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Preface

This is volume one of two books on what are called "the doctrines of grace." The second volume, to be printed soon if the Lord will, is *God's Sovereignty and Glory in the Election and Salvation of Lost Man*.

The title and subtitle of the book in your hands give an idea of the range of subjects taken up in connection with propitiation and substitution. Hopefully, the extensive Table of Contents and the two indices, a Subject Index and a Scripture Index, make this a useful reference on these subjects.

The fall of Adam and man's sinful state require that God be satisfied and glorified in respect of the outrage of sin against His nature and His glory. This the work of Christ on the cross provided, the value and glory of His Person as God and man being imparted to the work. Thus, the value and glory of the work on the cross is commensurate with the value and glory of His Person.

Chapter one briefly considers the testing of the first man as fallen in view of showing the need for atonement. The subject of the fall and man's thus acquiring by that fall what Scripture calls "sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) -- i.e., what we refer to as the old nature -- will be taken up in the second book in some detail. That examination will have special reference to the idea that fallen man has moral free will towards God; and that election is conditioned upon man's exercising human faith by this moral free will. Such teaching affects how one views the work of Christ on the cross. This present book considers that work in accordance with the truth set out in the second volume, namely, that fallen man is in bondage to "sin in the flesh," having no moral free will towards God and that God acts in accordance with unconditional election. Additionally, certain Calvinistic thoughts are also rejected, for example, the doctrine of reprobation.

The tables on pp. 90, 91 and 111 summarize numbers of truths in Scripture having to do with the work of Christ and its results.

*****

References and comments found in braces { } have been added to quoted material by myself in order to facilitate indexing or for added explanation or supplementation.

Scripture quotations are from the translation by J. N. Darby.
Chapter 1

Introduction to the Subject of Propitiation and Substitution

God’s Timing of the Work on the Cross is Connected with the End of the Testing of the First Man

THE TESTING OF THE FIRST MAN

God had not asked of Adam the performance of some meritorious deed whereby he would gain the right to some blessing. Rather, Adam had a prohibition, and this was a law for him. The prohibition was accompanied by a warning that if he transgressed the penalty was death. He was to stay in the creature’s place of subjection and own the right of the Creator over himself. In this state he was innocent, and by that term we mean that he was without knowledge of good and evil. He had humanity in an innocent state. He disobeyed, but was not deceived (1 Tim. 2:14), which indicates that he was cognizant of what he did in following Eve. He, the appointed head here on earth, defied the Creator, and brought the stamp of death upon all over which he was the appointed head. Not only would there be physical death, but moral death fastened itself upon the soul. He now had humanity in a fallen state. He had the knowledge of good and evil now; but he also had in his being something else that was not there when he had come forth fresh from the hand of the Creator. He had a sinful nature. He had acquired what Rom. 8:3 calls “sin in the flesh.” This sin in the flesh is something within us that desires to act contrary to the will of God, whether His will is expressed explicitly or not. It is a lawlessness within us 1 -- i.e., an acting without reference to the will and pleasure of God. This sin in the flesh acts in a uniform, consistent way, contrary to God. This awful, uniform contrariness is referred to in Rom. 7:23 as “the law of sin which exists in my members.” A law is a fixed, a uniform,

1. “Sin is lawlessness” (1 John 3:4).
principle of operation.

Fallen man was placed under testing by God. Note that well. The trial of man means the trial of man as fallen. Obviously, an innocent Adam was not the head of a race of innocent men. It is fallen Adam that became the head of a race of men, a race of fallen men. In 1 Cor. 15:45 we read:

The first man Adam became a living soul; the last Adam a quickening spirit.

There are actually only two Adams. The Lord Jesus is "the last Adam" -- last indicating there will not be another one. And, really, there are only two men before God:

the first man out of [the] earth, made of dust; the second man out of heaven

(1 Cor. 15:47).

It is as fallen Adam, and as the fallen first man, that the trial of man begins. I am aware that persons that continue the trial of man after the cross put Adam innocent in the epochs of trial, but it is a mistake just as is the idea of the continuation of the trial after the cross. It is part of a scheme that ignores the end of the trial of the first man at the cross, the evidence of which is given in a summary fashion below. The point here is that it is fallen man which is under trial -- to see if he is recoverable. It is fallen Adam as the head of a fallen race. It is the fallen first man as the head of a fallen race of men. Thus, we speak of the testing, or trial, or probation, of the first man.

FORMS OF THE TESTING

During the epochs of trial of the fallen first man, he necessarily had a standing before God. We speak of this as his Adamic standing -- and mean a standing in Adam as fallen. We speak of this as a standing in the flesh before God. It is fallen man in his natural state, sin in the flesh characterizing his state -- and the law of sin working in him. All men are under the headship of Adam fallen. All have the stamp of the fallen first man on them:

For this [cause] even as by one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death; and thus death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned (Rom. 5:12).

So during the epochs of trial, the trial may be of various forms, but it is the first man who is under those forms of trial; the first man, in Adamic standing in the flesh. We know that the trial ended in the rejection of Christ.

The trial took several forms during the epochs of trial. Man was left to conscience from the fall until the flood. Then government was introduced. When Christ was rejected and crucified, where was conscience? And what did government do to Christ? Another trial of the first man was made in the persons of Israel. To Israel was given the law and they sinned in the face of the law when they crucified Him to whom the law and the prophets pointed.

The first man was tried under law though the law was given to the Jews, not the Gentiles. The law made no distinction between who was the Lord's and
who was not. It addressed man in the flesh, man in the (fallen) Adamic standing, in the persons of the Jews. It was the first man under trial by law. The law made no distinction between who was actually a child of God and who was not. It was not addressed to the children of God. It was addressed to the first man in the persons of the favored Jews, and treated the first man as if he were alive. Moreover, it promised prolongation of life through obedience to it (Lev. 18:5). He was even provided sacrifices -- but of course they could not perfect the conscience. Once the sacrifice truly satisfies God, then there is no need of any other. 2 The history of repeated failure is recorded in Scripture; failure under Moses, under priesthood, under judges, under kings, under prophetic ministry, and finally rejecting the revelation of the Father in the Son. The conclusion was:

... but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father (John 15:24).

We have a law, and by our law he ought to die (John 19:7).

THE TESTING ENDED AT THE CROSS

They rejected the revelation of the Father in the Son! That rejection ended the testing. The point to its being the trial of the first man is that the expression embraces all in Adamic standing. That includes the whole world. Consequently, the world was declared under judgment, and all men held to be lost. This is part of the declaration in the gospel. And therefore God calls upon all men everywhere to repent. The trial of the first man was ended, the case of his irremediable lostness was proved, and there is no more trial of the first man. He is removed, as to his standing in the flesh, from before God; and is displaced by the Second Man.

At the beginning of the trial of fallen man, God spoke, of the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman,

... he shall crush thy head, and thou shalt crush his heel (Gen. 3:15).

At the end of the trial this came to pass -- at the cross. The enemy's head was crushed. All his plans are thus symbolized as defeated, though he be allowed to work evil meanwhile, until cast into the abyss.

It is essential to an understanding of the ways of God that the reader grasp the important fact that the probation of man ended at the cross. Implicit in the

2. It might be well to call attention to the fact that the millennial sacrifices will not have the significance that the OT sacrifices had. The OT sacrifices looked forward to the work of Christ and signified that the once-for-all work had not been done. These were offered under the Aaronic order of priesthood. In the millennium Christ will be priest after the order of Melchisedec, with an order of priesthood founded upon the once-for-all finished work of the cross. Thus, for an earthly people, the future sacrifices will look back in a memorial way to the once-for-all finished work, as carried out under the Melchisedec priesthood, though sons of Aaron officiate.
trial of man is the opportunity to undo the offense of sin before God and to live sinless before Him; to prove to God that his state, which resulted from the fall, was remediable (of course, it was not), that he could climb up again from the Fall. The idea that man is still under trial is absurd. What? God has not yet proved the case of man’s irreparable lostness? The first man still needs further trial even after rejecting the revelation of the Father in the Son (John 15:24)? -- even after rejecting the One full of grace and truth (John 1:14)?

The time when the great work of atonement was wrought on the cross necessarily coincided with the sentence pronounced upon the first man, which first fell from the lips of the Son Himself (John 12:31; cp. Rom. 3:19; 1 John 5:19). In the ways of God, He utilized the final test of the first man to be the occasion of providing the work of atonement. Christ was the final test, and Christ wrought atonement in connection with the end of that final test. This is all plain where a psuedo-dispensational continuance of testing after the cross does not cloud the understanding.

The God-glorifying life that the Lord Jesus lived, and in which He was rejected by the first man in every aspect of that life; that life in which He revealed the Father; that very life it was in which He suffered under the judgment of God in the three hours of darkness. And that very life in which He lived to the glory of God, and suffered in atonement, He poured out in death. And then came the last act which God allowed the first man to do to His Son:

The very spear that pierced Thy side,  
Drew forth the blood to save (J. G. Deck).

Then God rent the veil. The testing of the first man was concluded, and God no longer remained hidden, but comes out to man in the gospel, declaring that He has been glorified by the work of Christ with respect to sin and sins; declaring His righteousness in the preter-mission of the sins of the OT saints; and, that He is just in justifying the believer (Rom. 3:21-26). And He now commands all men everywhere, to repent (Acts 17:30).

The evidences of the end of the testing are most full and conclusive. Because there is no express statement in Scripture that says “the testing of man ended at the cross,” that will not excuse you from not accepting that great and basic dispensational truth of Christianity. The fact is plain in Scripture for all to see. It is stunning to think of professed dispensationalists not seeing the cross and the consequent gospel proclamation as marking the end of the trial of the first man. 3 It evidences the power of psuedo-dispensational schemes --

3. Why does the Scofieldian age-ism system say that the testing of man continues when God has declared that all are dead (2 Cor. 5:14)? That all are dead is a statement of the conclusion of (continued...)
schemes that not only reject this truth, but necessarily must also be defective regarding other truths connected with that one. And since doctrine forms practice, consequently practice must also partake of the defect in doctrine. You say, what doctrines and practice? God's way is for us to acknowledge the truth from His Word when it is brought before us, and then we are in a better position to learn connected truths. The truth of the end of the probation of the first man is summarized in the following chart.

3. (...continued)
the testing. God is not now testing dead men. Before the cross man was not treated by God as dead, but as alive in Adamic responsibility to see if he was recoverable from the fall.
End of the Testing of the First Man

... that which is spiritual was not first
The first man out of [the] earth, made of dust

FINAL TESTING

Tested by the person of
the Son, the Second Man

And at last He sent to
them His Son (Matt. 21:37)

The perfect King and the Kingdom (Matt.)
The perfect Servant and perfect service (Mark)
The perfect Man and perfect dependency (Luke)
The only-begotten, full of grace and truth (John 1:14)
The revelation of the Father in the Son (John 15:24).

Note particularly that the first man, in the persons of the Jews, was tested by the kingdom in the offer of the King and kingdom; and was tested by grace in the person of the Son. Man is not now being tested by grace. God has concluded testing the first man, having shown all to be under sin (Rom. 3:9).

ADAM
The First Man

UNDER:
Conscience
Government
Law
Priesthood
Judges
Kings
Prophets

"The fulness of the time" (Gal. 4:4)
"In due time" (Rom. 5:6)
(at the end of the time of testing)

"Yet sinners" (Rom. 5:8)
"Still without strength" (Rom. 5:6)
(conclusion at the end of the testing)

"Consummation of the ages" (Heb. 9:26)
(ages of testing)
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The Second Man Established in His Place

... then that which is spiritual (1 Cor. 14:46)
... the second man, out of heaven (1 Cor. 15:47)

NOW
The Second Man has displaced the first man.

In view of the end of the testing
of the first man, God declares:

Wrath of God revealed from heaven (Rom. 1:18)
All under sin (Rom. 3:9; Gal. 3:22)
Every mouth stopped (Rom. 3:20)
All the world under judgment (Rom. 3:20)
All have sinned and come short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:23)
For God has shut up together all in unbelief, in order that he might show mercy to all (Rom. 11:32).
Man is the slave of sin (Rom. 6:20)
Thoughts of the unbelieving are blinded (2 Cor. 4:4)
All are dead (2 Cor. 5:14; Eph. 2:1; John 5:24, 25; 1 John 3:14)
Now is the judgment of this world (John 12:31)
In due time Christ died for the ungodly (Rom. 5:6)
Christ died for all (1 Tim. 2:6)
Christ gave Himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. 2:6)
Christ is the propitiation for the world (1 John 2:2)
The whole world lies in the wicked One (1 John 5:19)
Satan declared to be the God of this age (2 Cor. 4:4)

NOW: Rom. 3:21; 2 Tim. 1:9-10; Eph. 3:10; Heb. 9:26

God “NOW enjoins that they shall
all everywhere repent” (Acts 17:30)

“Upon whom the ends of the ages are come” (1 Cor. 10:11)
(ages of testing)
THE STATE OF THE FIRST MAN REQUIRED THE CROSS

Blessed be God, the very cross awarded to Christ by the first man is that whereby God glorified Himself regarding sin, and through which He dealt with the standing and state (and its consequences) of the first man. The consequences require that man lie eternally under judgment, forsaken by God.

The life of the first man is forfeited and God now views man as dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1). The law had regarded him as alive, as under trial to see if he was recoverable. Now, the sentence resulting from the conclusion of the trial of the first man is pronounced by God. The blessed Lord Jesus, the Son of the Father, was here, “full of grace and truth,” and so man has been tested by grace and truth, in Him who perfectly displayed the Father.

...but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father (John 15:24).

Yet on that cross to which the first man assigned Him, He wrought atonement. And now I, as connected with the first man, am gone:

I am crucified with Christ, and no longer live, I, but Christ lives in me; but [in] that I now live in flesh, I live by faith, the [faith] of the Son of God, who has loved me and given himself for me (Gal. 2:20).

...Christ... who is our life (Col. 3:4).

It is clear that my life by which I live to God, is not the life of the first man improved in some way. It is not repaired, it is not mended, it is not a restoration to innocence. Christ is my life. And for me, the consequences, the judgment, and the penalty that resulted from the fall of man are forever gone. Those things cannot be attached to the life of Christ, who is my life. But they remain attached to unbelievers.

Aspects of the Work on the Cross

The subject of propitiation and substitution is broad and involves many considerations. For example, a most important distinction for the believer to apprehend is the difference between sin and sins, as spoken of in Scripture. A Christian generally first thinks about sins, i.e., acts, before the fact that within us is an evil nature from which those acts spring. The evil within is sometimes spoken of as “the flesh,” and sometimes as “sin.” 1 Pet 2:24 speaks of sins, borne by Christ on the cross. 2 Cor. 5:21, however, speaks of what is within us -- sin. The cross dealt with both of these. How they were

4. It is true that from another perspective, i.e., in Romans, man is looked at as alive in sins, but away from God and incorrigible (Rom. 8:7).
dealt with by God involves His glory and our place before Him.

There are, of course, numbers of other matters related, since all truth is related; but we might think of some quite immediately related as necessary for laying a foundation for apprehending the greatness of propitiation and substitution. For example, words like purchase (bought), ransom, and redemption, which will be considered later, are to be understood in connection with this subject. The subject of "the righteousness of God" is closely involved, as are other doctrines. There is a difficulty in giving an exposition of the subject because of the interrelationship of various truths, as always. We need the Spirit of God to guide us into the truth, for He is the unction (1 John 2:27) given for this purpose. That verse does not mean that there is no such thing as teachers (1 Cor. 12:28), for among the various gifts they also have been given for edification. The point is that we are not dependent on man, as merely man, for divine teaching. The Spirit has given the Word of God in the divine way and He is the interpreter of it (1 Cor. 2:11-16).

On the subject before us, both the Arminian and the Calvinistic systems err -- and do so with regard to the other connected truths mentioned above. The truth of these matters was set forth in correctness, through J. N. Darby, in connection with the restoration and recovery of truth in the 1800s. Here, by way of introduction to this book, is an extract from Him:

As to the general idea of its efficacy, the high priest drew near personally, and filled the most holy place with incense; then he took some blood, which he put on the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat. Sins were atoned for according to the requirement of the majesty of the throne of God Himself, so that the full satisfaction made to His majesty rendered the throne of justice favorable, grace had free course, and the worshiper found the blood there before him when he drew near, and even as a testimony before the throne. Then the high priest cleansed the tabernacle, the altar, and all that was found there. Thus, in virtue of the sprinkling of His blood, Christ will reconcile all things, having made peace through the blood of His cross. There could be no guiltiness in the tabernacle, but God would cleanse away the defilements, that they might not appear before Him. In the third place, the high priest confessed the sins of the people over the scapegoat, which, sent off unto a land not inhabited, bore all the sins away from God never to be found again. It is here that the idea of substitution is presented most clearly.

There are three things: the blood on the mercy-seat, the reconciliation of all things, and the sins confessed and borne by another. This order is found in Col. 1 -- peace made, reconciliation of all things by Christ, and of believers it is said -- "You hath he now reconciled in the body of his flesh, through death." It is evident that, though the scapegoat was sent away alive, it was identified as to the efficacy of the work with the death of the other. The idea of the eternal sending away of sins out of remembrance is only added to the thought of death. The glory of God was established and His rights vindicated, on one side, in the putting of the blood on the mercy-seat;
and, on the other, there was the substitution of the scapegoat, of the Lord Jesus, in His precious grace, for the guilty persons whose cause He had undertaken; and, the sins of these having been borne, their deliverance was full, entire and final. The first goat was Jehovah's lot -- it was a question of His character and His majesty. The other was the lot of the people, which definitively represented the people in their sins.

These two aspects of the death of Jesus must be carefully distinguished in the atoning sacrifice He has accomplished. He has glorified God, and God acts according to the value of that blood towards all. He has borne the sins of His people; and the salvation of His people is complete. And, in a certain sense, the first part is the most important. Sin having come in, the justice of God might, it is true, have got rid of the sinner; but where would then have been His love and His counsels of grace, pardon, and even the maintenance of His glory according to His true nature as love, while righteous and holy too? I am not speaking here of the persons who were to be saved, but of the glory of God Himself. But the perfect death of Jesus -- His blood put on the throne of God -- has established and brought into evidence all that God is -- all His glory, as no creation could have done it: His truth, for if He had passed sentence of death, it is made good in the highest way in Jesus; His majesty, for His Son submits to all for His glory; His justice against sin; His infinite love. God found means therein to accomplish His counsels of grace, in maintaining all the majesty of His justice and of His divine dignity; for what could have glorified them like the death of Jesus?

Hopefully what we have considered will help in understanding Chapter 2, which is an old article on the atonement. Chapter 3 is an article by W. Kelly on the day of atonement (Lev. 16). It is hoped that it will greatly aid our understanding, since the matter of the two goats so graphically present the difference between propitiation and substitution. While these two goats form the one sin-offering, the one work of Christ, they show two aspects of the work of Christ on the cross: propitiation and substitution. And while it will be seen that Israel is particularly in view in Lev 16, these two aspects of the work of Christ brought out apply to the saints now. The bullock, however, in connection with the priestly household, has the church particularly in view, in a typical sense. Very importantly, besides the sprinkling of the blood on and before the mercy-seat, we have the cloud of the incense meeting the Shekinah upon the mercy-seat; and this mind-prostrating subject of glory will be more fully dwelt on when we consider the mercy-seat later. Many quotations spread throughout this book refer to the bullock and the two goats of the day of atonement. It is well to have some understanding of Lev. 16 in order to better appreciate what is said in those quotations.


www.presenttruthpublisher.com
The Rending of the Veil Signifies a Change in God’s Dealings with Man

Before closing this brief consideration of the end of the testing of the first man, we should note the significance of the rending of the veil. It is the fact that this testing of the first man to see if he was recoverable ended with the rejection of Christ and nailing Him to the cross. The blood being shed, God rent the veil, signifying that God’s dealing with men was not to be any longer on the basis of man’s trail and that God would come out to man in a way heretofore unknown, and that the Christian could, by that shed blood, enter into His presence (Heb. 10:19, 20). The following article speaks of this:

Under the Jewish system God had conferred benefits, given laws, sanctioned them by judgments; but man had been kept at a distance: God had never revealed Himself. He dwelt “in the thick darkness”; and if He condescended to dwell amongst men, He was within the veil, where none could approach — in a word, unseen. He governed from His throne; but direct approach was forbidden. The thick darkness and the barrier of Sinai, or the veil of an unlighted holy of holies, secluded Him from man. Had He shown Himself in light to a sinful world, it must have been utter condemnation. The darkness had no communion with the light. Unseen, He might, in patient grace, bear much which man’s ignorance committed, and govern in mercy. But in due time, when man had been fully proved in all possible ways — without law, under law, under promise, prophecy, government, and even grace in the mission of God’s own Son — and proved utterly bad, the time was come for God to show Himself in grace, such as He really was. Had He done so before, man could not have been properly put to the test. This he has been; and now in infinite grace, when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ dies for the ungodly. Now if God came forth merely as light or holiness when man was wholly wicked, his will antagonistic, as the sceptic admits, He must, in the nature of things, have driven man out of His presence, unless holiness means allowing sin, whereas it means not allowing it. Yet God must be holy; that is, He cannot allow sin when He deals with it, or he would be morally like it, which would be a blasphemous denial of Him. How, then, does He act? In the death of Christ He manifests His holiness in the perfect taking away of sin, that His perfect love may flow out, never so shown to men as in this act. Now God can fully reveal Himself without a veil. His holiness is perfect blessing, because shining out in absolute love, sin being put away. As a sign of this wonderful all-changing change, the veil which before hid Him is rent in twain from the top to the bottom, signifying Christ’s death, according to the whole figurative arrangement employed to typify these things. And so the New Testament uses this event: “Having therefore . . . boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He bath opened to us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; . . . let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith,” &c. Again, “Into the second [that within the veil] went the high priest once every year, not without blood
The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing, which was a figure” &c.

Now here we have the veil and its accompaniments declared to have precisely this force in the mind of the Holy Ghost. According to the whole system of Scripture, and that in its deepest moral elements, whether of man’s relationship with God, or in reference to the peculiar position of Israel, which we know historically was then closing in, the rending of the veil had the most clear and weighty significance. Nothing could have had so much. It was the central expression of the whole change of the divine way of dealing with man, and of man’s relationship with God by the cross. And here I would remark, that I must, to ascertain the importance and “genius” of a fact, take such a system within itself. It is another question, whether the whole system be right or wrong? But within itself -- and the veil was a part, and a central part, of the system -- nothing could have such a distinct signification as its rending. It signified, as I have said, the change of the whole relationship of God and man. I must, if I refer to a veil and its rending, consider the meaning of its being there, to know the importance of it being rent. God’s being concealed or revealed, is not an unimportant idea; and the rending, at Christ’s death, of the veil which concealed His throne and glory, not difficult to understand. It is a figure of course, as all these parts of the tabernacle or temple were; but a figure of the most intelligible simplicity, and pregnant with meaning. 6

6. The Bible Treasury 5:112.
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Adam Displaced by the New Head

Adam-innocent is not viewed in Scripture as the head of a race; Adam-fallen is the head of a race. The testing of man began after the fall. It is *the testing of fallen man*, the first man as fallen, to see if he could be reclaimed. The one command under which Adam innocent stood in the garden of Eden was not part of the testing of fallen man. Adam had a law; and Adam-innocent stood under that law. That law for Adam-innocent is not part of the testing of fallen man. Rom. 5:13 says: “for until law sin was in the world; but sin is not put to account when there is no law.” World, here, refers to the world under the headship of Adam-fallen. “Until law,” without the definite article the, means -- until God brought fallen man under testing by law, law as a principle of relationship and standing before Himself for fallen man. The fact that Adam had a law before he fell from innocency does not alter the fact that:

from the time of the expulsion from Eden, “until law,” fallen man was not, during that period, under test on the principle of law as a basis of relationship and standing, with God.

