there is an advantage in taking the word as an adjective in the most general sense possible. The word itself is not decisive for the meaning in Paul's mind. This, at least, it must mean, that the death of Christ is that which *reveals* God as propitious to sinners, and even, we must add, renders God propitious, as showing both God's wrath against sin and the appeasement of that wrath. Paul is not solitary in the use of the word in connexion with the work of Christ. The writer of the First Epistle of John declares that Christ 'is the propitiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world' (2^2). He returns to the fact, and states its motive: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (4^{10}). According to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'it behoved Christ in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι) for the sins of the people' (2^{17}).

(*b*) Two circles of ideas seem here to intersect —the one legal, the other ritual. Many scholars maintain that the Old Testament conception of sacrifice excludes the idea of penal substitution or satisfaction; the victim does not bear the penalty, and so meet the demands of the law. By sacrifice communion with God is maintained, or, if interrupted by any transgression, restored. Even if this be so, it must be admitted that the sin and the trespass offering had reference to breaches of the law, and were regarded as the divinely appointed means of securing God's forgiveness. That the Psalmist disclaims the intention of seeking to recover God's favour by a sacrifice (a burnt-offering, Ps 51^{16}) shows that others so regarded sacrifice. While he is content with offering the sacrifice of a 'broken spirit,' and is sure that God will not despise 'a broken and a contrite heart' (v.[17]), the prophet, in his description of the Suffering Servant, explicitly states that it pleased Yahveh 'to make his soul a guilt-offering' (Is 53^{10}), and the dominant thought is that of penal substitution and satisfaction (v.[5]). It is highly probable that we have this same combination of ideas here. Paul may have been thinking not only of the sacrifices of the Jewish ritual, but also of some of the human sacrifices familiar from Greek and Roman story. It is true that he does not give the prominence to the idea of sacrifice which the Epistle to the Hebrews does; but he does refer to Christ's death as a sacrifice. He describes Christ as the passover lamb (1 Co $5^{7.8}$). In his account

of the Lord's Supper Christ is represented as the sacrifice of the new covenant (1 Co 11^{25}). It is not improbable that in Ro 8^{3} the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας is rightly rendered in the R.V. '*as an offering* for sin.' His references to the blood of Christ (Ro 5^{9}, Eph 1^{7} 2^{13}, Col 1^{20}) and his connecting of forgiveness with the death of Christ (1 Co 15^{3}, 2 Co 5^{21}, Eph 1^{7}, Col $1^{14.20}$) confirm the conclusion that Paul did habitually think of the death of Christ as a sacrifice, and that he would have accepted the general principle laid down by the Epistle to the Hebrews (9^{22}), 'without shedding of blood there is no remission.' It does not follow, however, that he had fused together the two conceptions of sacrifice and of penal substitution and satisfaction, and that he explained to himself the efficacy of sacrifice by its character as penal. We have no convincing evidence on that point. What is certain, that he did think of Christ's death under both conceptions without making any distinction. We are not warranted in weakening the force of this conclusion by the explanation that in sacrifice the sprinkling of the blood on the altar, signifying the presentation of the life to God, was the important matter, not the shedding of the blood signifying the death of the victim; for in the N.T. use of the sacrificial imagery it is the blood-shedding, and not the blood-sprinkling alone, on which the stress is often laid. The two ideas go together, for the shedding makes the blood available for the sprinkling. Christ's offering unto God was certainly His holy obedience, but He rendered that in suffering death. In Paul's teaching at least we must admit the conception of penal substitution and satisfaction. It is the Epistle to the Hebrews which gives prominence to the other thought. If vicarious suffering is not the sole element in Christ's sacrifice, but representative submission is also included, yet it is an essential element, and, without setting aside the teaching of the N.T., it cannot be got rid of from the Christian doctrine of the Atonement.

(*c*) A misunderstanding of the phrase 'through faith' must be removed. Paul does not mean that faith gives to the death of Christ a meaning as propitiatory that it would not otherwise have had. It is propitiatory as objective fact, but the application and appropriation of the fact for individual salvation is by faith; and to unbelief, this value, real as it is, is not disclosed. May we not add that it is only as a man experiences the Christian salvation that he can interpret Christ's sacrifice?

(*d*) What is the *rationale* of the Cross for Paul? 2 Co 5^{21} is the decisive statement. On the Cross the sinless was treated as sin. The consequences of the sin of mankind were appointed to Him by God, and were accepted by Him. This is the meaning of Is 52^{13}–53^{12}. Paul avoids saying that Christ was made a sinner, or that He was accursed (Gal 3^{13}), and probably he would not have said that He was held guilty or punished for us; but that He suffered for us, even instead of us, he does undoubtedly teach. This suffering he regards as a perfect manifestation of God's judgment on sin, more adequate for God's demand and man's need than all other judgments could be. As a manifestation of judgment it is a vindication of God's righteousness, the consistency of His action with His character as perfect. Such a vindication has its historical necessity in the danger of men misunderstanding the tempering of God's judgment by His mercy, or the forgiveness of sin, apart from such a judgment. But for Paul it seems to have an eternal necessity in the character of God Himself. It was only by showing Himself propitiatory in Christ's blood that He could be righteous, while reckoning righteous those who have faith in Christ (3^{26}).

(*To be concluded.*)