Under Moses, fallen man, in the persons of the Jews, was dealt with on the basis of law. This was a new character of testing for man in the flesh. The
standing for (fallen) man in the flesh, and the testing of (fallen) man in the flesh, ended at the cross. The law did not then ‘die,’ was not “nailed to the cross,” and was not abrogated. But the Mosaic system came to an end. The testing and standing of the first man, fallen man, man in the flesh, ended at the cross. That did not change the fact that each individual is responsible to God, and now all men everywhere are responsible to repent. The believer now is dead with Christ and dead to the law.

The chart of the previous page is explained in *Elements of Dispensational Truth*, ch. 3.4, sec. ed.
Chapter 2

The Atonement

Leviticus 11:17

There can, in one sense, be no true understanding of the nature and value of atonement but as there is a knowledge of the state of man needing it. If the need be fully seen, then the remedy must be according to it; if only partially seen, the remedy needed will be estimated amiss. Hence the first point for us to examine is the state and condition of man in the eye of God, for we may rest assured that it is an imperfect apprehension of man's state which lies at the root of the general indifference to this subject.

Adam was set in the garden of Eden, in innocence, subject to God, and while he remained in the subjection due from the creature to the Creator, he enjoyed the goodness with which he was surrounded. Against insubjection he was warned, and told that an infraction of the divine restriction (for it was not an exaction but a restriction, one which demanded nothing from him -- merely described the line which he must not pass over) would be followed by the penalty of death. His life would be forfeited if he acted in self-will. Adam did not remain subject to the will of God. He acted for himself, Satan being the tempter to the transgression, and the penalty fell upon him. Now death is the penalty, it is the wages of sin; but it is not a penalty which is only endured while passing through it, as would be the case with one inflicted by man; but, because it is inflicted by God, its full extent is not known till after it has been realized, as it is written, "to die, but after this the judgment." The sense in my soul that I die because of a penalty laid on me, in itself places me under a sense of God's judgment, and that for eternity; hence, it is not so much death itself which the sinner shrinks from, as the after consequences, even judgment from which there is no hope or possibility of extrication. The life is forfeited, and when the forfeit is paid man is then conscious of the nature of the penalty. The suffering is not merely the act of dying, but the consciousness of being under judgment to which dying consigns one.
Adam’s life was forfeited in the state and condition in which he was set here, and dying he must die; not to escape all suffering afterwards, but as a penalty introducing him into a state of suffering. He is now without a life, at least without any real possession of one that he can call his own, for he is insecure and uncertain as to the moment when judgment may begin. His life is forfeited. The forfeit has not been paid, but over a thing forfeited I have really no claim or power; it is the property of the one to whom it is forfeited. Man cannot count upon his life now for anything; according to God’s will it is forfeited, and when the forfeit is paid, the soul enters into judgment. Man’s state and condition is now that of having a forfeited life awaiting judgment. God’s righteousness demands this, it could not exact less. Man set upon the earth in blessing dependent on the Creator acts contrary to Him at the suggestion of another. This moral anomaly exists -- a creature of the highest and most perfect order, setting up a will, a line of action, contrary to God’s will. Hence the question whether man is to be suppressed, or whether God will be indifferent to him as a creature, made in His own likeness, acting in spirit and deed in contravention to His will. If God’s will is righteous, man is unrighteous, and can God in righteousness suffer man to continue in that condition in which he can contravene the righteous will of God? The answer is simple: if it could be so, there would be an end to righteousness. Hence, God forewarned him that if he should do what He had told him not to do, the penalty would be death, and the penalty of death, as we find by Heb. 9:27, reduces him to a state in which he is conscious of the extent of his loss and his distance, in judgment, from God. Death for the lost is only the prison door of one eternal night of misery, where the sense of distance from God is ever maintained in weeping and gnashing of teeth.

We shall now better comprehend the nature of the atonement, which could enable the holy God to set up man on another footing. To meet the righteousness of God there must be a victim, not in himself chargeable with our offence in any way, bearing the penalty of death. But not only this, there must be a personal excellency, over and above the life offered up. The life is offered up in substitution, and the perfection elicited in the time of offering is that basis which forms the ground for the re-establishment of man in another condition. It is evident that man could find nothing of this kind in himself; he could not offer up a life, for he had none to offer, it was forfeited, and there was nothing to be found in him but what would aggravate the judgment under which he had fallen. Once overtaken by the penalty, he

7. {It was not only that man by sin lost natural life, but he lost God; and it is not only that Christ gives me a new and better life than the tree of life could give, but He gives me God; He brings me to God and puts me in the presence of God. He makes known God to my soul, and gives me to be sure of His love (The Bible Treasury 9:208).}
could not be released from it; he had fallen under it. If a sinner has no soul, he is neither conscious of being under judgment nor of being delivered from it; but if he has, and is to be released from it, the release must take place before the judgment overtakes him.

Abel’s offering through faith sets forth the main points of the atonement. It is the primitive offering, and we may conclude that it was the one appointed of God. Abel offered of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. A victim not chargeable with its offence, giving up its life, and not only this, but it is added, “and of the fat thereof.” The blood was the life given in substitution for one who had forfeited his life, and the fat, the acceptable thing on which God could deal anew with the lost one. Now the sense first awakened in the sinner’s soul is that there must be something offered between him and God. Even pagans attest this in their propitiatory sacrifices and the like; and the law is distinctly on this ground, for it does not simply exact obedience to a code, which in God’s mind is only worthy of man, as His creature, but it insists on the need of the intervention of sacrifices, of many and various kinds, to meet the many and various states of the old man. And this was consistent with the law, for the law addressed man as still alive; but, while it did so, it could not overlook the sense on the conscience of distance from God and of impending judgment; hence sacrifices and rituals were imposed -- until the time of reformation -- which could not purge the conscience. On it there was the sense of judgment before God, from which there could be no relief until there was an atonement which would perfectly answer for the life under forfeiture and judgment, and open out a new way for appearing before God. The law dealt with man as still alive, and hence offerings were repeated, as expressing that there was need for intervention, because that which needed it was still in existence, or recognized as so. If the being under judgment had been superseded by an atonement having been offered, then there must be an end of that which required the atonement. Either the being continues waiting for an atonement, and consequently remaining in the state that needs it, as was the case under the law; or the atonement has come, and the state of the being needing it no longer remains. Both cannot stand together. If the atonement be a perfect one, it supersedes in the eye of God the being needing it. If it had been accepted, the state of the being needing it does not remain before God for anyone connected with the substitute. The law could not propose that man should be superseded, for if he were there would be no occupation for the law; and hence, while it suffered man to remain in his state it demanded from the worshiper continual sacrifices which never purged the conscience because, if they had, they would have ceased to be offered. The moment the sacrifices effected the end desired, they ceased to be required.

The error abroad is that the atonement is not seen as setting aside the
being under judgment, and consequently there is a sense of needing something expiatory still, which, as I have said, involves two things -- one, that the sacrifice is not a satisfactory one; and the other, that the state of the being needing atonement still continues before God. The sacrifice is properly the substitution for the being needing it, and, if a true and sufficient one, then that for which it has been a substitute is not dealt with, but the substitute. The substitute must have a life like that of the being to be atoned for, only guiltless, and unchargeable in any way with his offence; and must, after proving its faithfulness in every way, give up this unforfeited life for the forfeited one, which exposed man to eternal judgment; and not only so, but the substitute must be One who has life in Himself, in order that He may rise again as perfectly acceptable to God -- as it is said, "raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father." Christ having so perfectly answered every demand of God, and having borne the judgment on man, pours out His life at the bottom of the altar, and from thence is quickened by the Spirit, to establish man in His own life for ever. In His blood there is for every believer a substitution for the forfeited life -- for death, that door into the eternal prison -- for man in Christ has no longer a forfeited life, but life in Him who has risen out of death and judgment; and hence the life atoned for does not exist as needing atonement. The great points for us to see are that the state of man because of the fall was not remediable, because the life which was forfeited was the very life of the condition in which man was set on earth; and this forfeit was the penalty, only really known after it was paid, and not in the mere act of dying, and hence the substitute for this state cannot repair this forfeited life. The first terms of atonement are that a Man's life, sinless, unchargeable, and meeting every demand of God under His judgment, is to be given up, before He can do aught else in the way of blessing us. If the life were under probation (and probation could never atone for a state of offence) it would be open to man to repair it. This was the course observed under law. Man is there under trial, and the life is prolonged, judgment is staved off while it is kept. It did not propose to atone, but offered a continuance of life while its demands were observed, and for the obedient it intimated through the sacrifices that the life was not an acceptable one with God, even though, through obedience, its doom might be respited, as will be fully manifested in the millennium. But atonement must meet the state as it is. Atonement is positive, and no tentative measure could be atonement. Hence in the paschal lamb, which was an offering instituted before the law, the blood is poured out. This is the first and great thing. This satisfies the eye of God, and He says, "When I see the blood, I will pass over." The state of man as he is is met by that blood, typical of Christ's blood -- "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." The blood, meeting the eye of the Judge, atones for man's state. Man's life is forfeited,
and here is a life poured out for it. It does not remove the forfeiture, but it removes the consequences of it. The forfeiture has been incurred, and there can be no removal of what has been incurred, but there is removal of the consequences, and this removal is effected by the substitute taking the man’s place, and being exposed to his judgment, bearing the whole weight of it, in man’s nature; and then giving up the life, in substitution, for the forfeited life. One, with an unforfeited life, bears all the distance and agony due to the forfeited one, and having perfectly done so, gives the life up. He not only endures all that was due to man for his offence -- all the suffering which a forfeited life eternally entailed -- but having perfectly and righteously met all this, He gave up the life which was not forfeited, and hence, having answered not only for the forfeited life but for its consequences, neither the one nor the other remains to the one who is in Christ. A new path, a new position, is opened out. He has cleared off the old, and now, risen, is the Head and Founder of another race. In the Passover the people of God were safe through the blood shed, but more than this, they were inside, feeding on the very lamb whose blood had saved them. The victim’s place exposed the substitute to the judgment resting on man.

For man, death itself was but the door to the state of judgment. Christ bears the judgment, is made sin, put in the sinner’s place. He who had no sin, is treated as if He had, and freely and of His own accord gives up His unforfeited life. Substitutionally He should die, “not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.” He gives the unforfeited for the forfeited, after He had endured in Himself before God every agony due to the forfeited life, thus perfecting the atonement. Having been put in the sinner’s place, treated as the sinner in suffering, He resigns that life by which He was able to connect Himself with man’s state of suffering. He shed His blood and then closed for ever the history of man for whom He had atoned. The blood righteously sets free the being who is sheltered in a new life, because he trusts in it, and not in the state which required it, but in that of the Substitute now risen from the dead. As the paschal lamb, I feed on Him, roast with fire. My entire engagement is with Him, and He supports me, as before by His blood He saved me from a judgment due to my life and state.

Under the law we get properly four kinds of offerings, which in their various ways set forth what God required of man. In all but the meat-offering the blood was shed. In the burnt-offering, which set forth the devotedness of Christ offering Himself to God, we have the blood sprinkled all round about the altar, and then the offering is offered up. The victim is first accepted as an atonement, the hands of man being laid on it, and then the life is given up. This was necessary even in the case of a burnt sacrifice made by fire unto the Lord. In like manner in the peace-offering the blood was sprinkled round
about the altar, and it too was an offering made by fire of a sweet savor unto the Lord. The excellency of the victim is the special thing offered, as setting forth the ground and basis of all blessing, and hence giving full rest and peace to the soul before God. Christ's own personal excellence is the food of all the offerings, and the sure guarantee for eternal peace.

Now it is evident that if God required those under law to meet the demands of righteousness, the first thing is the surrender of life. Even in the burnt and peace-offerings, where there is no notice taken of actual sin, the blood was given up -- that is, the life of the substitute must be surrendered previous to the acceptance and sweetness of savor accorded to the offering; and this atonement and sprinkling of blood was consequent on the laying on of hands of the man needing it. I understand the laying on of hands to imply the attributing of man's state to the substitute. The substitute's life was poured out, itself without blemish, but having been charged with man's state previous to death, it surrenders its unblemished life for his, and is accepted in perfect sweetness before God, as outside and apart from that life for which it had atoned. Hence it is, as I understand, that when in Ex. 24:5-8, the blood of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings was sprinkled, there was an open way for the elders of Israel into the presence of God. The atonement is in the blood (Lev. 17:11), but it is plain that when the hands were laid on the victim the penalty and the consequences of that which rested on him who laid his hands thereon were made over to the substitute. Thus Christ was placed under all the weight of man's state before He died. He suffered because of what was placed to His account. He was made sin, and then poured out His life, and presented Himself in His offering capacity in every acceptable way a sweet savor in the very highest degree to God. In the sin-offering the blood was not only sprinkled, but all of it was poured out at the bottom of the altar, and besides the fat being burnt on the altar the carcase was burnt in a clean place without the camp. That is to say, there was no longer to be an admission of the existence of the being substitutionally represented in the carcase. There was the excellency of the victim and the giving up of the life of the victim; but with Christ there was also the suffering of being made sin, the Just for the unjust. His death ended before God that order of being which had sinned. He was justified in the Spirit, and not in the flesh. He was put to death in the flesh, but quickened -- made alive (that is the opposite to death) -- by the Spirit. In the fulness of time God sent His Son in a body prepared for Him. He was made flesh and dwelt among us. After thirty years of patient growth, passing through every phase of man's life here below and fully conversant with it, He came forth into public ministry, satisfying the long-restrained desire of His heart to be about His Father's business; and then, as is recorded in the first three gospels, He went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the devil; He set forth that there was no state of
infirmity of man in this present life which He could not relieve or remove. He raised the dead, expelled devils, healed the leper, gave sight to the blind, cured every disease; and yet, with all this, He was not able, in the days of His flesh, to place man in likeness to Himself as God’s man on earth. For this He must die; hence He says, “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone.” It can never produce one like unto itself unless it dies; “but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.” Sad and sorrowful as was His walk and pilgrimage here for thirty-three years, He now (John 12:24-28) foresees the terrible season when as the sin-bearer He would enter into the suffering of a sinner’s distance from God. Hence He adds: “Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour.” He now -- a man, in man’s life -- undertakes to bear in Himself from God all that was due to man. He has walked in every circumstance here well-pleasing to God. He has been the Father’s delight in all the ways of a man; and now, as the burnt-offering, He offers Himself freely without spot to God, surrendering every privilege and power to which He was entitled as the Holy One on earth. Unprotected and unguarded, He is open to all the attacks of men, and exposed to all the malice of Satan; and not only this, but when He takes the place of the victim in giving up His life -- His unforfeited life -- for man, then the consequence of this falls upon Him on the cross. He endures, trusting in God, bearing in His soul, for a season, the suffering and agony of one consigned by death unto eternal distance from God. Then He trusts, and then He prays, and then is succored, because He had done no wrong, neither was any deceit in His mouth. He, in conscious and restored favor, gives up the ghost, pours out His life, sheds His blood at the bottom of the altar; but being holy throughout, yea, the most perfect sweet savor to God in it all, He does not see corruption; He is not holden of death, He is raised from the dead by the glory of the Father; He is quickened by the Spirit—man, alive again, but after a new order, and now the fountain and source of eternal life to as many as come unto Him. And in proof of this He breathes on His disciples, and says, “Receive the Holy Spirit.” He can now impart to us His own life, by and in the power of the Holy Spirit. While He walked here for thirty-three years, however close His contact, however He imparted of His virtues to man, He had never placed man on a level with Himself, as a man here. He still abode alone. The corn of wheat by no amount of contact with men here had brought any to His own order. The greatest miracle did not effect conversion apart from the word. “Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine?” (Luke 17:57). The one who returns to give glory to God is the converted one, and the one in whom the word of Christ creates rest and assurance. There was no meeting or remedying the state of man until the Man Jesus Christ placed Himself under the hand of God, as One in Himself utterly and entirely irresponsible for man’s state -- having first proved in every stage
and circumstance of life that He could walk in the flesh, in every way well-pleasing to God -- to undergo all that was due to man, and in the searching agony of it to be proved to the utmost, as to whether any thought for Himself could arise apart from God. Nothing but self-renunciation and simple subjection to God marked Him throughout, and His perfect life He then pours out. It is not that He pours out the life merely, but He does so after having exposed Himself to the judgment which the deprivation of life entails. He surrendered the life in which He had thus exposed Himself to judgment; and then -- though the one holy, perfect Man, born of a woman in man’s estate, who had been in every way well-pleasing to God -- having been made sin, treated as the guilty, He offers Himself, sheds His blood, surrenders an existence which righteously He had held and lived in, and on which there was no claim, as substitution for that which had been forfeited by man. He had a life which had not been forfeited, but which had endured, in the hour of forsaking, more than any man had endured, in suffering and distance from God. He had a life which was perfect in every way, most pleasing to God; but He gave it up, and, before giving it up, endured in it all that was on man because of his evil and sin. “Now is the Son of man glorified.” Having so endured, having glorified God as a man, He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. The life in which He, as a man, had glorified God, and in which He had endured man’s judgment, He does not retain -- He pours it out. The atonement is in the blood. We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son. The reconciliation is effected. The sinless One has been made sin, and has given up a life which He might have retained, in substitution for a life which was forfeited. But He has glorified God in it all, and hence, He is raised from the dead; we are saved by His life. “If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.” The resurrection is the proof of acceptance, but it is for our justification. That which represented the resurrection in the typical offerings was, I suppose, the fire feeding on the fat. At any rate the fat was the excellency of the animal, and the fire consuming it indicated its acceptance. Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, and the resurrection is the proof and evidence that He has indeed offered Himself without spot to God, and that it was impossible that He should be holden of death. But then, having destroyed the power of death and abolished it, He has brought to light life and incorruptibility. In His resurrection He is the quickening Spirit. He can impart life, His life, to those whose death He has borne. Being reconciled to God by the death of His Son, “much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” He shed His blood for us, and, now risen, He is the second Man, able to communicate of His life to those whom, before He died for them, He could do nothing but relieve. He must die for them where they were, in order to set them in the life in which He is. He must bear their death and its consequences, before He could share with
them His life which is eternal.

The resurrection is the proof that Christ had in everything glorified God, and hence it is for the glory of God that He should rise from the dead. It would have compromised the glory if He had not risen. Having given up His sinless life for man’s sinful life, He is raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, and also declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. The resurrection is the proof that there was life outside of death. The atonement required a life not liable to death, and this being delivered up, His life, as the Son of God, asserts its place; and it is for the glory of the Father to raise Him from among the dead, manifesting the “mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.” The penalty incurred by man is not only borne, but borne by One in no way liable to it, as the Substitute for man. He gives sacrificially the life which in every step and walk here was so honoring to God; and more than this -- He rises not only because He has life in Himself; but the glory of the Father requires that One so perfect here as a man, and so glorifying God in submitting fully to all His righteousness, with the end and the aim of unlocking the heart of God, giving Him full liberty to deal on new and eternal ground with His people once under condemnation -- the glory of the Father requires, I repeat, that such an One should be in life again as a Man, though not in the life which He had poured out, but should, without seeing corruption, be raised up in the eternity of His own life. The first man, being under sentence, has received sentence in the cross of Christ; and not only this -- a sinless life is offered for the sinful one, and He, the Substitute, being raised from the dead, is the source and founder of a new race in eternal life and perfect holiness. We are cleansed from all sin by the blood of Jesus Christ His Son. We are made nigh by His blood. Nothing remains to interfere or interpose, seeing that the life in which all the offence has been committed has been judged in Christ, and that He has given up His perfect, unforfeited life for our sinful, forfeited one. But He is raised from being the dead Man into a living Man by the Spirit of God, in the power of an endless life, and the Man is on the highest ground, and in the highest connection, glorified now in the Son who has done all the Father’s will and finished His work. The first man is set aside judicially in righteousness, and the Son of God, who as Man met the righteousness of God and bowed to it in judgment, is the One to express in fulness the love of God. He bore the righteous judgment fully. He, when here, in a region where sin abounded, answered to God’s nature in righteousness, and He expresses in fulness and perfection that nature which is love, when sin has been for ever put away.

Blessed mission! Blessed Missionary to our heart of all the grace and goodness of the living God! As we live by Him, may we live to Him, in joy
and purpose of heart. Amen!

Chapter 3

The Day of Atonement

Leviticus 16

By W. Kelly

Introduction 8

It is of some importance to see, and I therefore remark it at the starting-point, that atonement 9 differs sensibly from redemption. In the book of Exodus stands the great type of redemption, and in Leviticus of atonement; the truth in both centers in the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the Old Testament redemption was the deliverance of Israel from Pharaoh and Egypt. In His mercy God interposed to set free the people from the house of bondage, and as the passover set forth its righteous ground in the blood of the lamb, so was there the figure of Christ's death and resurrection in the passage of the Red Sea, or rather of death with Christ, and hence of faith living to God. But this is not so

8. {The style and remarks indicate that this paper is by W. Kelly. The bold-faced headings, such as the one to which this footnote is appended, have been added to this printing, but the text is not altered -- other than enlarging Scripture references to assist the reader in locating a Scripture cited. It originally contained but one small footnote. The other footnotes have been added from other places to enlarge the usefulness of this paper, and the source of them is indicted in the respective quotations. Added footnotes, as usually, are enclosed in braces {} such as this footnote is.}

9. {Q. -- Lev. 16 etc. Does the Hebrew distinguish “atonement” and “propitiation”? Are there two different words? What distinction does the chapter present? It is known that ἑλασμός in the NT is translated “propitiation,” and in the Septuagint answers to “atonement.”

A. -- The Hebrew word Kaphar (for the question) means to atone, or make atonement. So it is regularly; and Deut. 32:43, Isa. 47:11, Ezek. 16:63, Ezek. 43:20, Ezek. 45:15, 17, 20, are the same in substance, though the effect in some cases is meant, as pacified, purged, forgiven, merciful, etc. “Propitiate” would be just as good a rendering as “atone”; and no other word regularly expresses either but the one. There is however a real distinction definitely drawn in the chapter, not between atonement and propitiation, but between propitiation and substitution typified in Jehovah’s lot and the scapegoat (The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:31).}

“Atonement is God Himself, by and in Christ, taking up the question of sin in His own grace for His own glory, that believers might now be fully and forever blessed” (W. Kelly, The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:183).}

Concerning the word Kaphar, see also Collected Writings 7:78; 19:200; 31:375; Notes and Comments 2:54, 58, 59; Letters of J. N. Darby 3:11;
much what is taught in the book of Leviticus, as a sacrifice for sin perfectly
glorifying God within the holiest, and a testimony to the people without that
their sins were confessed and borne away to be remembered by Him no more.

On one day alone every year in Israel there was a sacrificial work done
which had for its object to fit the people and the priests for their respective
measures of nearness to God. It was now a question, not of enemies, nor even
of Israel’s being delivered, but of conciliating with God’s holiness and
righteousness a people guilty and defiled. Could He own in living relationship
a people with sins and transgressions upon them? Were they by these
defilements to be utterly incapacitated in the person of the high priest from
coming into or standing in the presence of God?

Atonement \(^{10}\) met their need and His glory; for therein God proposed for

\(^{10}\) It is necessary to draw attention to the fact that atonement and reconciliation are not the
same thing at all. Reconciliation depends on atonement being made. In these articles the use
of the word atonement does not mean at-one-ment – making man to be at one with God. Making
man to be at one with God has to do with reconciling man to God (God does not need to be
reconciled to man). Now, this brings up the translation of Rom. 5:11 and Heb. 2:7. A question
regarding this was answered thus by W. Kelly:

Q. Rom. 5:11, Heb. 2:17. Are these texts correctly rendered in the A. V.? {KJV}.
A. Not so, but in the R. V. {Revised Version of 1888} the late Abp. Trench
(Synonyms of the N. T., seventh ed. 276) owns that the word “atonement,” by which
our (A.) Translators have once rendered \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\) (Rom. 5:11), has little by
little shifted its meaning, and confesses that, were the translation now for the first
time made, “atonement” would plainly he “a much fitter rendering of \(\iota\lambda\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\zeta\),”
as “reconciliation” of the term in Rom. 5:11. Indeed no Christian scholar can doubt
it. It is therefore astounding confusion for anyone, not merely to go back to
“atonement,” which the present force of our language forbids, but to imagine this to
be its primary meaning and according to its Biblical usage, if we mean the original,
which of course alone is authoritative. The simple and certain fact is that our A. V.,
now at least, is doubly incorrect; it gives “atonement” in Romans, where
“reconciliation” is the sole right rendering; as “making atonement for,” or expiating,
is requisite in Hebrews. A similar blunder pervades the OT rendering of the
corresponding Hebrew term. To reproduce that error is strange, especially with a
view to clearness and accuracy of statement, which it destroys. Wiclif and the
Rhemish were right as to Rom. 5:11; which fact goes far to convict of error the
others from Tyndale, notwithstanding the amiable prelate’s desire to excuse it on the
ground of the language shifting. On the other hand, Wiclif’s “merciful to” is very
inadequate in Heb. 2:17, as Tyndale’s “to pourge” is incorrect and rather the effect,
which has its own proper expression, though followed by all the older English save
the Rhemish (here as usual servile to the very odd “repropitiaret” of the Vulgate). In
the A. V. of this text to make “atonement” takes the place of “reconciliation” very
properly. \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\) in the NT sense is unknown to the Septuagint. Trench’s
doctrine of “reconciliation” is well meant, but, like that of theologians in general,
infirm and clouded. God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. Such was
His aspect in the incarnate Word. But man, ungodly and implacably hostile, rejected
Christ even to the death of the cross; wherein God made Him sin for us {2 Cor.
(continued...)}
that very people while in the wilderness -- the place where uncleanness abounds and men are always exposed to it -- to provide a way worthy of Himself and suited to them whereby their representative might approach Him. He proposed Himself to give them a ground of access to His sanctuary, and this in such a way that there should be no lowering of His character on the one hand, and on the other no denial of their uncleanness, but both known far better and more deeply felt than before. There was such a laying bare before God of their evils on that great day as was never witnessed on any other of the year. But the same institution which exposed did also cover them, at the same time judging and, canceling their guilt, and this, one may add, by the most unsparing dealing on God’s part and the most solemn confession on man’s. Nevertheless that judgment fell not on the guilty but on a God-appointed sacrifice. This is the truth with which the chapter opens. Here of course it is but a figure; but the figure of a most blessed and efficacious reality, of the utmost interest to us to whom God has now revealed its fulness in the death of Christ. For this very figure of atonement in Israel the Spirit of God takes up in the New Testament to show, not merely that we have an atoning sacrifice no less than they, but that theirs was but a feeble shadow and not the very image of what grace has given us now in the one offering of our Lord Jesus Christ (Heb. 9, 10).

I shall pursue the chapter just as God’s word has given it. He communicated it in such a way as to be not merely a most solemn rite for Israel, but also evermore for our instruction. Assuredly too it will be a profit to Israel, in the day when their eyes are opened to recognize in the crucified One the true Son of David, and they cast away every rag of beggarly elements that they may follow Him. This favor is reserved for them beyond all doubt; but in this very chapter, as is now somewhat known, we can read our distinctive portion as Christians, if not as the church, a foreshown blessedness which they are not to taste even in that day. It is revealed so distinctly, and at the same time so simply, that any child of God, no matter how little instructed, should be able to discern it with his own eyes and feel it in his heart. The goodness of the Lord has thought of us now in this chapter, not merely of the people as they shall be restored by-and-by, but of those who are being called

10. (...continued)

5:21}, and raised Him from the dead for our justification. Therefore, justified by faith, as being reconciled by His death even when enemies, we shall much more be saved by His life. To be reconciled to God supposes more than atonement, redemption from the enemy, and justification; it comprehends, besides, ourselves set in relationship with God righteously, according to the purpose of His grace. It means, neither changing God’s mind from alienation into love, nor merely man brought out of his enmity to God, but the God of love and holiness having so wrought in the sacrifice of Christ, that He can righteously send the gospel of grace to every creature, and establish every believer in a new and steadfast relationship of favor with Himself (The Bible Treasury 19:272).
by grace while Israel are no people at all.

The Interval in Israel’s History

For I may assume that you are aware how for two thousand years and more the children of Israel have ceased to be the people of God; and you ought to know also (I am obliged to say this, for some may not know it) that they will yet be restored to that position. The scriptures that predict the sentence of Lo-Ammi (not-My-people) are equally explicit that the title they have lost is to be given back to them by God’s grace (Hos. 1, 2). Not less distinct is the testimony of the New Testament in Rom. 11. Is God doing nothing meanwhile? Has He left an unoccupied blank between Israel’s ceasing to be His people, and their final blessing and glory in their own land? I speak not merely of “the times of the Gentiles” which span the interval; but within these He has brought out, founded on accomplished redemption in Christ, the mystery hidden from ages, Christ given to be head over all things to the church which is His body. By the one Spirit sent down from heaven all that believe in Christ are now baptized into this one body. Thus, within the Gentile parenthesis of judgment on Israel, there is an inner one of heavenly blessing, through association with Christ at God’s right hand. The typical intimation, to go no farther, of our chapter (Lev. 16) teaches this, not merely leaves room for better than Israel’s place, but in a measure shows it fulfilled during the present period only, besides pointing to the future resumption of their title by the children of Israel.

In many ways, therefore, is the type of the atonement day instructive to all who can read it in the light of a dead, glorified, and returning Christ. What gave rise to the ordinance of atonement day in Lev. 16, was the death of the two sons of Aaron. They had presumptuously trifled with the presence of the Lord, and they perished. Aaron is now informed by Moses of the way in which he might safely, as the representative of the people, draw near the presence of God.

Aaron as a Type

It is clear that in this we cannot regard Aaron as in analogy with our Lord Jesus. Types must be taken not merely as resemblances but as contrasts. It is of the nature of a type that it never rises to the fulness of the truth. No shadow could ever match the Savior. Hence we must remember that, although there are certain intimations of truth in all these types, yet (as the apostle shows us) they all fall short. What in the type was done once a year is accomplished in Christ’s death, once and for ever, as far as we are concerned. What was formally outwardly effected by the washing of water in the case of Aaron points to the purity of Christ’s person of human nature in Him as well as
divine. Christ was the Holy One at all times. There was no such thing as a process to fit the Lord Jesus for His work. He was a divine person and needed nothing from without. In Aaron’s case there was a process of cleansing. It was only this that could give a feeble intimation of what was absolutely necessary in order to atonement, namely, One who is Himself spotless. Such was Christ, “Holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.” He was not made holy, or harmless, or even separate from sinners; He was so. He was made higher than the heavens. This language views Him as a man, a servant, and a victim here, because of which He is now exalted. It is in connection with what He was made that His exaltation is spoken of. Where only His own divine glory is the subject, there is no word about exalting Christ; but if He goes down, then He can be lifted up; and He did first descend that He might ascend far above all heavens. His resurrection, &c., like His death are not of Himself alone, but for us. In His humiliation for God’s glory and in His love He was laying a foundation for the blessing of others; in His ascension He was triumphing righteously for others too. He was made sin on the one hand, and on the other He is made Lord and Christ and far far more. He was made flesh, He became man; but there was no sin in Him. Sin does not, as philosophers and heretics taught, necessarily belong to humanity. When God made Adam at first, there was no sin in him. Sin came in by listening to Satan, but Christ ever obeyed and ever abode the Holy One of God.

Atonement is for sin and for sin alone -- no doubt in the first aspect of it for the glory of God, for sin was an outrage on God Himself here below, quite apart from anybody being forgiven or saved, and the Lord Jesus in this very chapter is shown, in type, dying as the primary truth that God might be glorified in respect of sin. Hence the blood was carried in and sprinkled in the holiest. But we must not overlook the necessary limitations of types, indeed there is no part of scripture where there is greater danger to those whom the apostle Peter calls “unlearned and unstable.” Men see enough to invite and exercise their thoughts; but Christ as fully revealed is the one safe-guard. Human intellect never can be trusted; and for this reason its natural and invariable tendency is to exalt man; the object of God’s Spirit is to glorify Christ. We therefore need the Spirit of God to keep us right, otherwise we exalt ourselves instead of Him; and self-exaltation cannot but depreciate Christ.

Here then we find God laying down means by which there should in future be no such thing, either as ignoring sin, or as involving judgment in drawing near to Him. It had been fatal, not merely to Israel, but even to Aaron’s sons. How could a sinful man venture into the presence of God? The very priests had not completed their consecration before two of them died, and the other two were in danger of dying. So we learn in Lev. 10. Now God sets forth in type by what means guilty men, a people who own their uncleanness of all sorts, may nevertheless, in the person of their representative, draw near into the holiest of all. This is what comes before us in the type of atonement day. “Thus
shall Aaron come into the holy place with a young bullock 11 for a sin-offering" -- that is the first thought -- "and a ram for a burnt-offering." There is no coming short of blessing, no incompleteness in the thoughts of God. He would not be content with merely meeting sin; He would give in type the sign and means of acceptance; not merely blot out the consequences of evil, but invest us with conscious favor in drawing near to Himself. How full of grace He is! How bent on the blessing of His people!

"He shall put on the holy linen coat." In this we have the character needful for approaching God, what was displayed outwardly to the eye in Aaron. What did not man, what God, see in our Lord Jesus? "He shall put on the holy linen coat, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with the linen miter shall he be attired; these are holy garments; therefore shall he wash his flesh in water, and so put them on." A sinful man, Aaron needed thus to have all the consequences of sin removed, as far as that could be done figuratively; needed to have himself invested in a way fit for the holy presence of God. These were holy garments, not the garments of glory and beauty, but specially holy for this day and work.

11. {I certainly think, as to the strict application of it (for as to efficacy, whatever efficacy there is in Christ’s offering we have, and what is true of the Jew we have) yet as to the letter, the bullock for Aaron and his house is for us, the scape-goat is for the Jews. Aaron and his house were atoned for by themselves by the bullock, as directed indeed in Lev. 4. The sacrifice was of greater value, of weightier import than that for Israel. But this is not all -- this was complete before there was any purifying of things and places -- Aaron and his house are purified by themselves; and in the case of the goat the blood was sprinkled on the mercy-seat, and atonement made for Israel also before the cleansing began. Then, in the Lord’s lot, begins the putting the blood on places, before Azazel. It makes atonement, and purifies the holy place and altar, defiled by the uncleanness of Israel. It was Godward, the nature of sin as uncleanness in His sight; with this the places were all cleansed (the heavenly with better sacrifices) but the only thing mentioned in the first goat is the places -- no doubt in respect of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, as affecting God and His presence. No doubt thus death had come in and a sin-offering, but it met God, and after the reconciliation of the heavenly saints, the places were reconciled; and then last of all, when the high priest had confessed Israel’s sins, Azazel was taken to the land not inhabited. And this confirms the order of power- first the Church received, then the heavenly places cleansed, and then Israel reconciled; there is the Church, the reconciling the heavenly things, and Israel. There are other precious differences elsewhere noticed, but this as to the proper order of application.

Notice that on the great day of atonement, the blood was sprinkled seven times on the mercy-seat, and upon the altar (v. 19) -- as of the red heifer at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, once as far as appears on the mercy-seat.

NOTE. The blood of the offerings for sin for priest and congregation was sprinkled before the veil; on the great day of atonement it was on the mercy-seat; in ordinary cases on the altar of burnt-offering. This would make it communion, but it puts the people (through the priests) in the holy place. At any rate the congregation must be fit to be represented there by them -- fit for that place. Personally they came no nearer than before the altar of burnt-offering; there consequently their sin-offering was offered (J. N. Darby, Notes and Comments 2:52, 53).}
The sixth verse shows another marked contrast between the type and the Antitype. Aaron has to bring a sin-offering "for himself"; but this were impossible where Christ is concerned. Needing no offering, He could be exclusively for others; He had neither defects nor wants of His own. His love therefore could be occupied with God and us, without thought of Himself. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live" [not merely "by," which is far short of the truth, but] "on account of the Father." What a glorious picture of One who had not an object apart from His Father, nor a motive for anything that He did! What was the effect of it? The most perfect outgoing of affection -- holy and gracious affection -- ready to respond to every call, a poor sinner, a leper, a paralytic, or a blind beggar of the city, or a babe in its mother's arms. He was here a divine person, as open for every cry of need, as able to meet it in the power of God. He lived on account of the Father. He came down for the purpose not to do His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him; so that, whosoever came, He welcomed. If He had lived for Himself, He might have preferred this one to that. But no! If the Father brought any, this was enough; if the Father drew, He received "him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out; for I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." There met love and holiness among men but entirely set apart to God, and the effect was blessing flowing out around Him. He was, as scripture says, consumed by zeal for His Father's house. An insult to Himself He ever bore with perfect patience; but He could not tolerate any affront to His Father. He never scourged one who spoke against Himself. But when He saw what grieved His heart in His Father's house, He at once drives out what was a disgrace to God and destruction to men. Indeed the two things go together, whatever man may dream. And what will His God do in the day of retribution to those that despise Him?

We see then in the type that the high-priest offered his bullock for himself as a sin-offering, but in Christ, just because His offering was not needed for Himself, it could be perfectly for others. This contrast is warranted, not merely by the general truth of scripture as to the person of Christ, but by the direct and positive statement of the Holy Ghost in the epistle to the Hebrews. He contrasts the Lord Jesus with Aaron in this respect. It seems strange a Christian should need to be recalled to it now. But some have been drawn into license in their thoughts and language as to Christ, than which nothing is more dangerous. In the beginning of Heb. 5 the apostle is not describing Christ but the Aaronic priesthood, with which he proceeds to contrast the Lord Jesus. Aaron was taken from among men, an infirm man himself, he could feel for others. But to apply such words to Christ is serious indeed. The Spirit really contrasts it with Him. Christ was the Son of God, as is elaborately proved in this chapter, in order to be priest (though no doubt He must also become a man); so that, instead of deriving His honor from the priesthood, He conferred the highest on it. Quite the reverse was Aaron's case, whose honor it was to be
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called of God to the priesthood.

The Lord Jesus was the Son of God who glorified not Himself to be made a high priest, but, called of God after the order of Melchisedec, gave priesthood an honor it never did nor could otherwise possess. There was found for the first time a priest, not only perfect according to God’s mind and glory, but consequently of unfailing avail for man.

The Two Goats: 12

Propitiation 13 and Substitution

THE CONTRAST

In Lev. 16:7 we have another offering, and an offering of a kindred character. Only in this case there is not one animal only, but two.

And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for Jehovah, and the other for the scape-goat. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which Jehovah’s lot fell, and offer him for a sin-offering; but the goat on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat shall be presented alive before Jehovah, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scape-goat into the wilderness.

12. {See also The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:227-230, 246-249, 263-266.}

13. {Propitiation is found three times in the New Testament. In one it is ilasterion, that is, mercy-seat, on which we know the blood was sprinkled before God (it was His throne of judgment, the footstool at least of it, where He sat between the cherubim); to that man might approach, because the satisfaction for iniquity was offered. In the two others, Christ “is the propitiation for our sins” (1 John 2:2) -- a passage which has no sense whatever if it means to propitiate man. How is he to be propitiated for his sins? It is mere nonsense so to talk. The other is, He “sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins” (1 John 4:10). Here again it is for our sins, showing the well-known scriptural use of the word, God sending His Son as an ilasmon perit on amartion emon, can by no possibility be referred to propitiating man. Indeed it is foreign to every thought of scripture -- the use made of the blood -- Him to whom it was presented -- and the whole order of ideas about propitiation. Moreover, the term is borrowed from the OT, which had not the idea of reconciling the people, nor their wanting to be reconciled; but is perfectly familiar with the thought of propitiation -- the propitiatory being the very center of their religious service. It was the name of the covering of the ark, on which the blood was placed before God, as it never was before the people. They offered it through the priests to God.

The verb is twice used in Greek, though otherwise translated in English. “God be merciful to me, a sinner” -- be propitious: was this propitiating man? (Luke 18:13). Again, “To make reconciliation for the sins of the people” (Heb. 2:17). Here again the expression “for the sins” precludes such an idea. Besides, it is spoken of here as the work of the priest, “that he might be a merciful high priest ... to make,” etc. What had a priest to do -- with propitiating the people? It is an idea, as I have said, foreign to the whole subject. He carried in the blood within the veil, or outside sprinkled it before God -- the Israelite (where it was not common to all the people) having himself brought the victim, to offer it to God (Collected Writings 7:77, 78; see also 29:260; 31:375).}
Chapter 3: The Day of Atonement, Leviticus 16

Here is a marked difference between the two goats which together constitute

14. {The reader will bear in mind that the two goats together typify the work of Christ in two aspects, though it be one work. The goat whose blood was presented typifies propitiation; the goat sent away, having had the sins and transgression confessed over it, typifies substitution, which is for believers only. JND remarked:

Were then everybody’s sins transferred to Christ? If so, all are saved, or His having borne the wrath due them is ineffectual and reversible (Collected Writings 23:240). ♦

Then Aaron was to bring the live goat and lay both his hands upon its head and confess all the transgressions of the people over it, and send it away, by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness, to a land not inhabited. That is the other part of sin-offering, substitution evidently. Just as in the blood on the mercy-seat God was met in His nature and character; so in the scapegoat you have substitution for transgressions. Substitution does not include everything, not the full glorifying of God, I mean, but our sins borne by Christ.

If substitution were for the whole world, it would save the whole world. Propitiation was dealing with God’s nature and character. There are two things: blood brought to God in respect of God’s character, and a scapegoat for the people’s sake. One constantly sees two things in this way, a double figure for a whole. There is the wilderness and Canaan; there is Moses and Aaron, and these two are one Christ. So here, in the first part God’s nature is met; in the second, the sins are put away. The first goat is called “Jehovah’s lot,” the people’s sins are confessed over the second (as Christ confesses the sins of His people on His own head as His own, and can call them “mine iniquities”). I see what God is in blood on the mercy-seat; but the moment you have substitution, and individual acts of transgression, you have a scapegoat (Collected Writings 19:244). ♦

Now on the great day of atonement there was Jehovah’s lot and the people’s lot. The blood of Jehovah’s lot was put on the mercy-seat. God’s righteousness and love, and majesty and truth, all that He is, were perfectly glorified. Besides this, there was the scapegoat, both goats representing Christ in the same great sacrifice; but the high priest represented the people, and their sins were confessed on the head of the goat, and carried away, never to be found. Now here there was representation, transfer, substitution, and the work was effectual for those represented. In scripture all is simple and clear; and though in the mere shadow only for the year, yet it was effectual and irreversible. Substitution is simple and intelligible; the sins were confessed on the head of the goat, the people’s sins, and they were gone. But in Dr. B.’s substitution the man may not consent, many alas! (we know) do not. Were their sins transferred to the Substitute and the wrath borne effectually and irreversibly, and yet they reject Christ and die in their sins? Dr. B. ‘s substitution is no substitution at all, for nobody’s sins were really borne, and no people really represented. Christ is a propitiation for the whole world; but this is Jehovah’s lot, the blood, in which God has been perfectly glorified in all He is, presented to God and accepted of Him. Now, says the Lord, is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him; and if God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him. And so it was and is (Collected Writings 23:241). ♦

The scapegoat is an instance of the perfect nonsense of speculation. Some make the scapegoat a demon, and then sent away; some that it was sent away to appease the demon, lest he should do mischief to Israel; and one makes out that, while Azazel was a demon, they sent the sins all back to him (Collected Writings 19:200). ♦

(continued...)
the sin-offering for the children of Israel. The difference is told out in the fact and name of the two lots. What can be plainer than Jehovah's lot, and the people's lot? The reason too is most important; yet, spite of this early teaching of the Spirit, it has been constantly forgotten.

For what do we find even among those who really preach most earnestly, and are, by the grace of God, blessed to souls? What is the character of their preaching? Is the first place given to God's glory? Do they start aright from Jehovah's lot -- how Christ has glorified God? Not so. 15 What they continually iterate and reiterate is what Christ is for man. Consequently there is the tendency to dwell most on the circumstances in Christ's work which move the feelings, which bring out the incomparable patience and grace of Christ towards man. They see and press sufferings from man and on behalf of man. It is quite otherwise in what the Holy Ghost shows us here. He begins with what was for God. The first lot was Jehovah's, not the people's. In evangelical preaching the one thought ordinarily is the people's lot. 16 The value of Jehovah's lot as distinct from the people's is not known. Not but that they believe that God was needed, and had, as their divines commonly say, "satisfaction." Is this denied? Surely not; but there was really a great deal more. What I would now point out, however, is that, in the teaching of the Holy Spirit, Jehovah's lot is put first, while in the common teaching even of beloved men of God it too often has no place at all.

I am not speaking of ritualists. We may pity their self-complacency, while on ground of extreme danger, groping with their tiny tapers, where God alone can give light as He has given it most fully in Christ and His word by the

14. (...continued)

As regards Azazel -- the word is pretty plain I think, I have heretofore noticed it; Ez, the goat -- Azal (to depart) in whom the sins fail and disappear -- and this is practically, I suppose, the force of eretz g'zerah (a land of separation), to fail, to be removed, perish, excluded. The sins disappeared wholly -- they were sent off, and so gone to the land where no man was-they were lost. The use of the two words, only thus used here, is remarkable, for the total disappearance of sins, never to be found -- there was no one there to seek for or find them. Just as in the Jewish idea, death removed man from this world, and then there was no remembrance, it was a non est as to this world -- so the sins, they were gone, and were not, not to be found, like Rachel's children though not longed for (Notes and Comments 2:51). ♦

See also Collected Writings 31:375.

15. {No doubt our sins were borne too, thank God! that we might have part in the results; but blessed as this is for us, it was really a secondary thing to the basis of the glory of God in the universe, and the bringing all into order, according to what He is fully displayed. So John 17:4, 5. But in John's gospel there is not a word of the forgiveness of our sins, save as administered by the apostles (Letters of J. N. Darby 3:101).}

16. {See Collected Writings 19:250 concerning the importance of distinguishing the two aspects of the work and giving each its proper place.}
Spirit. I am speaking of such as are generally held up as the soundest preachers now and for hundreds of years. And I affirm as unquestionable, that Jehovah’s lot has no such distinctive place in their preaching, as God’s word laid down even in the law of Moses. The people’s lot is all but exclusively dwelt on, and consequently the great point in the minds of these preachers of grace is the removal of the iniquity and transgressions and uncleanness of the people. But in the death of Christ there is incomparably more. He did bear our sins in His own body on the tree. This is most true and exactly what is conveyed by the people’s lot. But what is taught by Jehovah’s lot? There you will find a great and general defect in the gospel preached by those reputed to hold the doctrines of grace. And this goes far to explain why we so seldom hear of the “righteousness of God.” God’s own glory in Christ’s work with respect to sin is not understood. Hence, habitually the most learned of their theologians question what is meant by such expressions as “coming short of the glory of God.” The uncertainty of their maturest men even on these capital points, which every Christian should know clearly, is truly lamentable. Why is it so? Mainly because they slip over the truth that answers to Jehovah’s lot -- that side in Christ’s work which secured in the first place the glory of God.

JEHOVAH’S LOT: PROPITIATION FOR THE GLORY OF GOD

Let us listen to the words of our Lord Jesus: “Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him” Not a word about sinners, though no doubt this never could so have been, had there not been sin: but it is not the first thought. How was He glorified? By being seated on the throne in heaven? By being lifted up on the cross on earth. It was the moral glory of Him who restored what He took not away; who gave up everything that God might be vindicated; who not only surrendered all, but suffered to the uttermost, and this not in the first instance to save sinners but to glorify God about sin. True, He did save sinners; but the prime thought with Christ, as in all His life, so in His death, was Godward. You do not see the difference? It is really immense, and of all possible moment. During His life it was the Father that He was pleasing in all the affections and all the obedience of the Son. But then came the otherwise insoluble question, Would He endure the judgment of God? Would He not merely abandon everything, but be Himself abandoned of God and suffer that He might be glorified where He had been dishonored, in the place of sin? He had been glorified throughout the life of the only obedient One who ever walked this earth. But would He glorify Him by bearing that which was most hateful, not only to God, but to Himself the Holy One of God? The answer is, He gave Himself up for His glory, and so passed under, not merely death, but

also divine judgment. In His case judgment came before death. And such is the meaning of that most wonderful scene, where all is wonderful, at the close of the life of our Lord Jesus. Wherefore was that strange, that infinite, abandonment of Himself? That God, in all His moral being, His truth, love, holiness, righteousness, and majesty, might be glorified.

There is another thing. "If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself." The glorifying of the Lord Jesus at the right hand of God was the answer to the moral glory we find in His cross. "And shall straightway glorify him." God did not wait for the restoration of His kingdom to Israel. He raised Him up and set Him at His own right hand, far above every name that is named. This was the answer to the cross, the only adequate answer to the Lord’s giving Himself up to the judgment of God against sin. I say the judgment of sin, because therein the question is not yet raised as to who is to be saved. The matter in hand was God’s glory in presence of sin. And so we find our Lord in John 10 saying, not that He was loved because He laid down His life for the sheep, but, “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again.” None doubts the delight of the Father in His dying for the sheep, but apart from that work, for surely in the absolute laying down of His life, there was manifested perfect confidence in His Father as well as devotedness to His glory. He would lay it down and take it again; and on this account the Father loved Him. Surely this should -- could -- not be forgotten by our hearts if we love God and feel how He has been outraged by sin. To lay down His life because of the glory of God; to show the most absolute confidence in God and the most complete surrender and self-sacrifice for God is of an essentially higher character than any application of His work to bear our sins and secure our pardon. Putting the people’s lot first -- that is, making what Christ suffered for us the principal or only thing -- is not, only unscriptural, but an essentially God-forgetting and selfish consideration. It is the outcome of that natural instinctive egoism which, even when we are awakened and in some degree instructed by the Spirit, is apt to rise so readily to the surface in us. How inveterately the heart turns to think, if not what we are to do, at any rate, how things affect ourselves in the first place! One easily understands it as being natural. Still it is incomparably more blessed to estimate God’s side of Christ and His work confiding in Him about ourselves without question. If God proposes aught for our learning, it is well to weigh it; but if God gives, it is according to His own thoughts and heart, and this will always prove the best portion. He remembers our every want as well as His glory; and this finds its fullest illustration in the death of Christ as scripture puts it.

18. In the case of men the order is “after this, the judgment.”
We look then first at Jehovah's lot. 19 The first goat was in respect of that which, having been compromised by sin, and had to be cleared. And if we look into the New Testament, we shall find that this has a marvelous effect which could not be shown in the Old. You are aware that there was no such thing as the going out of the message of grace to men during the period of God's special dealings with Israel. But when our Lord died on the cross, He died not merely for "that nation" (the old people of God), He tasted death for every man. I know there are many Christians who would narrow this if they could. How few are those who really believe there was such largeness of grace in God's mind. But it is vain to resist scripture. Our wisdom is to learn, and we cannot learn except by subjection to the word of God. We may understand it little at first; but the path of wisdom is to bow and accept even what we do not comprehend. We shall understand better as God sees to His glory who never forgets, and as we are fit for it.

PROPITIATION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD 20

In Rom. 3:25 we may see this truth in distinct reference to the very type before us.

God Hath set forth Christ to be a propitiatory [or mercy-seat] through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are

19. {A blessed thought it is for us that we draw nigh to God in His own nature and character, what He is in Himself. He is there in His own nature, in righteousness and holiness, and we, absolutely cleansed for that, and, in the new man, created therein after God, draw near to Himself without having any question as to sin, now put away. Our delight is in holiness and righteousness, in God as He is; and we draw near according to the intrinsic value in God's sight of the blood of Jesus. It is the enjoyment of what God is, in righteousness and true holiness; but Christ in His offering has been the glorifying of what He so is. This is very blessed. We approach God, and joy in God. This is divine righteousness as it is in itself, as it is in God, enjoyed by us as admitted through Christ. And, note here, it is in this way we specially know atonement, for peace and drawing near to God. Hence for the atonement for Aaron and his sons this only was done. The bullock was slain, and the blood sprinkled upon the mercy seat and the altar of incense. There was no confession of sins, no scape-bullock. Christ, raised from the dead by the blood of the everlasting covenant, enters in according to the glory of the Father, according to the display of all His perfections brought out in the resurrection of Christ (for He was raised through the blood of the everlasting covenant, and by the glory of the Father); so we, as associated with Him, draw nigh in the full acceptance which that blood has in the necessary righteousness of God as regards it. It is not merely that sins can be forgiven, and therefore I can have to say to God as a moral governor (which is also true -- "There is forgiveness with thee that thou mightest be feared"); but I draw near in the positive and perfect acceptance in which God in His own nature receives, in righteousness, that which has glorified it absolutely; that is, according to His own nature. God is active in owning Christ thus in righteousness, in raising Him from the dead and setting Him at His own right hand; and thus we enter (Collected Writings 10:201).}

20. {... God's righteousness as Judge is in Scripture connected with blood, as in Rom. 3; so in the Passover (Notes and Comments 2:68).}
past through the forbearance of God,” &c.

I do not quote the A.V. in the word “propitiation,” as it is translated in our version, but have given you what I believe to be the truer idea, as it also stands in the Authorized Version of Heb. 9:5. Here there is clearly a reference to the first goat in Lev. 16; in the second there was no blood shed whatever. The whole point in the second is that the goat was presented alive, and sent away into a land of forgetfulness to be seen no more. But the first was killed, and the blood carried into the holiest to be sprinkled there, and on the altar, “To declare his righteousness.” Up to this time man’s righteousness had been in question, and man completely failed, never more so indeed than in the cross. But in that cross of Christ God established for ever His righteousness. There Christ who knew no sin, was made sin, and so glorified God perfectly, even as to sin. It was God made Him sin; and I understand thereby, that God charged Him with all its consequences as far as this could be done by imputation to the Holy One, who suffered for sin as really, yea, far more perfectly, than if it had been His own. Christ went down as truly and unsparingly under the divine judgment of sin, as if He had been Himself guilty. He was so completely charged with sin that God dealt with Him not only in death but in judgment. For nothing more distinctly marks judgment than God’s forsaking one. If you say it is also marked by punishment, what punishment was not there? He was bruised and wounded, and He had stripes, by which, I do not mean, what He received only at the hands of man, but above all from God.

When it is said, “By his stripes we are healed,” is it credible that a saint could believe they refer to His being scourged by the soldiers? These figures so multiplied in Isa. 53 express not merely of what man did to Jesus, but what He suffered from Jehovah, when He laid the iniquity of His own on the rejected Messiah -- figures taken from what is common among men, but above all to express that which He Himself inflicted. It pleased, Jehovah to bruise Him, it was He put Him to grief; and it was for the transgression of His people that He was stricken. He bare the sin of many.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD WITH RESPECT TO THE SINS OF OT SAINTS 21

So in Rom. 3 the death of the Lord Jesus is to declare God’s righteousness. Now that Christ had done this work, it remained for God to show His estimate and acceptance of it. What is God’s measure even now of His value for what Christ suffered? That every believer in Him is justified, their guilt gone at once and for ever! It is no longer then a question of man or his ways, but of Christ and His death. The believer has, at God’s call to him as a sinner, given up all

21. {This will be more fully examined when we consider the matter of the righteousness of God in connection with our subject.}
pretension to do anything for God or himself, and found in Christ redemption. God found His all in Christ, even for the lost in His death, and proclaims this truth to man that believing he maybe justified. Thus God’s righteousness is declared not only in receiving Christ to His right hand, but in the justification of the believer. God set such a value on Christ’s surrender of Himself to death for God’s glory which sin compromised, that man’s righteousness is not now in question but God’s. The justification of the believer is a question of God’s marking His value for Christ’s work. This is connected first with “the re­mission of sins that are past,” meaning not our sins in our past lives, but the sins of the saints in times gone by, which had been passed over in anticipation of the work of the coming One. I repeat, “the passing over” of these sins; for the word here used is peculiar, in fact never found elsewhere in the New Testament. It is not exactly remission, but pretermission. In fact, God forbore to judge. From Old Testament times, God was waiting for the work of Christ, and, because of that work, He passed by the sins of the elders who obtained a good report of all that believed on Him who was coming. But is this all we enjoy now? Far from it. “To declare at this time his righteousness, that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth on Jesus” (v. 26). There is not a word about “forbearance” here, the work being now accomplished and indeed accepted. The difference may be compared to that between a creditor who had every confidence that the debt would be paid, and therefore forbore to press for payment; and that creditor when he has received payment of the debt. In this case we do not speak of forbearance, but of acknowledging that payment has been made. God is now “just, and the justifier of him that believeth.” This is the gospel of God.

PROPITIATION THE BASIS OF THE UNIVERSAL GOSPEL PROCLAMATION

But remark also in connection with this what is found in Rom. 3:22,

22. {In Rom. 3:22 we read these words, “Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe.” There we have the principle of the two goats, or the truth which answers to them. “The righteousness of God unto all is what corresponds with Jehovah’s lot. God is not the God of Israel only, as the Jews always sought to make out. Is He not the God of Gentiles also? It is exactly what the apostle says in this chapter a little farther on, “Yes, of Gentiles also, seeing God is one, who shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through their faith.” But here we have it in the form, “The righteousness of God, by faith in Jesus Christ unto all,” after which words there ought to be a comma to make it strictly correct.

Next comes in the answer to the second goat, “and upon (ἐπὶ) all them that believe.” Here is implied the security of the believer. It is not “unto all them that believe.” “Unto” thus distinguished is a tendency or direction; and, even when meaning more, it may not reach all. This is exactly what the gospel is -- “unto all.” The gospel addresses itself to every creature; as also every soul is bound to receive the testimony of God’s grace, which puts upon them the responsibility of bowing in their hearts to it as from God. As it is “unto all,” he who does not preach it “unto all” misunderstands his duty as a herald of the gospel. On the other hand, the (continued...
Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.

This also has its place in the type; we can at any rate connect the two. The blood, whether of bullock or of goat, which was put upon and before the mercy-seat, could not be limited in its value typically before God. Certainly...
we learn from the apostle that the testimony to the blood of Christ was meant to go out far beyond those that believe. The righteousness of God is "unto all," without restriction, though only upon all them that believe. There are two things, therefore; the universal aspect, and the special effect. Its actual efficacy is only on those who believe, but the rights of the blood of Christ demand that the gospel should be preached to every creature under heaven. 24 It is due to Christ, and His blood, that every poor sinner in the world should be met by the message of God's righteousness in the gospel, a righteousness which condemns

23. (...continued)
before Him as eternal redemption. The two goats made but one Christ in different aspects. But propitiation alters the whole ground of God's dealings with man. It is the display of God's mercy maintaining God's righteousness, but opening the door to the sinner -- the ground on which I preach the gospel, and can say to every sinner, The blood is on the mercy-seat; return to God, and it will be His joy to receive you: it is not necessary for Him to judge you if you so come, for His righteousness is fully glorified, and His love free. This may bring out the evil will in man, but it is then "ye will not come to me that ye might have life." There is death in substitution -- He "bore our sins in his own body on the tree" -- "died for our sins according to the scriptures": as I have said, the two goats are one Christ (Letters of J. N. Darby 3:101). ♦ It is not substitution when I say to all, "The blood is on the mercy-seat"; I do not say "your sins are put away," because I do not know that they are. And coming to detail, I can not only say, "Come and welcome," but, "God beseeches you to come, for the blood is on the mercy-seat." The scapegoat goes a step farther; for if the man does come, it declares that it is impossible for God ever to tell you about your sins again, for they are all put away. I do preach this as truth generally; for scripture never says Christ has borne the sins of everybody. You have lost certainty the moment you make that assertion.

I always say "our sins," which scripture does say, and then they by faith take it for themselves. "Our sins" is strictly for believers. Paul is there (1 Cor. 15) preaching the gospel from his own point, as his experience. The word "our" is on purpose used vaguely there (Collected Writings 19:242, 243). ♦

The meaning of Azazel is the scapegoat; it is the goat that carries away.}
24. {Where was obedience proved? In the place where Christ was "made sin." Where was love proved? In that place where Christ was "made sin." Where was righteousness proved, and holiness, too? There where Christ was "made sin."

It must have been so, because sin was there before God's eye; and if Christ had not accomplished this, nothing would have been done at all.

If, then, all is done, and so done, I can say to any sinner in the world: The blood is on the mercy seat, "Come." God has been glorified in Christ, as He Himself said, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him." Will you come?

Inasmuch as God has been perfectly glorified, the testimony of the blood of Christ goes out now to the sinner, and says, 'Grace is free, grace reigns through righteousness'; while as to the full result of it, this will include "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (Notes and Jottings pp. 273, 274). ♦

One of these goats was Jehovah's lot (the other was the people's), and the blood was put on the mercy-seat. There was no confession of sins in that. Christ's blood being on the mercy-seat is the ground on which mercy is proclaimed to all the world, even to the vilest sinner in the world (Collected Writings 27:359).} ♦
not but justifies all who believe. But what would be the effect of this alone? Had there been no more than the gracious message presented to all, not a sinner would have been saved. Just because we are sinners, and such by nature, we give God credit for no hard ways with us who deserve condemnation, instead of saving grace. We believe not Him, but our own competence, instead of our total ruin. Because a man is a sinner, he is an enemy of God. He may be ever so decent a man in his way among men; but the moment you measure him by his conduct towards God, you come to another conclusion. He is found totally wanting; he has not a right thought of God, nor a true judgment of himself, nor sound sense of what he needs, still less of what is due to God. Hence had God done nothing more than send out to all the good news of Christ’s sacrifice for sin, infinite as it is to all, not one would have been saved. There is naturally in us such a repugnance to face our state before God, such a shrinking on the one hand from the conviction and confession of our sins and guilt, and, of the other, such indisposition to believe God’s grace and submit to His righteousness, that not a soul would bow to His message. Was it not so once with every one of us? I speak to you that believe. Were you always believers? Why were you not? Christ’s blood had been shed ages before we were born. Why did we not believe the first time we heard the gospel? Because we were not wretched and guilty only, but self-willed, haughty, and rebellious sinners. How came we to believe at last? By some goodness or truth in us? In no wise, but because God’s Spirit wrought to make us sensible of our evil and of His good; brought us down in our own eyes and exalted God’s grace to us in Christ. Thus facts agree with the written word, and there is a further dealing of God essential to the saving of every soul, the intervention of the Spirit with us personally by the truth to make us feel and own our sins and sinfulness in presence of His love and thus bring us to God by the faith of Jesus. For naturally every soul is either opposed or indifferent, and in one or the other way shows that carnal mind which is enmity against God. But we are not to suppose that this resistance always takes the same form. All have gone astray, but every one in his own way. The same particular manner of unbelief is not found in all. The calm unbelief that thinks highly of itself is quite as offensive in the sight of God as the bold unbelief that openly despises the scriptures. When the grace of God works personally, the result is that we break down in repentance and truly believe.

First, then is the righteousness of God unto all without distinction: and this answers not to the people’s, but to Jehovah’s lot. The sacrifice of Christ has made it consistent with God’s character to send out the gospel to every one. It is another thing where the word takes effect, and His righteousness is “upon all them that believe.” There is a gracious result produced, according to God, and by His Spirit they believe. To believe on Christ is as truly given as to suffer for His sake (cf. also Eph. 2:8). The one is just as much the fruit of God’s grace as the other. No soul ever believed savingly till it was given of God to believe.
Chapter 3: The Day of Atonement, Leviticus 16

Not one of us ever would have believed on Christ’s name, unless also born of God. It is not a question therefore of God vindicated alone, but of our being quickened also. We had still been lost, had God merely sent out the message announcing His love in Christ’s death, addressed to our responsibility. It is of grace alone that any believe. I know that men as such would deny this, because they think more of their own character than of God’s. But if a man really judges himself in the light of God, he will find little difficulty in believing that he is as bad as God says he is. What we find here is, however, Jehovah’s lot in the first instance; we shall, by-and-by, see the people’s lot.

The Incense: Christ’s Person

In Lev. 16:11-14 a fresh distinction is brought in. But first there is the fulness of the fragrance of Christ. We must remember that it was not the offering of

25. {But a remarkable type intervenes before the blood of either was carried within. And Aaron “shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before Jehovah, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring [it] within the veil; and he shall put the incense upon the fire before Jehovah, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that [is] upon the testimony, that he die not” (Lev. 16:12, 13). What does this mean? The traditional idea is that incense represents the prayers of the saints: surely an irrelevant interpretation as applied, not only to the type before us, but to what is analogous in the book of Leviticus, and indeed wherever incense is offered under the law. In the special circumstances of Rev. 5 we do find the prayers of the saints symbolized by incense (Lev. 16:8); but in the very same book (Lev. 8:3), we read of “much incense” given, in order to impart efficacy to the prayers of all the saints at the golden altar which was before the throne. Here the distinctness of the incense from the prayers is beyond argument.

It is clear from this, sustained by a great deal more elsewhere, the incense cannot be assumed to mean absolutely or only the prayers of the saints. The royal priests in Rev. 5 present the prayers of the saints as incense; the angel high-priest in Rev. 8 puts to the prayers of all the saints much incense, which no creature could do -- only Himself. Where would be the sense in adding the prayers of the saints to the prayers of the saints? We must therefore look for a larger truth in explanation; nor really is it far to seek. Early in Leviticus, and specially in Exodus, we may find Seasonable help.

Thus in Ex. 30 we have the detailed composition of the holy perfume for Jehovah, which was not for man “to smell thereto” on pain of being cut off. This it was which beaten small was to be put before the testimony in the tabernacle of the congregation. It set forth the fragrant grace of Christ, the more tried so much the more abundantly sweet to God. It was what He peculiarly appreciated in Christ. Here the prayers of saints are out of the question. It prefigures the personal grace of Christ tried to the utmost, but even in the minutest as in the deepest thing agreeable to God Who alone could estimate it fully.

In Lev. 2 we have nothing to do with the prayers of the saints, but Christ livingly acceptable to God. Therefore incense enters as an important element in the “meal (not “meat”) offering.” Fine flour, oil mingled or anointed, or both, with salt, composed it; so too ears of corn green or full. But the peculiar claim of “all the pure incense” is ever reserved for God. The remnant, after the memorial handful for the burning as a sweet savor to Jehovah, was Aaron’s
Christ made Him fragrant, it was what attached to His own person. He was
ever the Father’s delight. Not a particle in Him offends God. The Son became
a man, the Word was made flesh. He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh,
though for that reason not sinful flesh. On the other hand, neither is it true that
He was merely in the likeness of flesh. He was made really flesh, but when
“sinful” is added, then only in the likeness of it. He was really and properly a
man, and He is so still. His being risen from the dead does not in any way
detract from His real humanity. He is man and will be so for ever. He is much
more, we know; He is the Son of God. That blessed One deigned to be a man,
but a man without sin, and so He could be made sin. He never was made sin
before the cross, but He was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, the moment
He entered the world.

The Bullock and the Goat

THE TWO COMPANIES 26

In this type then we see a beautiful testimony to the fragrance of the Lord
before His work on the cross. The blood for others was not presented till after
the incense had been brought in and had ascended to Jehovah. Then the blood
of the bullock is brought in and sprinkled once on the mercy-seat, before it
seven times — a perfect witness. Next, “he shall kill the goat of the sin-offering
that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil and do with that blood
as he did with the blood of the bullock.” Why are both the blood of the goat
and the blood of the bullock thus sprinkled? I know there are those who find
in the death of Christ nothing but God’s providing for His church. But there is
more every way. I have already shown that the first requisite is for His own

25. (...continued)
and his sons’; but “all frankincense” was burnt upon the altar. It was the expression of Christ’s
personal grace in its unspeakable preciousness to God. Our prayers here are clearly out of the
question. Do not all these offerings at the beginning of Leviticus speak exclusively of Christ? If
none but the presumptuous would dispute the bearing of the Holocaust, of the Peace-offering,
and of those for sin and trespass, it ought not to be doubted that the Meal-offering has at least
as much of the character of Christ offered up to God as any other oblation. They are all the
reflection of Christ and His work, each in a distinctive way.

Surely incense in Lev. 16 has nothing to do with the prayers of the saints. Is it not the
fragrant grace of Christ’s presence which God alone could appreciate in Him, and in Him only?
All went up to God. Elsewhere it was His grace rising up in intercession, when making prayers
of saints acceptable to God. Ex. 30:34-38 as seen affords if possible a still clearer proof of the
reference to Christ, where our prayers would be quite out of place. But time fails to dwell
further on this interesting type, which attests the fragrance of Christ’s personal grace to God,
and can in no way point to the prayers of saints, whatever be His grace also in making them
acceptable (W. Kelly, The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:276, 277).}

26. {See also Notes and Comments 2:47.}
Chapter 3: The Day of Atonement, Leviticus 16

glory. But even when we restrict our thought to man, I deny that it is only for the church that Jesus died. The blood of the bullock and the blood of the goat were not two offerings for the same class. The difference was made too precisely in the type, to allow the thought of mere repetition in the antitype. As the priests and people differed, so yet more what was represented. There is one manifest enough instance how loose and incorrect are the notions of theology. I am not aware of any theologian that ever lived who distinguished rightly the truths taught by the bullock and the goat. Perhaps one may say so after having read more than most. So far as my memory serves me in recalling the ancient fathers -- both Greek and Latin – and modern theologians in our own and other countries, I fail to think of one who makes the obvious distinction. Do I mention this for the purpose of showing that any of us now understand better? God forbid such a thought! I say it not for exalting men now above those of the past, but to show how rich and deep God's word is, and that theology is an empty thing after all, for it cannot explain even the simplest scripture about the death of Christ.

What then are we to learn from this double presentation in type of the offering of Christ? Why the bullock and the goat? The New Testament enables us to answer this very simply. Christ was to die "for that nation" -- Israel --

and not for that nation only, but that he should gather together in one, the children of God that were scattered abroad {John 11:51, 52}. Thus two distinct objects meet in the death of Christ. First, we see His people -- then rejecting Him. Yet He died for them. But who were the children of God that were to be gathered together? This is going on now. It is not merely saving souls, but gathering together God's children. The saved are gathered together in one. Hence, every Christian owns as a brother (and, according to the epistles, as a member of Christ) a believer from the ends of the earth; the truth of which relationship makes it so offensive to hear people talk of this church and that, forgetting that, if scripture should decide, there is but one. Whether in John's writings, or in Paul's, we find always of course the same substantial truth, the unity of those now gathered by the Spirit of God. Indeed the word of God by no apostles allows the splitting up of this unity into various distinctive bodies or sects. Not that there may not be ever so many meetings, even in one city, as in Jerusalem or Rome; but there was maintained the testimony to unity not only in each place but all over the world.

We do not of course hear of this unity in the type, but when the antitype appears. But we might see that Christ's work goes on beyond "the people" to those whom the priestly house represents now brought into blessing, as the people will be by-and-by through the death of Christ. While Israel are still the rejecters of Christ and therefore themselves rejected of God, God is gathering together in one His children who formerly had been scattered. Instead of being hidden among Jews and Gentiles, and mixed up with them, they are now called
out to form a distinct company. “And, being let go, they went to their own company” (Acts 4:23). Instinctively believers had begun to act on the truth. So again, if they went to another place, they found children of God gathered together as such, and companied with them. This had never been the case before. Where they went, the preaching of the apostles, &c., was used to gather them. What brought them together? The power and presence of the Spirit who gave them the knowledge that Christ had died for this very purpose. How wise, full, and precise is scripture. We little know its worth.

Here then we see not the unintelligence of man, but the work of God; His provision for man’s necessity, and this in two distinct aspects -- the bullock and the goat. Now let us, marking what the blood of the bullock is for, search the New Testament for divine light on all. “And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering which is for himself and shall make an atonement for himself and for his house” (Lev. 16:11). It was for the priest himself and for his house.

CHRIST’S HOUSE AND ITS PRIVILEGES

The Epistle to the Hebrews states expressly that Christ’s offering was not for Himself, but it shows also a priestly house for whom it was. There were those that God gave to Him, as it is written, “Behold, I and the children whom God Hath given me.” The true Aaron has a house and a family now on earth -- Christians! He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren. And hence one object of this epistle is to prove among other things that now not only are our sins forgiven, but we have a title to enter into the sanctuary. And who can enter into the sanctuary but a son of Aaron? There was nothing so characteristic of the Aaronic family as entrance into the holy place. An Israelite could not do so; he could only go beyond the court of the tabernacle. The Hebrew believers, or Christians, are invited to enter not into the holy place only, but into the most holy. The privilege of a Christian is beyond the type of Aaron’s sons, just as the glory of Christ is beyond Aaron. The apostle can say,

Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus (Heb. 10:19).

Who are meant by “brethren?” Surely not the early believers only, but every child and saint of God nw. All these are “brethren,” and exhorted now to draw near with boldness into the holiest. And that he means nothing short of the holiest of all is evident from the words “through the veil.” Therefore it was that, when Christ died, the veil was rent from top to bottom. It was to show that there was an end of that which kept man outside. The believer can now go into the presence of God. Of course it is by faith, and by faith in the blood of Christ. What characterizes a Christian according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, is this right of entrance into the holiest. He is not merely one of the people but a priest, yea, is more free of the holiest than Aaron. Men, women, and children
who believe on the Lord Jesus, are Christ's house, and associated with Him.\textsuperscript{27}

And here let me say that we must never confound priesthood with ministry. They are quite distinct things. Every person who can draw near into the holiest is a priest, but not every person is a minister. A minister of the word is formed by the Spirit bestowing a distinct gift of Christ. Ministry is a matter of the sovereign choice of the Lord among the saved, and depends on a gift which the Holy Ghost imparts. It is quite a distinct thing from priesthood. So that I trust I may say without offence that Luther was entirely wrong in his idea of a Christian democracy. If all are teachers, it is hard to know who are to be the taught. If God had been pleased so to constitute His people, of course one would have heartily accepted it. But it was a confusion of thought, however great and good a man he may have been.

Aaron's house, then, was the priestly family, which typified the whole Christian family. For them the blood of the bullock was shed. For whom then was the blood of the goat? For the people. "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people" (Lev. 16:15). Further we read, "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place until he come out." There He is now in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not men. He is gone in not with the blood of others, but with His own, and that not merely for us who believe and who have now the incomparable privilege of entering in spirit into that sanctuary "whither the fore-runner is for us entered" -- but for the people. You

\textsuperscript{27} {This, our priestly place, is the unquestionable doctrine of the New Testament. It is not merely where the word "priest" is used, or the sanctuary is in view. Nearness of access to God, by the faith of Christ through His blood, is everywhere the truth of the gospel, from the fundamental Epistle to the Romans right through the whole extent of the New Testament. Is there any part of it (unless it be the Epistle of James, which, without taking up redemption, rather looks to new birth in those begotten of God), which does not present the substance of the truth now lying before us? -- that we come under the bullock as well as the incense, to speak Levitically? We have therefore special privileges adumbrated by Aaron and his priestly house, and indeed a vast deal more.

Mark this difference: though the blood of the goat entered within the veil, Israel never got beyond the brazen altar; we, on the other hand, draw near into the holy places before the mercy-seat. We come even boldly unto the throne of God. We are entitled to behold the glory of God there in the face of Jesus Christ. You may perceive that other scriptures are here mingled along with this type which comes before us; but it is scarcely desirable too straitly to sever one truth from another. These are only used in order to show the fulness of the Christian roll of blessing. How comes it to pass that we have our privileges shadowed not only by the sons of Aaron but by Aaron himself? that they really can only be measured by Christ on high? It is because, as we know from other parts of scripture, we are made one with Christ. Yet union is not the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews simply, because it is not God's object there. But he that wrote to the Hebrews is none other than the apostle who brought out the mystery concerning Christ and concerning the church, as no man ever could before or ever did since (W. Kelly, \textit{The Bible Treasury}, New Series 3:308).}
may ask, why have we such a privilege now? why cannot the people by-and-by in their time of blessing have the same? Because it is not the same thing to believe in a rejected Christ, as to welcome One who comes forth in manifest power and glory. God puts special honor on those who believe while He is hidden from the world. Surely those who see Him by-and-by will be blessed, but "blessed are those who have not seen, and yet have believed." This is our portion, the portion of those who now by the sovereign grace of God are severed from the world to believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and to pursue with the heart's delight the path He has traced into the very presence of God, knowing that there He has sat down for us and that we may now freely draw near where He is.

THE FUTURE BLESSING OF ISRAEL

But He will come out. Has He come out yet? No. Now mark the difference and what fixes the true interpretation of the goat. I said that the goat is for the people as distinct from the priestly family; that is, for those who are to believe by-and-by, in contrast with those who believe now. And this may be made perfectly plain, spite of every prejudice. "And he shall go out," &c. (v. 18), just as we know the Lord Jesus Christ is coming from the right hand of God in heaven.

There is not a creed in Christendom that does not own His coming again. Not that I cite creeds as any authority: but to those who value them more than I do I do say they habitually teach that He is coming again. That is what answers to Aaron's coming out in the type. "He shall go out unto the altar that is before Jehovah and make an atonement for it." And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times and cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.

When the Lord does come, He will come to reign over this world, to take the lower heavens and the earth under His own power and rule for the glory of

---

28. {Then afterwards when Aaron comes out, the people's actual sins are administratively removed, and they can be freely blessed. This diminishes the direct application of the scapegoat to us; but besides that, we enter into and anticipate all that is true of Israel, as grafted into the tree of promise, and that Christ's bearing of sins is thus applied, yet I believe only positively spoken of in Peter and the Hebrews, where the Jew is first; yet it is as propitiation formally, in general, extended to the whole world; 1 John 2:2. This gives a much fuller character to the work of Christ for us, while it leaves not the smallest cloud on the truth that He washed us from our sins in His own blood, for sin is totally put away -- our standing-place is without it before God. It is not merely sins administratively removed at a given epoch when Christ comes out, but we enter into the holiest completely purged. It is a full, heavenly, sinless qualification we now possess, "made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." No doubt fundamentally the same work is done for Israel, or they could not be blessed, but we go within with Aaron; their sins are, as I have said, administratively removed when he comes out (Notes and Comments 2:48).}
Chapter 3: The Day of Atonement, Leviticus 16

God. We find in the Epistle to the Colossians that He by the blood of His cross not only made peace, but is to reconcile all things whether in heaven or on earth. This corresponds with what we have here. The blessing of all creation coalesces with the forgiveness of Israel.

“And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar he shall bring the live goat; and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness.” Remember this is after He has come out of the sanctuary. Are we Christians waiting for our portion? Are we looking for the Lord Jesus to come out and take away our sins then? What sort of doctrine would this be? You know well that what the gospel proclaims is, not that the Lord is going to do something for our sins then, but that He has already done it perfectly and for ever, and that He is gone into heaven where we now draw near through the rent veil, which is characteristic of Christianity. He is to come forth and be seen by His own people, the Jews; and there applies the live goat.

Why is it put after His coming out? The goat already was slain is the type of the work done for the people, the live goat of its future application to them. The reason why the latter is put at the end of all is because God foresaw that the time when the people will be brought under the effect of the work of Christ is not while He abides in heaven but when He comes out. Then the Spirit of God will he poured out afresh upon the people broken down under a sense of their sins, and learning that the very One whom they despised, and hated, and slew, is the Redeemer, the Lord God of Israel; learning too that He will forgive them and put away all their most grievous offences in that day when He returns.

This is predicted plainly in Zech. 12. It is precisely what we have here in the scene of the scapegoat: not of course, the actual work of suffering for sin, but the application of it, when Israel comes under its efficacy. The work was His death. Here it is their really learning that in consequence of that blood-shedding their sins are completely gone. It will be a work of divine grace in their souls.

PRESENT BLESSING FOR CHRISTIANS

But it is worthy of all note that in the case of the sacrifice for the house of Aaron there is no second animal. There is no scape bullock. 29 There was a

29. {What makes the absence of a scape-bullock easily understood is, that it was for priests, persons already within as such. What concerned them was approach within, or rather God's (continued...)
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bullock slain just as the first goat was, but there was no live bullock sent away into the wilderness! Why is this? We who are represented by those for whom the bullock was offered are not looking for the Lord to come out for the application of the work like Israel in the day of power and glory. We wait for His coming, but “apart from sin unto salvation.” For our bodies are to be there brought under His power as now are our souls. We now hear the grace of God in the gospel, and we are led, though often through a certain conflict of unbelief which afterwards is made profitable to us, into full peace and liberty by Christ’s work. We have not to wait till He comes out again to know our sin blotted out and gone. Instead of waiting without till He comes forth, we follow Him in where He is gone. This is the essence of Christianity. We enter into blessing where He is, in heavenly places. The Jews, on the contrary, wait for Him to come out and bless them on the earth. They will then see and believe. We believe without seeing. Consequently we, looking by faith into the sanctuary, do not require to see a visible and separate sign to show all our sins confessed and put upon Him and borne away. We rest simply on the blood that went in before God. Nothing can be more marked or more beautiful than the difference in the type between those who believe now, and those who in that day will look on Him whom they pierced.

STATE OF SOUL OF THOSE BLESSED

I must close without entering into details. I will add just one point more, and that is, the state of soul that is produced even in those who will then rest on the atonement. This is very important. There is a certain state of heart that goes along with the knowledge of that infinite work of the Lord Jesus, and the man whose heart is not wrought upon suitably to it is not a true believer. What is that state of heart? I will answer in the words of the chapter. “In the seventh month, in the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls and do no work at all... It shall be a sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls by a statute for ever” (Lev. 16:29-31). It is a beautiful fact found elsewhere, that on this same day the jubilee trumpet was sounded and everything was rectified, every man was reinstated in that which was his own. But there was exercise of heart too. First, his soul was to be afflicted in that day, not to be merry. Wherever there is genuine faith, there is genuine repentance: where souls do not feel their sins, it is vain to look for the remission of them. Instead

29. (...continued)
nature or character within, for they would not have been there without it -- it was done, in fact, when they were consecrated; but it gives strongly the true character of worship. In point of fact we were sinners just as Jews will be, or were, on the earth, and hence have needed the scape-goat, when our responsibility was in question as they do: just the same exactly as we anticipate the use of Isa. 53, or even the blessing of the new covenant, but it does show what our worship in the priestly character is (compare Deut. 16) (Notes and Comments 2:61; see also pp. 50, 51; and Collected Writings 16:200).}
of talking lightly of receiving the word with joy, there is deep self-judgment, resting on that most solemn, humbling scene, where the Lord Jesus died for us. Secondly, there was no pretension to work on that day, it was to be a sabbath-day, the work was Another’s. There was no thought of their doing anything towards atonement, but real brokenness of spirit in the presence of such incomparable mercy.

May God bless His own truth, and make us feel more and more how complete it is, how every part of the Old is bound up with the New! The man who understands the New best will most value the Old.

_The Bible Treasury_ 12:8-16.

**The High Priest’s Garment on the Day of Atonement**

The death of Aaron’s profane sons was the occasion of declaring man’s unfitness to draw near before Jehovah; even Aaron must not approach at all times within the veil on pain of death (Lev. 16:1, 2). Aaron must come with a young bullock or calf for a sin offering. He had to bring a ram also for a burnt offering (Lev. 16:3). Aaron had to put on the holy linen coat, to have the linen breeches upon his flesh, to be girded with the linen girdle, and to be attired with the linen miter or turban; and he must bathe his flesh in water before putting them on (Lev. 16:4). All this spoke of intrinsic imperfection and uncleanness. He was as he stood in no degree meet for access to God; and when he did get there, it was through incense and blood.

The high priest appears not in his official robe, but in the garb that spoke of unsullied righteousness, the special holy garments. These were not regular or proper apparel. The high priest was distinguished by a rich dress wherein gold and jewels had their place. The holy “linen garments” were required for the atoning work of this day.

We may here observe that this exceptional presentation of the high priest on the Day of Atonement helps to understanding a verse which has been fatal to men otherwise versed in scripture. It is written in Heb. 2:17,

*Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like to His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in all things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people.*

To reconcile sinners to God is exactly what the gospel proposes; but to make reconciliation for their sins is an unhappy expression. The A. V. {KJV} did not mean that God can ever be reconciled to sins, or would have us reconciled to them. It is one of those verbal oversights occurring in an otherwise admirable version. Reconciling is not atoning.
In Rom. 5:11 it is commonly known that it should be "the reconciliation," not "the atonement"; whereas in Heb. 2:17 30 "atonement," expiation, or propitiation would be correct, not "reconciliation" which is another word and truth. Atonement implies expiation as to sins, and propitiation as to God, Who is offended at sin, justly indignant at that which directly violates His will on the part of man who resists His authority and commands. Atonement is God's intervention in His grace by Christ's death to expiate the sins and pardon the guilty who believe; and therefore is it the sole way in which He can righteously bring the sinner into reconciliation with Himself. Therein is God as truly glorified as the repentant soul is brought nigh to Him in peace. By that work the face of God becomes propitious to the sinner, so that his sins being judged on Christ are sent away never to be found again. "To propitiate, or make atonement for the sins of the people" is the right sense.

But here some stumble at the text in Heb. 2:17, because the High Priest is not in His official status on high till after the sacrifice is made. 31 His proper sphere is in heaven. They therefore deny propitiation till after His death He entered the sanctuary above. But this undermines God's general testimony to the death of His Son, for an imaginary work assigned to Him in His disembodied state as if He were the efficacious High Priest in that condition. It effaces the propitiating character of the work finished on the cross for a different work which is not another. It annuls reconciliation by His death, unless it be true that He reconciled us by it before this fancied and strange doctrine of propitiation made in heaven 32 after His going there in the separate state. "You . . . now He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death" {Col. 1:21} says the apostle, not by an after work in heaven. Here He died, lifted up from the earth no doubt, yet not in heaven, though the virtue of His blood was at once infinitely there as here and for ever. Can one conceive a more admirable shadow than what God gave to put these two things together? The high priest had to act that day in a manner not more necessary than effectual for making atonement for sins; nevertheless he was not arrayed in his.

30. {See The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:211.}
31. {See The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:212, 248; New Series 4:35, 36; Notes and Jottings 21, 22.}
32. {W. Kelly has written a survey of "Modern Views Subversive of the Atonement," and added this at the end:

The last aberration, which we may notice here, consists of a slight on Christ's work on the cross in two opposite directions. One writer will have it that Christ only completed His vicarious suffering after death and before resurrection in hades, and even the punishment of damnation; the other insists on propitiation being made by Christ's entering between after death and before resurrection. I understand both of them to hold that the work was not finished in the blood and death of Christ on the cross, but the propitiation effectively depends on a further action of Christ (whether in heaven or in hades) in the disembodied state. Each of these appears to be a fable as to a foundation truth (W. Kelly, The Bible Treasury, New Series 4:132).}
official but exceptional garments.

Does not this instructive type singularly tally with the facts? The Lord entered on the proper functions of His priesthood, after He had been perfected through sufferings and ascended to heaven. But before this the atoning work was effected and accepted. "Having made [by Himself] purification of sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Heb. 1:3), nay more, "With His own blood He entered into the holies, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12) -- the very text misused to confirm the error that propitiation was only then and there made {in heaven}. He obtained that redemption strictly neither in heaven nor on earth, but "lifted up" on the cross. There did God make sin Him Who knew no sin; but if atonement was thus made, its efficiency penetrated the holiest that very moment. "It is finished" said He Who poured out His soul unto death. The blood was for God in the sanctuary and for man's sins on the earth.

The reality far surpassed every part of the type. To this end was He "lifted up from the earth." Thus does He draw "all men unto Himself," not sons of Israel as such exclusively but all {John 12:32}; for as the cross closed all hope from a living Messiah, every thing for sinful man turned on a crucified Savior. On the cross He bore God's judgment of sin while the virtue of His blood instantly reached the holiest. Only after His ascension and sending down the Spirit was it preached to men on earth. It was in type the high priest alone acting, not in regular intercession, but in the exceptional position of the one great representative in the judgment of sin before God, both for the heavenly family and for the earthly people, not yet saluted of God as entered on His ordinary functions above. Had it been with the garments proper to His heavenly place, one might have thought of a fresh action of Christ in heaven, to make out a succession of stages answering to the various parts of the type.

But even the type, as it stands and we read, is plain enough, that before the high priest assumes his ordinary garments, he executes a work of the deepest moment, clad in the holy linen, and this after He leaves the sanctuary. For only then does He confess sins on the scape-goat which carried them away to be remembered no more. If believers have not to wait for Christ's coming out of the heavens to enjoy this great privilege from His substitution, we must beware of a too technical treatment of the type. Reasons that called for a pledge to Israel at the end of the age rendered this order necessary for the shadow. But the body is of Christ for us already. Aaron had not, Christ had, obtained eternal redemption when He entered the sanctuary. The very image, the truth, has an immediate completeness and unity which the shadow could not possess. For the law made nothing perfect (Heb. 7:19). Aaron was immeasurably below the Savior and His work.

Chapter 4

Propitiation

{This paper, while not designated as by W. Kelly, nonetheless bears the imprint of his style and knowledge. It has much to say about the evil notion that propitiation by blood was made in heaven. However, what is brought to bear on that matter has application to other theories of atonement involving something subsequent to the cross.}

It may help souls, in danger of being perplexed by words as unintelligent as they are confidently uttered, it be clearly understood that the same Hebrew expression for “atonement” is used throughout Lev. 16, and that this finds its counterpart in the Greek verb which the Revisers {1881 Revised Version} correctly render “make propitiation” in Heb. 2:7, and its derivative substantive “propitiation” in 1 John 2:2 and 4:10.

It is a characteristic of the NT that there alone do we find “reconciliation” in the sense of divine grace. The Septuagint never uses καταλάσσωσιν with any such force. Indeed the verb only occurs in Jer. 48:39, the substantive in Isa. 9:5, the one meaning “changed” and the other exchange or “restitution”: so remote is the application from its NT usage. We can easily understand that, as with other words, so Christ’s presence and work of grace gave κ. an entirely new and blessed character. God was in Christ reconciling, not merely the Jews, but the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them -- the very thing the law must do. But the world, though made by Him, knew Him not: its wisdom was its darkness. The Jews more guiltily received Him not. In result both crucified Him. On that cross Him Who knew no sin God made sin for us. This is atonement; for no ignorance can be more pitiable than only looking for the bare word. God has graciously revealed the thing in all variety of forms, for which faith praises Him. On the cross the Savior was charged with sin and our sins, and bore the judgment of all unsparingly, that we might become God’s righteousness. Thus the reconciliation which unbelief and hatred refused is now made good; and God has not only reconciled to Himself us who believe, but given us the ministry of reconciliation. Grace reigns through righteousness here also. What do we not owe Him?
Now the fact already stated as to Lev. 16 proves the utter fallacy and sheer heterodoxy of denying that propitiation applies to the blood of the cross, and of limiting it to putting within the sanctuary. For in that chapter, which is the main ground of course of the NT references, call it atonement or propitiation, one and the same term is used of all the work of that great day. So we find it employed in general, Lev. 16:6, as none can deny, without the least restriction to the sanctuary. It is striking that it is next expressly said of the scape-goat, Azazel (Lev. 16:10), where such a limitation is manifestly absurd. Again in Lev. 16:11 it occurs with presenting the bullock for sacrifice. Afterward it is said, as all agree, of the sanctuary in Lev. 16:16, 17, whatever be judged of Lev. 16:18. What is more, the same term is applied as elsewhere to the burnt offering for the high-priest and for the people. In short the Holy Spirit applies the word for making atonement or propitiation to all the sacrifices of that day, and to each part without no less than within {the sanctuary} (Lev. 16:30-33), so as completely and without the least arguing to demolish the human theory that restricts propitiation to the sanctuary alone, and thus excludes the work on the cross from that expression.

The NT speaks with no less largeness; and "to propitiate" or "propitiation" there means that God-glorying work as a whole, not a part only. To limit it to an act in the heavenly sanctuary, to deny propitiation to Christ’s work on the cross, is therefore flying in the face of the truth of scripture without the smallest warrant, and to the deep dishonor of that which gave its righteous efficacy to the blood before God, or to the dismissal of all sins into the land of forgetfulness.

If any one were to say that the Lord on the cross failed to make good the type of the blood put within the holiest, &c., such teaching on Lev. 16 ought surely to be refused as unsound. To set forth the efficacy of Christ’s blood in figure, Aaron had to bring in some of the atoning blood, as well as when he came out to lay the sins on the scape-goat for their total removal out of sight. But the substance of the atonement or propitiation was the sacrifice offered to God. The slaying of the victim, the carrying in of the blood, the dismissal of the confessed sins (to say nothing of the incense at an early point and of the burnt offerings at the close), were each and all aspects of the same one work. What is so painful and new to most of us (certainly to myself in general fairly informed) is the singling out the intermediate portion of this instructive ritual as alone propitiation or atonement, in the face of the scripture which itself so speaks of all the parts composing it. To me this is an irreverent anatomy of atonement, as dangerous to faith in His work as the severing of His person in which other speculators have unholyly indulged. All sound in the truth hold that the propitiation or atoning work of Christ is a whole, and “finished” here below as Himself said. And a most serious slight of His infinite sacrifice I cannot but regard it to deny that to be propitiation wherein sin was judged and God forever glorified as to it.
But the new doctrine goes farther, and by a mischievous putting together of Heb. 2:17, 8:4, and 9:12, assumes that Christ went on high after death and before resurrection (of course therefore in the disembodied state) to effect propitiation; and that this alone did it. NOT His sacrifice on the cross instantly owned before God, as the rent veil testified on earth! {What this doctrine of Christ making propitiation in heaven means, is} Propitiation was not even begun then {on the cross}, whatever the Lord cried! The new doctrine boldly tells us that He in the separate state and in heaven alone made propitiation for our sins. Is this the truth of God? or a cheat of the enemy? He that rests in the simplicity of faith on the atoning sacrifice of Christ as prefigured in Lev. 16 rejects the hypothesis of these separate stages of life, and death, of earth and heaven. The true force of the types he sees in their combined value, as the inspired text carefully impresses on every soul subject to the word. The interpreting of the blood taken within, as alone propitiation, and never verified till after Christ died and was a separate spirit on high, not only shocks the spiritual sense but dislocates scripture, disparages the cross, and invents a strange unheard of propitiation in lieu of that which God’s elect have hitherto believed in. Familiar as perhaps one may say I am with what has been written on propitiation since the church began, it has not been my lot to hear a whisper of the kind till some four or five years ago.

But what say the NT scriptures whence we are entitled to look for the fullest final light from God? Does Heb. 2:17 give a hint of a work done after death to propitiate? We hear very simply of Christ “a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God to make propitiation (or atonement) for the sins of the people”: a clear reference to Lev. 16 and as clearly fulfilled in that complete work in which He stood representatively on earth for the exceptional work of atonement, the basis of all that blots out sin, and glorifies God, before interceding for the saints in their temptations and sufferings. But not the most distant hint of a disembodied priesthood before He was made perfect, saluted of God a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, and for ever set down on the right hand of God.

Does 1 John 2:2 or 4:10 give cause for the scheme? The first text simply declares Christ the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the whole world. Thus the essential requirement, the foundation of all the rest based on it, is the death and blood-shedding of the victim; for apart from shedding of blood there is no remission. Now the truth includes what is meant by putting the blood before God, but it insists on the sacrifice as the absolutely necessary and most integral part of propitiation. This spurious novelty on the contrary as absolutely excludes it from being itself propitiation, which is conceived to be a special action by Christ’s presence in heaven for a little while after His death. Just think of the boldness of trusting a bit of reasoning against the plain and large bearing of God’s word in order to pick out, not Jehovah’s lot nor the people’s, nor yet the bullock, but a manifest result however
interesting, instructive and momentous, and contending that this alone is propitiation! Certainly 1 John 2 is ominously silent on any such point. 33

Still less does 1 John 4:10 help the desired inference. It appears distinctly and decisively adverse. The love of God was manifested in our case, that God hath sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him. Such was the first want of man morally dead, even life Godward; and this life is in His Son. But however precious and eternal, it is not all we want, for we were guilty and lost sinners. Therefore another proof and gift of His grace: --

Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son as propitiation for our sins.

He sent Christ to be such. The heterodoxy to gain the least show requires His going to heaven after death, for that purpose. As far as it speaks, the intimation here is altogether in favor of the large, full, and sound view of propitiation, and against the notion of a retreat to heaven to effect it. And scripture cannot be broken. Whatever added light may be from other texts (and I am dead against limiting our view to where the mere word literally occurs), no other can undo the certain and simple intimation to our faith that God sent His Son to be propitiation, instead of the dream that He went back to heaven after He died and before He rose for any such purpose. We know that He was that very day of His death in Paradise, and the converted robber too; but what scriptural link has this with making propitiation? If ever a time and place could be supposed to forbid such an association, Lev. 16:17 excludes it. The triumph of grace is seen in such companionship in Paradise. Whatever the importance of our Lord’s passing through the separate state, nowhere does scripture connect it with effecting propitiation. And as for Heb. 9:12, what can be stranger than to lower that grand entry once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption, to the imagined brief errand to make propitiation? To say that it is not ascension is the merest assumption.

I am not ignorant that some complain because I do not set out other views of the author, such as his faith in the Lord’s sacrifice, bearing the curse and judgment, and dying for us. This seems to me wholly unreasonable. I did allow of much truth, and truth altogether inconsistent with his error. The statement that “expiation was made on earth, for Christ suffered on earth, died on earth” (Help, 63, 4), overthrows his system completely. For every scholar knows that expiation means at bottom the same thing as propitiation, and that any real difference is imaginary. In Greek and Hebrew it is the same word.

Nor ought it to be forgotten, by those who feel a difficulty of seeing how the dismissed live goat fills so weighty a place in the rites of atonement, that

33. I leave it to the reader to find out what there is in Rom. 3:5 and Heb. 9:5 to support the new theory.
Aaron was expressly to take the “two he-goats for a sin-offering,” and to set both before Jehovah at the door of the tent of meeting (Lev. 16:5, 7). Indeed it is added, as if to forestall any objection of this kind, that “the goat upon which the lot fell for Azazel shall he set alive before Jehovah, to make atonement over (or, with) him, to send him away as (or, for) Azazel into the wilderness. The removal of our sins, though thus typified, as truly hung on our Lord’s death on the cross as the witness to the efficacy of His blood in the sprinkling of the sanctuary. To deduce separate acts of Christ, at distinct times and different places, and even in another condition of His person, is foreign to Christian truth.

What I affirm (in the face of all special pleading to minimize a mere fable which lowers the cross by denying its propitiatory value, and draws the mind away to itself from the solid truth of God’s word) is that all which is peculiar to Mr. C. E. S. {Stuart} on the most solemn of subjects is unquestionably false. Therefore I envy not the human feeling that essays to put forward other things that are true in order to weaken the just indignation which rejects and resents such an error. An outcry from any beguiled by the heterodoxy is natural. What can one think of an apology for it from any that reject it? With such human liberalism one cannot sympathize. God is light and God is love. To predicate of Christ as propitiation a false scheme which diverts from the revealed truth is to my conviction beyond measure grave, though I do not expect to convince all that may read this protest. To palliate it by a show of argument in order to justify fellowship with those in such error one can leave the Lord to judge.

When we are subject to the scriptural testimony to Christ and His work, there is no difficulty. If we take it up in a human way, there is nothing to save us from error one way or another. But it does seem marvelous that one imbued with NT truth should fail to see that what gives character to all the accessories of Lev. 16 is the offering to God, the great sin-offering of Aaron, not more the center of the book than of the entire Jewish system. No doubt therein were many measures and many manners; but it formed, specially to the Christian eye, a unity without parallel among these types. We may study with profit the distinction of the goats from each other, and of the bullock from both (Lev. 16:5-11); so also the censer with its burning coals causing the cloud of incense to cover the mercy-seat, the witness of the personal acceptance of Christ when ever so tried by divine judgment (Lev. 16:12, 13); again, the sprinkling of the blood, not only of the bullock but of the goat upon the mercy-seat and before it, and the cleansing and hallowing of the holy places and altar (Lev. 16:16-19). We may weigh the dismissal of all the confessed iniquities on Azazel to a land of separation (Lev. 16:20-22). We may consider the resumption of the ordinary garb of the high-priest instead of what marked the exceptional action in the previous verses, and the offering of the burnt-offerings as well as the fat
of the sin-offering (Lev. 16:23-25). But not even a pious Jew would have
singled out one of these many parts as exclusively atonement or propitiation,
whilst he would simply, unequivocally, have viewed the sacrifice as not only
the grand basis but that which in the highest way gave an atoning character to
all that followed.

That Aaron had to enter the sanctuary in order to put some of the atoning
blood there according to the word of Jehovah is true. That Christ had to enter
heaven before He rose to do something analogous is to beg the question
altogether; just as it is to overlook the type of Aaron’s coming out again for
the transaction of the scape-goat. The force of this last is evaded by making it
solely prophetic of future dealings with Israel at Christ’s appearing. For it
figures what Christ did adoringly, as the ground of that mercy to guilty but
repentant Israel by-and-by. It is the removal, rather than the forgiveness, of
the iniquities confessed. The two goats are regarded together as a sin-offering.

And when the Christian looks at Christ on the cross given in infinite love,
yet withal abandoned of God, His God, drinking the cup His Father gave Him,
suffering infinitely for sins, sin itself judged on His person, -- there it is that
both conscience and heart rest by faith according to the fullest revelation of the
word. He believes without hesitation that all was made good there and then.
He does not limit the work any more than the person of our adorable Savior:
it immediately penetrated heaven, and is the ground of a reconciled universe
for eternity. He gladly interprets the shadow of the incense, and of the blood
put in the holiest as the highest witness to Christ vindicating God for His own
presence, but this solely because the essence of the propitiation was in the
sacrifice. He does not admit for a moment another act in the Antitype for the
necessarily separate and the subsequent stages of Aaron; and he points not only
to the scape-goat as the manifest disproof of it, but to the burning of the fat of
the sin-offering as well as the burnt-offerings as assuredly fulfilled in the one
great sacrifice of Christ. All were parts of the atonement, as the chapter
clearly shows save to a reasoner bent on his own will and indifferent to the NT
key which God graciously affords us in our weakness and ignorance.

It is this holy and beautiful and solemn unity which is infringed by the
delusion lately broached of the blood in the sanctuary being alone propitiation;
and this in the face of the express statement of the chapter itself which applies
the same word, call it atonement or propitiation, to the entire work of the high-
priest on that day. So arbitrary a restriction has the effect of denying the
sacrifice itself, the ground of what follows, to be propitiation. And this not
only does the greatest wrong to Christ’s work on the cross, but opens the door
for the will-o’-the-wisp of a distinct action of Christ in heaven after death and
before resurrection which alone claims to be propitiation.

It is by more than one said that in pointing out the unscriptural temerity
of this false teaching I am attempting to fasten heterodoxy on its author. But
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this seems wholly unfounded on their part. Nor am I in the least unfair or one­sided, as they are who set the true things the author says to screen the error from the abhorrence of all who glory in the cross of Christ. Nothing is easier than for a partisan, if he will, to give good excuses for a bad thing. It is the invariable way of human alliance faithless to Christ and the truth. I have briefly enough exposed a novel intrusion into a foundation of the faith, which is refuted by the scriptures alleged and would supplant the revealed propitiation by a fable. Nor has the author or any friend title to complain of its summary and decided exposure, after venturing in his “Recent Utterances” to attack the faith of all save his own small following, as if they denied propitiation or made it impossible.34 For in this respect Mr. P. {B. F. Pinkerton} differs not substantially from all saints known to me. The aim of the enemy is plain. If the only propitiation be something that followed Christ’s going to heaven after death, the sacrifice is robbed of that value which scripture gives it in the faith of all outside the Reading {England} fraternity, and must sink into a subordinate place. Some who accept the dream may continue in a measure old habits of speech notwithstanding; better still some having real faith underneath their new creed may retain honor for the cross of Christ. But inevitably where souls are formed only on this notion, they must eventually sink to the level of the heterodoxy that Christ’s sacrifice is not the essence of the propitiation, which last is a mysterious and subsequent sprinkling of His blood by Himself in heaven after His death and before His resurrection. To state the view is its truest and strongest condemnation to all

34. Neither the author nor his apologists have a just plea against hard measure from others in presence of such words as these, still uncanceled -- the first hint of the dogma that came before me (in 1886, I believe): --

Now as propitiation by blood could only be made in the holiest, and the Lord never entered that on earth, for He was not a priest on earth, where and when has propitiation been made by Him? The answer is simple -- in heaven and after death. Mr. Pinkerton affirms all was done in this world not in heaven [and in this I should have thought all saints concurred unhesitatingly]. If so, propitiation by blood the Lord has not made, nor can He make it. The doctrine we are asked to accept [and I never to my knowledge heard other from an orthodox believer of any age, land, or confession] sweeps away all hope of salvation, for atonement is not complete without propitiation, and this Mr. Pinkerton really denies that the Lord could and did effect [a monstrous conclusion and simply from his own delusion]. His doctrine is in flat opposition to the word of God” (Recent Utterances by C. E. S. {C. E. Stuart}, p. 42).

Either people do not believe such reprehensible language, and then what can one think? or, if they do, they are bound to have the courage of their convictions, and to act as they speak. If the saints at large, who differ as to this from Mr. S. wholly, and not from Mr. P, “sweep away all hope of salvation,” and deny true propitiation, are they not in deadly error? or are they condoned by the author, as so ignorant of the truth that their error is a small matter, and quite unworthy of raising a question of fellowship or discipline?
single-eyed believers. And any effort to fritter away its seriousness by putting forward other things the author states is in my judgment not of God.

It is a fact that the NT does not expressly say that God was propitiated, but speaks of Christ expiating our sins, of His being a propitiation for them and sent for this purpose by God. Admiring the wisdom that avoids language which heathen, ignorant of divine love and holiness, might from their old habits seriously misunderstand, I believe it quite another thing to deny that God needed propitiation. For herein the offended majesty and violated will and outraged nature of God were vindicated. It is therefore profoundly erroneous to confound it with reconciling love. The gift of the Son in God’s love in no way negatives the necessity of Christ’s blood as a propitiation: it is unbelief to array them in opposition. Therefore one hails these words of C. E. S. in Dec., 1888 (only just seen),

God requires propitiation to be made, because men have sinned, that He may in righteousness be propitious to them,
even though the NT may not so express itself. But they seem quite inconsistent with, and surely corrective of, the expressions reprobated in “Help and Instruction,” which shocked souls by setting the letter against the spirit of all scripture. For the essence of propitiation is Godward, on man’s behalf indeed, but in the unsparing judgment of his evil, the ground of divine righteousness as we see so plainly declared in Rom. 3:25 and elsewhere. Nowhere was it said, thought, or implied, that the author believed not in Christ’s sufferings on the cross. But this doctrine was judged, whatever else was right, to be ruinously wrong, first, in eliminating propitiation from the sin-offerings of atonement to confine it to the blood carried and sprinkled within the sanctuary; secondly and worse, in insisting that Christ only made this type good, and Heb. 2:17 true, by going into heaven after death and before resurrection, to make propitiation for our sins.

... But it seems unobjectionable and called for to say, now that his name is so often invoked for what he detested, that J. N. D. has repeatedly left on record under his own hand (what his life-long ministry proved to all that knew it) his distinct faith that Christ’s making propitiation for our sins was here below on the cross (Heb. 2:17), and by no means after death and in heaven as an action of His priesthood there. 35 Any one who has access to his Collected Writings can verify this without

35. {W. Kelly also said:

After examining carefully all the passages we are now referred to, I affirm that Mr. S.’s heterodoxy finds no countenance from the writings, any move than from the oral ministry, of Mr. D. How then account for this confident but baseless reference? The very passage cited at length distinguishes the high-priestly action on the day of atonement from the whole of the priesthood carried on in heaven itself. The propitiation was on the cross of Christ, Whom God set forth a mercy seat through faith in His blood; and when He set Himself down on the right hand of the majesty on high, it was as having Himself made the purification of sins. It is mere fiction that He had to make propitiation there. It is true that Mr. D., like everybody else, has (continued...)
doubt by examining Doctrinal 3:484, 5; 4:325. From this conviction I never knew a single godly man in or out of fellowship, still less a teacher, dissent; and if it be true that the Reading {England} error appeared ten or twelve years ago, I can only presume that no man of discernment had read the articles, almost all such at that time being absorbed in the then impending or current sorrow.

35. (...)continued
allowed himself, from the Aaronic type, the figurative language of Christ’s “carrying in the blood,” &c. just as he elsewhere speaks of burying the remembrance of our sins in the grave of Christ. Is it possible that any are so “unlearned and unstable” as to take such words in a literal and material way?

In not a vestige of his Collected Writings does Mr. D. teach propitiation after death, in heaven, and in the disembodied state, consequently, before resurrection, as Mr. S. teaches: all which things are false, and no truth, but the undermining and supplanting of revealed truth by a really revolting dream from the enemy. Readers who are not leavened will see that Mr. D.’s doctrine was no other than that which has been now, as always, maintained in these pages, if they weigh his Doctrinal 4:325, where he says, “save the fact of propitiation in Chapter 2 [Heb.] in which the high-priest represented the people (not a proper act of priesthood, though of the high-priest on the day of atonement).” Now the pith of Mr. S.’s theory is the putting together of Heb. 2:17, 9:12, and 8:4, which results in deadly error annulling the cross, and inventing a ghostly priesthood; whereas Mr. D. expressly discriminates Heb. 2:17, and thus maintains the holy balance of the truth, giving the cross its fundamental value, and showing the true distinctive character of priesthood on high. Mr. D. expressly calls the propitiation “an exceptional case.” It was here below and by the blood of the cross, though the right hand of God in heaven alone adequately expresses its moral glory and efficacy.

But if plain scripture is so gravely perverted, we must not wonder at the misunderstanding of a dead saint’s words. If he had been alive, they would probably have been let alone. But it is well, if error be at work, that it should come out plainly, and that we should know who seriously stand for the truth (W. Kelly The Bible Treasury 16:207). See also The Bible Treasury, New Series 3:176.)
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Purchase, Ransom, and Redemption

The subject of atonement is a very large one. It involves the Scripture use of numbers of words, such as: atonement, propitiation, ransom, pardon, bought (or, purchased), redemption, reconciliation, and the actual substitutionary bearing of sins of believers. The subject of propitiation and substitution is also related to the subject of election; for it is the sins of the elect that Christ bore substitutionally in His own body on the cross. These are all related to the work of Christ on the cross and it is difficult to deal with, say, *ransom*, without bringing in some of the other words at the same time. Thus, in considering what *ransom* is, we must consider purchase and redemption at the same time. First, then, we will consider that there are three kinds of rights, so to speak, that the Son of God has regarding believers -- two of which He has regarding unbelievers.

The Rights of Christ by Purchase

There are two rights that the Son of God now has over mankind, while over the believer He has three rights.

The first He has is Creator rights. The Son of God created all things (John 1, Col. 1, and Heb. 1). In view of creation, He has Creator rights over all.

His second right He has acquired as the Son of Man. By becoming man, and dying on the cross, He has bought everything, i.e., has purchased everything, and has rights over everything, not only because He is Son in the Godhead, but in addition as Son of man. *Son of man* is a title of very broad scope -- wider than His title over Israel as Messiah. Indeed, it is in accordance with the title, Son of man, that authority to execute judgment has been committed to Him:

For even as the Father has life in Himself, so he has given to the Son also to have life in Himself, and has given him authority to execute judgment [also] because he is the Son of man (John 5:26, 27).

The Son of man will be on the great white throne.

The word *purchase* is sometimes used to represent the thought that the Son of man has *bought* everything. He died on the cross and that introduced a new possession of all, in addition to His rights as Creator of all. The new thing, *purchase*, is seen in Matt. 13:44, where the field is bought to obtain the treasure in it. In a previous parable it is said: “The field is the world” (Matt. 13:38). Everything belongs to, was bought by, i.e., purchased by, the Son of man. Thus we find in 2 Pet. 2:1:

But there were false prophets also among the people, as there shall also be among you false teachers, who shall bring in by the bye destructive heresies, and deny the master that bought them, bringing on themselves swift destruction . . .

These false teachers were never redeemed; but they were bought. Christ has Creator rights and also purchase rights over them, but such were never saved, never *redeemed*. They are false professors, the same false profession characterizing them as it does those miracle-claimers of Matt. 7:22:

For many shall say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied through thy name, and through thy name cast out demons, and through thy name done many works of power? And then I will avow unto them, I never knew you. Depart from me, workers of lawlessness.

He said that He never knew them. In John 10:14, He said: “I know those that are mine.” And again:

My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me (John 10:27).

It is obvious that those in Matt. 7:22 never were sheep of Christ: “I never knew you.” True it is that they cannot be lost-again persons, for were they ever saved, the Lord would have known them for a while -- but He affirms: “I never knew you.” If they had been sheep of His, He would have had to say, ‘I knew you once, but I do not know you now.’ It is clear they were professors but not possessors. They are among the purchased, the bought, and thus the Son of man has a title over them; but they are not redeemed.

We must not with the theologians confound purchase with redemption. All the world, all mankind, even the wicked, are *bought* by Christ’s blood; but none, save believers, have *redemption* (*ἀπολυτρώσιν*) through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, though the *ἀντίλυτρον* be *περὶ πᾶντων*. Purchase makes all to be His property or slaves; by redemption we are freed from Satan, Christ’s freedmen, to serve God in liberty. 37

While some truly own Him to be Lord, some call Him Lord only by profession, as we have seen. However, by purchase rights He is Lord of all:

the same Lord of all [is] rich towards all that call upon Him (Rom. 10:12).

Of course He is Lord of those who do not call upon Him! He is Lord of all. The occasion will come when all will be compelled, “every tongue confess that Jesus Christ [is] Lord to God the Father’s glory” (Phil. 2:10). Think of teaching Christians that they may accept Him as Savior and later, perhaps, accept Him as Lord. Why, He was Lord before a person is saved. His disbelief of it does not change the fact. When he truly calls upon Him:

... if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God has raised him from among [the] dead, thou shalt be saved (Rom. 10:9).

The Christian owns His Lordship and that He is Christ’s slave.

And finally, the third right is the right of redemption. The believer is redeemed, not the unbeliever; so it is clear that redemption goes further and deeper than purchase. By redemption the Christian is Christ’s freedman -- free, in liberty, free from slavery to self, free to do God’s holy will.

**Ransom Is the Purchase Price**

While *purchase* (buying, bought) does not necessarily involve redemption, redemption requires a *purchase price*. Now, Christ gave Himself as a ransom for all, and that *ransom* is the *purchase price*. Paying a ransom price for all, as in 1 Tim. 2:6, purchases all, but this does not redeem all. Redemption requires the purchase price but is not the same thing as the purchase price. Redemption requires the ransom-price but redemption is not the same thing as the ransom-price. J. N. Darby has commented on the distinction between purchase and redemption -- and this entails a consideration of the word “ransom” in 1 Tim. 2:6 and “bought” in 2 Pet. 2:1:

... in “denying the Lord that bought them,” {2 Pet. 2:1} the simple answer is, there is no reference to redemption at all. The ordinary word for redemption is ἀπολύτρωσις. The price for it is called ἀντίλυτρον {ransom}, applied to all (1 Tim. 2:6), but ἀπολύτρωσις is not {not applied to all}. Redemption from under a given state is expressed by ἐξαγωγή in Gal. 3:13; 4:5 – deliverance from under the law. The only other two passages are in Ephesians and Colossians -- “redeeming the time,” rescuing an opportunity (κατρυνóν) which offers, so as to profit by it for good -- not making a good use of all time, as usually supposed (cp. Dan. 38. {In a footnote to 1 Tim. 2:6, JND has “Antilutron huper: a ransom in place of.” To construe this into substitution, i.e., making it mean that Christ bore everyone’s sins in His own body on the tree, because of the words “in place of,” is not scriptural. It is confusion, attempting to make “in place of” mean what is meant by substitution, i.e., the bearing of sins.
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2:8). I do not believe that ἀγοράζω has ever the sense by itself of 'redeem': it is simply to buy. I know it is so translated in two or three passages, as Rev. 5 and 14; but it is simply "bought."

The passage in 2 Pet. 2, I am persuaded, refers to the idea of a slave bought in a market -- the contrary of redeemed from a state of slavery -- and who, though his δεσπότης (master), (not κύριος, the Lord) has his right over him, will not own it. You may remark, that in the passage of Jude treating the same subject, δεσπότης is applied to God also: they deny "the only δεσπότης θεόν." The question of redemption out of a previous state does not enter into either passage; but the {issue is the} denial of a divinely inherent or acquired title over them. The strongest expression connected with this, and referring to all, is that which I have quoted -- ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων -- "a ransom for all." Nor can the well-instructed saint desire to weaken it. Christ has a title by His dying gift of Himself, not merely by creation, over all flesh. If rejected, He is rejected as the accomplisher of a redemption work, the guilt of the rejection of which lies on all who hear of it. And He has an absolute title by it over all flesh; giving, in virtue of it, eternal life to as many as the Father has given Him. But ἀπολύτρωσις -- actual redemption -- is never referred to at all. But I comment as well as criticize. Λυτρῶ, to redeem, as well as λύτρων, a ransom, or λύτρωσις, redemption, bear out the general statement above.


The scriptures speak of redemption as of a deliverance effected by a ransom, and subsequently by a power producing a full result in behalf of those for whom that ransom has been paid. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of offences" (Eph. 1:9). "Awaiting adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23) -- (Collected Writings 23:152).

He offered Himself without spot to God to be a sacrifice, He must be lifted up; He prayed that if it were possible the cup might pass, but it was not if we were to be saved; and so, call it "indemnity" or what you please, we are saved from wrath through Him. His death was an apolutrosis, it was a lutosis, without which there is no apolutrosis for us. Luke and Hebrews both use the word lutosis which is just redemption by ransom, losegeld, or indemnity, loskaufung. These are exactly what Dr. W. says is not in Scripture. He says "we obtained the righteousness which was a necessary condition for our salvation." Where is this in Scripture? And so far as it is scriptural that "we are made the righteousness of God in him," how is that so? is the question. "He was made sin for us."

Dr. W., as I have said, forgets it is God's righteousness. God's wrath is the shape or form assumed by God's justice with reference to sin. I agree. But where was this displayed? Was it not in Christ's suffering "the Just for the unjust," a lutosis, the substitution of Christ as "made sin for us"? (Collected Writings 29:267).​

There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. A ransom is that by which redemption comes, is wrought; to have the good of it Christ must be believed (continued...)
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Perhaps more help can be gleaned from this:

Ques. How far does it go, a “ransom for all”?

To all, of course. He was not an *apolutrosis*, nor *antilutrosis*, but *antilutron*. If it had been the former, you would get all the people saved. It is merely an adequate price paid, so that God can now send out a testimony to all the world. “The Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29) is a great deal wider. *There*, I believe, the new heavens and the new earth come in. But *here*, it is an available price, so to speak. Whatever God is now doing, sin is the occasion of it, whether judgment, or mercies, or salvation, or discipline, or patience, or anything else. Time will come when there will be no sin at all, and that is the point of *ho airon*: “who taketh away,” etc. It will then be *all* accomplished, but it is now applied to us. “Preached to every creature,” etc. (Col. 1:23) is just founded on this.

Ques. How could you use that now?

I should say, ‘the blood is on the mercy-seat-come!!’ It is never said that He bare the sins of the world.

Ques. He bought a field, as well as treasure in it?

Yes, but there it includes all creation. We find the same thought in the passage, “should taste death for every man,” as in the one, “which taketh away,” etc. This goes beyond everyone; it is really for everything, though we see not yet all things put under Him.

Ques. In Lev. 16, atonement is made for things as well as persons?

Yes; the most wonderful thing to me, in that connection, is that, not in chapter 16, but in chapter 8, the tabernacle and vessels were all anointed with oil, and not merely was blood upon them; that is to say, the Holy Ghost takes His place in all creation. Though not guilty, the creation is defiled, and it is to be reconciled. Satan goes into the heavens now as the accuser of the brethren.

Christ is now Mediator between God and man. I do not think I could use “mediator” beyond men. He did not take up angels, that is, their cause, but He took up the seed of Abraham. He will reconcile all things in heaven and earth. At the present time, all is in confusion. An angel receives a command to answer Daniel’s prayer and has to stay three weeks on the way. It was under God’s hand, of course, but there it is, and in that respect all is in confusion.40

Propitiation is the aspect of the work of Christ that is the offering a satisfaction to God for the outrage of sin against His nature and majesty, and glorifying Him with respect to it. The ransom of 1 Tim. 2:6 is related to this aspect

39. (...continued)

in: but as the righteousness is of God, it is as good for the Gentile as for the Jew, and is needed by the Gentile as the Jew. “There is no difference” (*Letters* 3:180). ♦

40. *Notes and Jottings* 313, 314.
(propitiation) of the work of Christ, not to what we mean by substitution, i.e.,
the bearing of our sins in His own body on the tree. Ransom is not substitution
-- such that Christ bore everyone’s sins on in His own body on the tree.

I quite believe that Christ died for all, but I cannot say that He bore, as a
substitute, the sins of all. The word, it seems to me, is very clear on this
point in its doctrines, in the consequences that it draws from them, and in its
types. So that I take ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων in the simplest and
widest sense. Satisfaction has been presented to God for men, but here (1
Tim. 2:6) it is evident these words refer to the desire to make of Jesus, at
least of the Messiah, a mediator of the Jewish nation. No, says the apostle,
He is so for all. God Θέλει (not βούλεται) that all, not the Jews only,
should be saved; He has given, therefore, one Mediator for all, who has
made the propitiation which was necessary, and demanded by the majesty of
God, so that the door is open to all through the satisfaction that He has made
to the outraged majesty of God. 41

Were then everybody’s sins transferred to Christ? If so, all are saved, or His
having borne the wrath due to them is ineffectual and reversible . . . But in
Dr. B’s {Horatius Bonar} substitution the man may not consent, many alas!
(We know) do not. Were there sins transferred to the Substitute and the
wrath borne effectually and irreversibly, and yet they reject Christ and die
in their sins? Dr. B.’s substitution is no substitution at all, for nobody’s sins
were really borne, and no people really represented . . . Substitution is for
people whom the substitute represents; it is one man or person substituted for
another, and taking actually the consequences of the conduct or position of
him whom he represents . . . He was substituted for them and took the
consequence in sovereign grace; and they are saved. He cannot charge as a
judge the sins which he himself has borne and expiated on those for whom
He Himself has already borne them. 42

If Christ is the substitute for all, if He bore the sins of all in His own body on
the tree, then the sins of all were transferred to Him on the cross. And He died
in connection with this work. His blood was shed in connection with His being
the Substitute. His death and bloodshedding cannot be undone. If Christ is the
substitute for all, then the sins involved with His sufferings for them, and His
death and bloodshedding, have all to be reversed, the work of substitutional
bearing of sins undone -- the sins have to be transferred back to the unbeliever
who dies in his sins and is judged according to his works (Rev. 20:12). So the
sins and the guilt Christ bore on the cross were not gone by His bearing them
and taking the punishment for them. All this confusion is avoided when we

41. Letters 1:99; this quotation also appears in The Bible Treasury, New Series 8:96.
abide by the Scripture statement that He bore the sins of many. 43

Speaking of this in terms of Lev. 16, the scape-goat, representing substitution, was sent away. Well, since the scape-goat was carrying everyone’s sins, it would have to be recalled, somehow, to retransfer some of those sins back to some people.

Moreover, the ransom for all is just that – for all, not the elect only, though substitution and redemption are for the elect only. 44

**Ransom For Many, Ransom For All**

It is interesting that before the cross the Lord Jesus said:

... the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many (Matt. 20:28; see also Mark 10:45).

A distinction was pointed out by W. Kelly regarding the prepositions translated “for” in Matt 20:28 and in 1 Tim. 2:6:

There is indeed a true sense in which our Lord is ransom for all; and the apostle speaks of it in 1 Tim. 2, “the testimony to be borne in its own seasons.” But a nice difference distinguishes the two texts. When, as in Matthew, it is a ransom for many, we have it clearly defined. The “for” is “instead of” (\(\text{\textit{\textalpha\textnu\texttau\textomicron\textomicron}}\)) many. It is strict substitution. When, as in 1 Tim., all are in view, it is simply “on behalf of” (\(\text{\textupsilon\pi\epsilon\rho}\)) all. “For” has not always the same sense in Scripture. 45

In this statement in the synoptic gospels, the largeness of the ransom, the propitiation for the world (1 John 2:2), is not expressed whereas, after the cross, in 1 Tim. 2:6 it is expressed.

“Many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God.” In a word, the Spirit of God as yet (before the birth of Jesus, observe), leads the

43. See *Collected Writings* 23:265, 266.

44. In his strictures on the Revised Version of 1881, J. N. Darby remarked:

So they have added pronouns, which destroy the whole force of the scriptural statement. Thus they have added “our” to redemption—“in whom we have our redemption” -- instead of, “redemption.” Now, “our” redemption is our personal deliverance -- a great and saving blessing surely -- but redemption is the great and stupendous work of the Savior. I would add, before going further, that I can gather why they have used pronouns with it, namely, to distinguish it from the price of redemption, such as antilutron -- ransom price. But this does not in the least authorize the use of the pronoun not in scripture, raising a question as to its limits, and making it solely something about us, which scripture does not. The thing itself is lost, in its application to us, whoever we are (**Collected Writings** 36:86).

45. *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 3:341. A. Marshall, in his *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, translates \(\text{\textit{\textalpha\textnu\texttau\textomicron\textomicron}}\) in Matt. 20:28 and Mark 10:45 as “instead of”; and \(\text{\textupsilon\pi\epsilon\rho}\) in 1 Tim. 2:6 as “on behalf of.”
mind of the evangelist to exhibit the Savior in His primary character as to
dispensation and personal mission, according to the hope of the promises made
to the fathers, and this by the faith of those who were looking to them as Jews,
and to whom Jesus was not yet presented in the flesh, and therefore not the
subject of the Spirit’s direct testimony as come for a Ransom for all, “The
testimony [to be rendered] in its own times,” but “to his people,” all
through. 46

There was *the due time* for the statement that He gave Himself a ransom for
(on behalf of) *all*, and that was post-cross testimony -- after the ending of the
testing of the first man. However, it seems that the phrase “ransom for
(instead of) many” was meant to direct attention to the fact that blessing was
not going to be confined to Israel.

These things are in accordance with the two-fold character of the work of
Christ: that which is first, what is due the glory of God; and secondly, the
salvation of sinners. The ransom *instead of many* correlates with the salvation
of sinners, while the ransom *on behalf of* all has in view the satisfaction
rendered to, and the glorification of, God with respect to the outrage of sin
against His nature and majesty. This latter is the basis upon which the gospel
is preached to all -- for Christ was a ransom *on behalf of* all (1 Tim. 2:6).

Additionally, it needs to be much observed that Scripture does not say,
either before the cross or after the cross, that “He bore the sins of all.” It says
that He bore the *sins of many* -- those many *instead of* (*ἀντί*) whom He was
the ransom; for He was a ransom *instead of many* (Matt. 20:28).

*Isaiah 53 -- 1 Peter 2:24*

It is quite clear that Isa. 53 is directly about Jews. But in the NT we see that
some of what we have there is applied to Gentiles.

The Lord Jesus is seen there as one rejected by the Jews. However, God
will have a future remnant from among them. They will be brought into an
acceptance of Christ. In Isa. 53:4 we read that:

> we did regard him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

But they will come into the understanding that Christ bore the cross for them
(Isa. 53:5, 6). The words “our” and “we” in the verse refer to the remnant,
not the entire nation -- though when the future purging of the Jews (Ezek. 20;
Zech. 13, 14) is completed, those left living compose the nation of those that
are all saved (Rom. 11:26). In these two verses we have substitution --
answering to the scape-goat of the day of atonement. The words “wounded,”
“bruised,” “chastisement,” and “stripes” are figurative words used to describe

46. Notes and Comments 6:76.
Jehovah’s dealing with Him on the cross, as their substitute. Peter spoke of this when he wrote:

... who himself bore our sins on the tree ... by whose stripes ye have been healed (1 Pet. 2:24).

J. N. Darby wrote:

Though our sins were as scarlet they are made white as snow, and we are bound to believe it, for “his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” He has charged Himself with them. I am convicted, and then humbled about them. But before the day of judgment comes, Christ came, and on the cross was bearing the sins He would have had to judge. The cross was God dealing with Him about them. When He comes in judgment I say, That is the Man who put away my sins.

As the high priest confessed Israel’s sin on the scape-goat, so has Jesus confessed ours as His...

47. All was cleared away and removed-Christ bore our sins on the cross, then atonement had to be made for the sins that were upon Him, and there it was made in the same act, in His dying. For Himself, clearly no propitiation was made -- He was making it; still He was the scape-goat, as well as the Lord’s lot, and the actual sins that were there had to be atoned for. What He stood as, and what He carried was the object of the propitiation He made. In Lev. 19:22 we have al, both for the person, and for the sin (Notes and Comments 2:59).

48. W. Kelly wrote:

Again, He “offered” Himself without spot to God. It is not the word for bearing our sins, strictly speaking. There were two parts always in sacrifice: the one is the victim simply, presented as an offering; the other is the sins laid upon the victim. Now this word expresses only the former element, which, by the way, detects the wrong use of that term in Peter, where it is said that “he bore our sins in his own body” -- as the margin and some others say -- “up to the tree.” Now the usage is strictly limited to the textual sense “on the tree.” If it had been the word here called “offered” there might have been some show of reason for it, because “offered” has reference to the presentation of the victim when the sins were not yet laid on it. The fact is that the phraseology excludes a continuous action and asserts a subsequent and transient fact, contradicting the whole idea; in short, the notion confounds the offering of the victim first, with the laying the sins upon him afterwards. Now the passage in Peter speaks expressly of the final moment when the sins were laid upon Christ. Consequently the teaching is as utterly false as it is possible to be. The “offering” is distinct from the bearing of the sins, and each of the two parts has its own moment (The Bible Treasury, New Series 7:235). See also Collected Writings 7:210, 211,293-296, 300.

49. JND has a footnote to this word, saying:

Or, ‘bruise.’ Though the word is in the singular, it is literally the marks left by scourging. ‘Stripe’ does not convey this.

He does not mean that 1 Pet. 2:24 is speaking of literal scourging marks as healing us, but what the word means. The word is used figuratively concerning the sufferings under the hand of God.


51. Collected Writings 7:74.
He bare the sins of all who are saved . . . 52

. . . actual sins committed, which are dealt with and put away out of God’s sight by One “who was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed,” Isa. 53:5. 53

He gave Himself for my sins, and suffered agonies and wrath for them on the cross, that I may be clear from them. 54

He suffered for the sins of every believer, by the sacrifice of Himself, He has perfected them for ever. He that is dead is freed from sin. But Christ died; He then is freed from sin. But whose? Ours, who believe in Him. It is all gone, gone with the life to which it was attached, in which He bore it. The death of Christ has closed for faith the existence of the old man, the flesh, the first Adam-life in which we stood as responsible before God, and whose place Christ took for us in grace. 55

Peter’s words convey to us that the Lord Jesus was bearing punishment on the cross under the hand of God. The punishment that He endured was for “transgressions” and “iniquities” (Isa. 53:5). His soul was made an offering for sin. Concerning the word sin, JND has a footnote which says: “Asham, ‘trespass-offering’: see Note b, Lev. 5:1.” Peter said He bore our sins.

As to the time while God is forming the bride of Christ, Peter speaks of Christ as having borne “our sins,” not everyone’s sins. The fact of a limitation is true also in Isa. 53, where Jews are in view. 56 If Christ bore everyone’s sins, then He bore the sins of every Jew. But Isa. 53 does not support that:

. . . by his knowledge shall my righteous servant instruct many in righteousness: and he shall bear their iniquities (Isa. 53:11).

There is a footnote to JND’s translation which says:

52. Collected Writings 34:76.
53. Collected Writings 34:134.
54. Collected Writings 18:289.
56. And so, when they look on Him whom they have pierced, will it be fulfilled in its direct and glorious meaning, for they above all were of the travail of His soul. “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem,” etc. “He came unto his own,” etc. So Peter in his first address. It does indeed fully, in offering of atonement apply to the Gentile, as Paul was commissioned specially to declare, i.e., the power of it, but in specialty of promise it belonged to the Jew, whose (see Romans) “the promises” were, and the “oracles of God,” and “of whom, as concerning the flesh; Christ came,” as here particularly set forth. Nor is this ever departed from in Scripture; “It was necessary that the Word of God should have been first preached unto you, but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so,” etc., which was his special office; so here, where the general truth of Christ’s mission, and the principles of divine truth exhibited in Christ, and to the Gentiles -- in a word, what we are wont to call the Gospel -- was to be set forth for the Church, as applicable to men, the larger scope of these promises, “a light to lighten the Gentiles, the glory of God’s people Israel” was not forgotten (Notes and Comments 6:77).
Lit. 'the many,' i.e., those that are in relationship with him.
The Jews for whom Christ bears their iniquities are limited -- not every Jew; and thus Christ did not bear everyone's sins. Further, In Isa. 53:12 we read:

... he bore the sin of many.

No, this is not a sub-set of "He bore the sins of all" because there is no such set. There is no such statement, nor teaching, in the Word of God.

Stripes, chastisements, bruises, wounds, inflicted on Him, and that by Jehovah being pleased to bruise Him, surely speak of punishment, and punishment for us; for it was for our iniquities, our transgressions; and it was that which made our peace and healed us, if indeed we are healed. And this is the more distinctly and remarkably brought out, because it is in contrast with the false judgment the Jews had formed of Him -- that He was stricken and smitten of God, as suffering under His disapprobation. "We hid as it were our faces from him; we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." Now they found out He had borne their griefs, and carried their sorrows: and, lest the thought might stop short at His only bearing them (for He did so bear them in the sorrow of His heart), the Spirit in them adds, "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities," etc. And lest there should be any mistake as to whence this came, we read further, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief" (Isa. 53:10). Indeed it would be mere folly to say that the wicked Jews had wounded him for their iniquities; nor could they, nor would they, say they were healed by His stripes. 57

The notion that Christ bore everyone sins involves this punishment of Christ on the cross and then the sinner being eternally punished for them also when, having been judged according to his works, he is cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20). What underlies these false notions is uncleerness about propitiation and substitution.

We should beware of an attitude of leveling everything; or, on the other extreme, to allow for no common blessings of saints in various ages. While the Christian has blessing flowing from the cross, so does Israel. And while some are common (for example, the forgiveness of sins), there are differences. JND remarked:

As all my sins were future when He died for them, so when once I am not in the flesh all that belongs to it faith looks on as past as to atonement and righteousness when He died. For so, and so only, could they be put away. But, as risen, I come into the holiest, not only because I am cleared from sins (a process which, in itself, went no farther than judicial acknowledgment of me where I was responsible), but according to all the value of that in which Christ is entered in. This, I repeat, is our only proper present

57. Collected Writings 7:66.
position; because the old man, who was the responsible man in this world, is viewed as dead and buried, so that we are not in the flesh. Hence, though we were responsible, and the sins were borne and atoned for, we are not at all now in the place, and condition, or nature, in which that government and dealing took place; it is over for us. The bullock, the fullest and highest value of Christ’s sacrifice, is ours, and represents our present standing. The two goats clearly show that the same one sacrifice of course applies to both parts of His work; our being presented to God according to His nature, and the putting away of sin, which was inconsistent with our duty as children of Adam.

But the application is, in a measure, different when Israel comes in question: because they do not enter into the holiest through the rent veil, the new and living way. They know the value of Christ’s sacrifice when He comes out, and they look on Him whom they have pierced. They are under the weight of multiplied transgressions as a nation, and stand on that ground, and in flesh -- have not to do with Christ within the veil, but when He has come out. I need not say, it is no new sacrifice. Isa. 53 presents to us their recognition of the One we already own. They are not in heavenly places in Him; but He appears to and is with them, to bless them in the earth. They are accepted according to the righteousness of God as a moral governor. 58

Redemption

Redemption is the third claim that Christ has on us and we must not confuse this with general purchase:

We must not with the theologians confound purchase with redemption. All the world, all mankind, even the wicked, are bought by Christ’s blood {should, rather, say death}; but none, save believers, have redemption (ἀπολύτρωσιν) through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, though the ἀντιλυτρον be περὶ πάντων. Purchase makes all to be His property or slaves; by redemption we are freed from Satan, Christ’s freedmen, to serve God in liberty. 59

In one point of view, then, we are Christ’s slaves; and in another point of view we are His freedmen -- but in every case to do His holy will!

W. Kelly well contrasted redemption with purchase:

It has been often remarked, and very justly, that although Genesis is so prolific of the various counsels and ways of God, there is the more marked an absence of the special truth of Exodus in it. Thus, although we have sacrifice as such, covenant and other kindred dealings of God, redemption in its full import at least is never brought before us in that book. I am not aware of anything of the

58. Collected Writings 10:202
59. The Bible Treasury 11:207.
sort. By redemption I mean not merely a price paid to purchase us that we may belong to God (this indeed is not the proper import of the word), but rather in its precise meaning this too that God has broken the power of the adversary, ransoming and freeing us for Himself. Such is redemption. I grant you that to the Christian both these truths are made good. He is bought with a price, as we are often told in scripture, and we know it. But the effect of the purchase is that we become the bondmen of the Lord; the effect of redemption is that we become the freemen of the Lord. As ever, man is quick to put the two things in opposition. He cannot understand how a person can be both a freeman and a bondman. But the truth is certain, and both clearly revealed. The reason why a man finds it hard to put the two truths together is that he trusts himself and not God, and this because he wants to be free from the restraints of His will and word. It wants but little thought and reflection for a person to understand that each of them is not only quite just, but that they are both thoroughly compatible and harmonious. Can we not comprehend brethren, that we were under the power of an enemy of God? In the face of this, when enslaved to him, redemption was the putting forth of God’s own power in Christ in a way suitable to His majesty and holiness, in which not a single claim was left unsettled, not a single requisite was not answered, not a single sin of man but was judged, yet all and every quality in God was honored, and we are brought out triumphant and free. Thus we are made to be the Lord’s freemen; and what should do it if Christ’s redemption could not? He did indeed accomplish it, but at all cost to Himself.

But there is more than this in the work of Christ which broke the power of Satan, “that by death he might destroy him that had the power of death.” He has perfectly annulled his power, and met all on God’s part needful for us; but there is another thought. It is of all consequence that we should feel that we are immediately responsible to God according to the new, intimate, and holy relationship which is ours in virtue of redemption. We are bought with a price. (And what a price!) Thus we belong to Him -- we are not our own, but His. These two truths combine in the Christian; but there is this difference between them -- that the world also is “bought,” and every man in it, whereas it would be false to say that every man in the world is “redeemed.” If we are subject to scripture, we must say that there is no such thing as universal redemption; but we must confess the truth of universal purchase. 60

To this we add something from W. T. Turpin:

And when the morning comes, then God says to Moses, stretch out your rod over the sea again, and the sea will return to its strength. And God brought it back by a strong wind, “and the sea returned to its strength when the morning appeared,” and the same tide that opened the way for Israel came back in all its rolling power over the whole glory of Egypt and whole power of Pharaoh, and submerged them in the mighty waters, and there was not one of them left. “Thus God saved Israel.” It was God’s salvation, God’s extrication, God’s deliverance. And then you find four things said about them -- they saw, they believed, they feared, and they sang. They never sang a note before; they

60. Lectures Introductory to the Study of the Pentateuch, pp. 165, 166.
complained in abundance afterwards, but they never sang before. Now they sing; and God has so ordered it that song must go with redemption. You cannot sing until you are redeemed; when you are redeemed you can sing. Now they can sing, and the song, beloved friends, is all about God, not a single word about themselves. That is the peculiarity of that note when it is struck, the theme, the note, is all divine:

The Lord hath triumphed gloriously, the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea {Ex. 15}.

Now let us take it out of pattern. You know the meaning of taking things out of pattern, I am sure. Here it is in pattern or type, what do you find when you take it out? Why, that the meaning it is that the precious death and the glorious and triumphant resurrection of Lord Jesus Christ for us, accomplished everything that was in the mind and heart of God, is the complete overthrow of the whole power of Satan, the overthrow of all the power of death, “that through death he might annul, destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil,” the complete putting away and judgment of sin by the sacrifice of Himself, the whole destruction of Satan’s power. That is to say, every enemy that was against us, sin, death, Satan, the grave, were allowed to rise to their highest, and when they were at their highest, were swept away for ever: that is what it means. You have the figure of the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ so beautifully there! I do not know anything more touching to the heart than to read of that rod and that strong east wind. O the spotless distress of His precious soul when the east wind of judgment beat upon His head, and that was the night, it was the night of deepest woe to Him when He underwent all that judgment, and endured it all; there was the night of judgment, and then there was the morning of His resurrection. That is what you have got here in type. Thank God if we understand through grace what that is.

In His spotless soul’s distress, the judgment was borne alone by Him, all the waves and billows flowed over Him, all the east wind of judgment blew upon His blessed head when He stood there alone for us; and then He rose triumphant, and there comes the morning, so that you have the night and the morning, the night of the cross, the morning of the resurrection. And in that resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, you have got two things; resurrection out from among the dead begins the new thing, it is the new beginning. But there is more than that in it. It is the testimony, the evidence to the Christian of the completeness, of the fulness of Jehovah’s triumph, of God’s salvation, so that I can see in that empty tomb of our Lord Jesus Christ the vindication in testimony and evidence to me that God has been perfectly glorified and perfectly satisfied with regard to all my sins. 61

Chapter 6

The Death, the Blood, and the Cross of Christ, in Their Meaning Regarding the Believer

The Death of Christ Regarding the Believer

The bearing of the death of Christ regarding those who are not believers is reserved for the next chapter.

CHRIST DIED AS AN ACT OF HIS WILL

First, let us be sure that our Lord died as an act of His own will. The blood of the atonement came from the side of a dead Christ. Our Savior did not bleed to death:

On this account the Father loves me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have authority to lay it down and I have authority to take it again. I have received this commandment of my Father (John 10:17, 18).

It is abundantly clear from this that the Lord Jesus died as an act of His own will. And thus we read:

... he said, It is finished; and having bowed his head, he delivered up his spirit (John 20:30).

His head did not droop in death; indeed not. It was His act, and He delivered up His spirit -- for no one took His life from Him. It was voluntary, His own act.

DELIVERING POWER IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST

The believer has, through sovereign grace, appropriated the death of Christ for Himself. G. V. Wigram has written largely on the subjects in this chapter, particularly on the Scripture’s use of the death of Christ. The reader would do well to obtain a copy. Here we will consider but a small part of it as bearing on the delivering power, for the believer, of Christ’s death. Commenting on Rom. 6:2-13, he wrote:

The argument of Paul seems here to be towards the proving by God’s estimate of the death of Christ for the church, and the church’s fellowship by
the Spirit in that estimate, that the church is free from sin, and so free as to have no pretext for continuing to live in it.

If God's object, says he, was, that as sin hath reigned unto death even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord, no one can say, We will continue in sin that grace may abound. And then the context quoted follows -- the grand truth of which seems to be that our exemption from the charge and guilt of sin comes by God reckoning us dead with Christ by the Spirit: being planted in the likeness of His death, we were baptized thereinto and buried with Christ by baptism into death. That is, God, having given to us the Spirit of Christ Jesus, looks upon us as one with Him, and so imputes to us all that was true of Christ. Now He died under the charge and the power of sin imputed -- but when He had died it had done its all, and being raised from the dead He dieth no more, death bath no more dominion over Him -- for He liveth unto God. And now, if all this has been done by God to His Son for the church, let every member of it reckon himself dead indeed unto sin, so as neither to allow it to reign in the mortal body by obedience to its lusts, nor to yield the members of the body as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin. The whole weight of the argument seems to me to turn upon the mode in which the church got her freedom from sin, in the power and guilt of it, even by being identified of God, through grace in the Spirit, with that which was the all that the charge and power of sin imputed could effect upon Christ Jesus.

This passage has often been taken as if it applied to the death of Christ as presented to the world. That such a view involves a complete violation of the characteristic marks of the whole context, as well as very unsound doctrine, is plain. Perhaps the saints do not look enough at the inseparable union of their blessing and the life of the Son of God. If we know Him we must have His Spirit, and this Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, and identifies us fully in all things with Him, so that God looks upon us by virtue of it, as having that true of us which personally was only true of Him whose Spirit we have received, and thus retrospectively we are said to have been crucified together with, died together with, and been buried together with, Him, as well as quickened together with Him: for though the life that was in the Lord was not fully manifested to man till the resurrection, when He became manifest the second {last} Adam; yet I need not say that He was not intrinsically and personally, after the resurrection, other than what He was from the beginning, the only begotten Son of the Father, the Lord of all glory. The death of the Lord in this place seems presented as the place of the saints' and church's clearance from all the charge and power of sin.

17. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ: that ye should be married to another, even to him. who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God," &c. (Rom. 7:4).

In the last citation the death of the Lord was shown as the means of clearing the church in principle, from under sin; here it is presented as having the same effect as to law, and on this simple ground, that the claim of
the law having been met by Christ fully, they who are looked upon as one with Him are free from it. This to the individual believer is of immense importance in connection with obedience; for as long as the mind of the Christian turns to law, as though it still rested upon him, he will be under that which stirs up the evil of the flesh, and, God knows, we need not either that, or the sorrow consequent upon it, in addition to the difficulties of our walk. I would only further notice that the expression, "that ye should be married to another," should rather be "that you should be for another," for it refers to the saints' present connection with the Lord, and that is one of espousal; not yet marriage. And again, in verse 6, "that being dead wherein we were held" should rather he "that we being dead to that wherein we were held," as a closer and more literal rendering, as well as one more consistent with the sense of the context.

If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you (Rom. 8:10, 11).

What blessed consolation and comfort is here! Having in the seventh chapter traced the practical effect upon the mind, and its thought of regeneration as in a Jew, so regenerated, considering the question of law, and then shown how sorrow and depression were the result, here we find the apostle presenting, as it were, the same individual, with the question of law disposed of, in the blissful meditation upon the work of redemption wrought for us by Christ. The question of regeneration had turned his thought inward, and then the question of the spiritual character of the law had scared him: redemption lifts up his mind from self to Christ, to all accomplished by Him, and no condemnation established -- and more than this, it meets the very thoughts awakened about the body of sin, and death in us proves that our bodies are so, or Christ need not have died; and throws the mind therefore not upon anything in self, but upon the faithfulness of God, who, having delivered Christ for our sins raised Him again, and will quicken into newness of life all those who make that death the ground of their acceptance before God. And thus, believer, as thou well knowest, is described both thine experience and thy hope as to thy body -- it is dead because of sin; but it shall be quickened because the Spirit of Him that raised up Christ from the dead dwells in thee. 62

The Blood of Christ

62. The Cross, the Blood, and the Death of Jesus Christ; Their Uses and Applications by the Spirit in the Scripture, Winschoten: Heijkoop, pp. 140-144, fifth ed.
THE EMPHASIS ON BLOOD IN SCRIPTURE

What then is the reason that the whole word of God should give such prominence to our subject? It is two-fold: first the blood “is the life” of the man or animal, (hence when it is seen out of the body it is a proof of death); secondly, man’s life is forfeited by sin and sins. He is mortal, being descended from Adam after his fall, “As in Adam all die,” and has a sinful nature; in addition to which he has committed sins, the penalty of which is death. “The wages of sin is death.”

Now it is because of the first of these reasons that at the Lord’s supper we get the blood typified apart from and outside that which sets forth the Lord’s body. The bread would be enough to set forth Christ, but to set forth His death or Him in His death, we have the special image of the blood as poured forth in the cup. Hence the force of that verse “Without shedding of blood there is no remission.” Other types of death exist, such as the water of baptism, but blood is specifically death in its atoning aspect as placed between God and the sinner. It is the only thing that covers sin. Hence when it was sprinkled on the mercy seat, God could not only dwell with rebellious Israel, but could say through the mouth of Balaam that He had beheld no iniquity in them, although proof enough of their rebellious spirit lay within the ark in the very holiest. As to the second reason -- life being forfeited to God on account of sin, no man can lay down his life as a freewill offering for another (as Moses wished to do). The reason Christ could do so was, because He was sinless in nature and practice. His life was therefore not forfeited on account of sin or sins, and He alone “had power to lay it down.” This He did in perfect love for us who had forfeited our lives. This sacrifice has two aspects, God-ward and man-ward. The atoning blood looked at from God’s standpoint propitiates Him, or in other words satisfies fully the claims of His holiness, that has been outraged and set at nought by sin for 4,000 years. An offence against an infinite God demands an infinite sacrifice. Therefore even though no sinner on earth were to trust in the blood, God’s righteousness on account of sin looked at generally would be vindicated in Christ’s death. But man-ward it has another side. God is not only now vindicated as regards His own holiness and righteousness, but He comes forth as the justifier of every sinner who believes. The blood washes away out of nod’s sight the sins of all who rest on it.

Towards man then it has a saving power, of which the vilest may freely avail themselves. It therefore atones to God for sin and justifies believers from their sins. 63

THE ATONING BLOOD CAME FROM A DEAD CHRIST

After He was dead came the shedding of the precious blood that we read about

63. The Bible Student 2:38, 39.
in Scripture. His death was not due to bleeding to death, 64 or any other cause, except His own act. And so the blood of the atonement came from the side of a dead Christ who had delivered up His spirit. That precious blood had all the value of the death; and that death had all the value of the three hours of atoning sufferings under the abandonment of God. 65 This is the blood of which Scripture speaks, and this alone! It is the blood from the side of One dead, who delivered up His Spirit. Yes, the blood must have the value of death in it, yet that death be not by the shedding of blood, else the death would not have been the voluntary yielding up His life by dismissing His spirit.

THE ATONING BLOOD ACCOMPANIED BY WATER

Moreover, the atoning blood was accompanied by water:

The sacrifice of Christ abides in its efficacy; but, so far from this being all we want, because of it there is a necessity for "the washing of water by the word." "He that is washed [bathed] needeth not save to wash his feet." For this is he that "came by water and blood, not by water only, but by water and blood." The Lord Jesus has provided for all. Out of His side, as we know, flowed both; and so it is, that as the blood of Christ expiated our sin as guilty sinners before God, so the water not only gives us new birth, but also, in answer to His own intercession, carries on the cleansing of the feet when they are defiled in our own passage through the world. 66

"This is he who came by (dia) water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by (en) water only, but by (en) water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness." The testimony of the water and of the blood is twice expressed in this verse, but with a different Greek preposition each time. He came by (dia) water and blood; and then He came in (en) water and blood; that is to say, in the power of the water and of the blood. The former of these expressions (dia) indicates the character in which Jesus came here below; the latter (en), the power displayed by Him according to that character. Jesus came in a character of purification and expiation: "by water and blood." He has wrought according to that character, and has accomplished purification and expiation in water and blood. Although the water and the blood both express the death of Christ, they set forth two results of that death. We are cleansed by the water of death (sanctification), and we are also cleansed by blood (justification). From this it follows that, the death of Christ giving its character and value to our sanctification, we reckon ourselves dead to sin even as Christ died for sin. I do

64. It was not by taking blood from Him as a victim that He died. The water and blood that were shed were when He was dead — and it is vital to hold that He gave up His life and that it was not taken from Him by shedding His blood. I quite admit He had really to die. But the reality of His drinking the cup of wrath, which unquestionably from scripture was accomplished before He gave up His spirit, is of the last importance (Letters of J. N. Darby 3:392).

65. It is when really already dead, that His blood which had all the value of that death was shed (with the water) to cleanse from sin. It must have the value of death in it, yet death not be by it (Letters of J. N. Darby 3:196.).

not know if we pay sufficient heed to this purifying power of the death of Christ, whereby we are freed from the power of sin now.

"And it is the Spirit that beareth witness." The Spirit of God, present here below, is also a witness of the grace of life which is in Jesus. But it is in virtue of the death of Christ that the Holy Ghost has come down. Thus purification, expiation, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, are privileges which exist for us only in virtue of a dead Christ. 67

The thrust of the soldier’s spear brought out the divine testimony of salvation and of life.

Notice also how opportune this circumstance was. If they had pierced Jesus before His death, and had killed Him, He would not Himself have given up His spirit: if they had pierced Him without putting Him to death, His blood shed thus would not have had the value of His death. But He gives His life Himself; He is dead, and all the value of His death, in its two aspects of purification and expiation, was manifested, when His side was pierced and the water and the blood came forth; 1 John 5. 68

Let us be sure to keep the eye of faith fixed steadily on that blood accompanied by the water, from the side of the dead Christ. This is the blood of the atonement.

THE ATONING WORK HAS AS ITS VALUE THE VALUE OF HIS PERSON

The sufferings, the death, and that which came from the pierced side has all the value of His Person imparted to it all.

None but the divine person of the Son, become man, can meet the case; without the shedding of His blood was no remission; His death was absolutely requisite to free from sin: but all this availed only because He endured the forsaking of God. 69

It is most important to understand that the value of the work is commensurate with His Person. While we do not doubt that His sacrifice was a propitiatory sacrifice, Scripture does not state it that way, perhaps with the heathen sacrifices in view, propitiating their gods. How Scripture presents it is this:

and he is the propitiation for our sins (1 John 2:2).

It is Himself! He imparts all the glory and value of Himself to what He wrought! This gives infinite value to that work.

NO REPEATED APPLICATION OF THE BLOOD

Another point regarding the blood of Christ we must speak of before we close. It is this -- Whereas the blood of bulls and of goats required to be shed again and again every time a man sinned, the sacrifice of Christ is not only offered

68. Collected Writings 33:298.
69. The Bible Treasury 6:192.
once for all, but for ever cleanses from all sin. It not merely cleansed us when we believed, but it cleanses \{1 John 1:7\}, or in other words, no sin can ever stand against us in God's book, for the value of the blood of Christ for those who believe is eternal. There is a practical cleansing and a restoration of communion that take place as regards the sins of the believer, but this is by the application of the water of the word, not of the blood of Christ. This is shown in the OT type of the red heifer in Num. 19, and also by our Lord in John 13. To confound the constantly repeated cleansing of the washing of water by the word with the eternal cleansing power of the blood of Christ, shed once never to be repeated nor reapplied, is a serious mistake. 70

Take the prevalent idea of a frequent recourse to the blood of Christ to restore from failures. How could men speak thus if they believed that Christ obtained everlasting redemption? or that the worshipers once purged have no longer conscience of sins? They cannot have the truth of the gospel in their soul, else they never would think after such a fashion. Christ bore our sins in His body on the tree, not merely those before we believed; His blood cleanses from every sin, not from some only. The saints ought to know that there is the washing of water by the word \{Eph. 5:26\} to meet any defilement in the Christian by the way, but no annulling of redemption through Christ's blood. "For by one offering He (Christ) hath perfected" not only for ever but continuously \(\epsilon\iota\gamma\zeta\,\tau\iota\,\delta\iota\eta\nu\nu\kappa\epsilon\zeta\) the sanctified \{Heb. 10:14\}. There is no such thought in God's gospel as our needing a fresh propitiation through His blood after the first; for it was plenary and all-sufficient. But we need to have our defiled feet cleansed by Christ's word and advocacy. And we confess any sin \{1 John 1:9\} wherever we act inconsistently with Him; we confess our sin in that particular to God, and judge in ourselves that which exposed us so to fail. That is quite true and right; but not to shake the ground of His one sacrifice and of redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our offences.

If our sins were not all effaced, what would be the value of any? If only one were not forgiven, it would be fatal. But to the believer, forgiveness or remission of our sins means a complete clearance of the sad burden. Only if one should sin, conscience acts under the Spirit's dealing, and there follows a real humbling of ourselves due on any failure; for every such thing is a shame to us and a grief to the Holy Spirit of God whereby we were sealed unto the day of redemption \{Eph 4:30\}. This however cannot touch the accepted work of our Lord Jesus. Author as He is of everlasting salvation \{Heb. 5:9\}. So also the knowledge of the Father and of our relationship as His children are quite unshaken. For "we have an Advocate with the Father" \{1 John 2:1\} who is on high expressly to meet effectually all these difficulties, otherwise insuperable. We are thus ever indebted to Christ; but His advocacy is not His bloodshedding, nor is His blood again His advocacy. Risen and in heaven with the Father, He lives to intercede for us. His blood had quite a different aim and effect. His sacrifice has done its own work perfectly; and His advocacy \{1 John 2:1\} has its proper place for our need afterwards; and woe to all those that ignorantly unsettle the truth, and insinuate what undermines the gospel of

70. The Bible Student 2:40.
The Work of Christ on the Cross and Some of Its Results

Christ, even though they believe in His person. 71

SCRIPTURE'S USE OF THE BLOOD

G. V. Wigram's summary remark is apropos here.

The blood, when spoken of as known so as to be valued, always seems to involve, more or less remotely, the idea of atonement. In itself it is atonement; even that by which alone God can be just, and yet the justifier of the sinner; and, so it is that which not only enables God to bless, but the sinner to draw near for blessing. And yet it has more uses and applications in connection with atonement, than most are aware. For it may be looked at as presented with the view of giving eternal life to them that believe; as in itself propitiation; as the removal of sin; as justification; forgiveness, nearness, peace; as that which alone cleanses the conscience of a sinner, or can keep a saint's conscience clean; which has cleansed the person in one place, and the robes in another; which is redemption -- an approach to the holiest -- the secure and retainer of that place -- our purchase money -- our sanctification -- the proof of our election -- our power over Satan, the power and measure of our obedience to God, that in which we have communion one with another, the seal of the everlasting covenant, &c., &c., &c. In such various lights does the Spirit make mention of the blood! May the saints, however weak, know God's estimate of the blood in all the varied applications of it, and, through the Spirit, learn to adopt God's estimate, and to set aside their own.

Ignorance of the blood, or carelessness as to it, is the world's condemnation. 72

The Cross and the Believer

THE CROSS MEANS REJECTION

The cross is, in one way, the measure of the first man's rejection of the Lord Jesus, the revelation of the Father in the Son. G. V. Wigram wrote:

The cross seems to me to be used in scripture as especially connected with shame and disgrace. The cross was in itself a cruel and a disgraceful heathen mode of death -- kept, even by them, for the very vilest. It seemed to say -- This is a wretch, who has no feelings to be considered and whose sufferings may be protracted so as to scare others from committing what he has done. By the Jews seeking it for Jesus, it was saying, either "We are not Jews," or "He is no Jew"; for then, if a sinner, he should have been stoned -- and in it they were saying that He was not their king (as you will see in John 19), nor their prophet, much less Son of God; as done by the Gentiles also, it was the denial of His being the Son of God from whose hand the Gentiles had received their kingly power. (See Dan. 2.) The cross is used in scripture as the thing which, in one word, tells what is

72. The Cross, the Blood, and the Death of Jesus Christ; Their Uses and Applications by the Spirit in the Scripture, Winschoten: Heijkoop, pp. 3, 4, fifth ed.
the present result among men of serving God; of being a disciple; of becoming one; and this not only at the hands of the world, but of the professing world. The cross of Jesus proved this as to Jerusalem and its law; while at the same time it told of His thorough self-renunciation, perfectness of obedience, and of the estimate the world had of God: -- Jew and Gentile would crucify His Son. The priests of His temple, they would seek it for Him; Pontius Pilate would rather yield it to them, though he knew Jesus was innocent, than have it said himself was not Caesar’s friend. It was God’s way of telling what He felt about man’s sin; about the old man in each of us; about carnality, self-righteousness, and human wisdom; about there being no ground of justification or means of purification, in whole or in part, in us; no door open by which a new life could come in to us; of making the Jew and Gentile shake hands; of stripping all of boasting, specially from the Jew, &c., &c. In so many different connections is the cross presented. May the believer pass and repass through the testimony of scripture about it, and learn to use the cross of Jesus for the purposes for which it is given and made known to him! 73

See 1 Cor. 1:18; Gal. 5:11; 6:14; Phil. 2:8; Heb. 12:2; Mark 8:34.

THE CROSS MEANS FORSAKING

On the cross the unfathomable forsaking took place in those three hours when He was made sin for us. He was there forsaken by God (it does not say by the Father). Upon this inscrutable horror our souls often meditate, especially when remembering Him in His death.

Death was the penalty of sin. Death, therefore, when Christ undertook to endure the penalty, was all that we should have looked for; but His blood was needful for atonement also. Perhaps those who had understanding then would have thought, “The Father loves Hun, and therefore you will see His death will be one of peculiar ease: how it will be we know not, but perhaps the veins will open outwardly of their own accord, and that quiet stupor pass over Hun which comes in bleeding to death, and He will gently fall asleep, without a struggle or a groan. But this was not God’s way. For He came not only to endure the penalty and to give the blood in atonement, but to be the standard by which God might measure the world and the flesh in man. And in the cross we see the effects on Him of His really drinking that cup of trembling to the dregs which was our doom. The poisonous draught could not take that effect on His pure human and perfectly divine person which. it would on our impure human and only mortal persons. But O what an effect it did take! for it cut off all intercourse between Him and God. The whole vital energy of the relationship between the creature and the Creator was drained, and the relationship severed; and even that Holy Thing had no refuge left to Him save in the relationship between Himself and God in deity: these two things seem expressed thus: -- “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” -- “FATHER, into thy hands I commend my Spirit.” And why was this? Because He had presented Himself as the Lamb, and was looked upon

73. The Cross, the Blood, and the Death of Jesus Christ; Their Uses and Applications by the Spirit in the Scripture, p. 51.
as already filleted and garlanded for the sacrifice with the wreaths of our sins and follies. How plain is it then that God can hold no intercourse with sin! He saw it laid lightly, only as by imputation on Jesus, and He hid His face from Him, and would not look upon Him. O how He has told out here His hatred to sin, and the un mendableness of the sinner, in himself, as such; and the impossibility of any one whatever treating with' Him until all his sins have been forgiven him, and all his iniquities been covered. 74

THE CROSS IS THE SENTENCE ON THE FLESH AND CARNALITY

With a few more edifying observations by G. V. Wigram, we close this section:

14. The cross is God’s sentence against all that is carnal in the church (1 Cor. 1);
15. Even as it is the sentence of God against all that is carnal in the world (1 Cor. 2:2);
16. The cross was, in Jesus, the proof of how He had emptied Himself -- “being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (2 Cor. 13:4);
17. The cross was that to which the Jews (Peter and Paul among them) had to flee from Moses’ law, for justification, purification, and the power of a new life Gal. 2:20);
18. The cross, therefore, strongly condemns any one who, having heard of it, would in any way share the honor of salvation between Jesus who died on it and self (Gal. 3:1);
19. Offensive as the cross is, it was Paul’s only testimony for justification or purification (Gal. 5:11-24);
20. The cross, therefore, by itself, as giving nothing but shame to nature, will not do for popular preachers; yet it is the Christian’s only stay (Gal. 6:14-16);
21. The cross is the power of union to Jew and Gentile, as throwing a shade over the ordinances of the one, and the intellectual pride of the other (Eph. 2:16);
22. The cross was the measure of the obedience in humiliation of the Son of God (Phil. 2:8-13);
23. The cross, therefore, is the sine qua non of a true Christian -- in other words, “no cross, no Christian” (Phil. 3:17-20);
24. The cross is God’s estimate of everything great and noble in the world which He will reconcile to Himself (Col. 1:20);
25. Especially thus connected with the Jew under Moses’ law (Col. 2:14);
26. The cross was the measure of the Lord’s willingness to endure (Heb. 12:2);
27. The cross was the world’s and earth’s estimate of the value of the Son; What is the religion of the earth!!! (Rev. 11:8).

74. The Cross, the Blood, and the Death of Jesus Christ; Their Uses and Applications by the Spirit in the Scripture, pp. 52, 53.
Chapter 7

Died For All, Blood Shed For Many

Christ Died for All

That Christ died for all is the declaration of Scripture:

For the love of Christ constrains us, having judged this: that one died for {ὑπὲρ -- huper, on behalf of} all, then all have died, that they who live should no longer live to themselves, but to him who died for {ὑπὲρ} them and has been raised (2 Cor. 5:14, 15).

THE TOTAL INCLUDES A SUB-SET

Before looking at this passage in some detail, let us observe a point that is helpful and of which we have an example in this passage. He died for all; and so we say He died for us. The us is part of a larger group called, in this passage, all. Us is a sub-set of all. When I say Christ died for me, that does not necessarily mean that He did not die for all. And in this case, it is taught expressly that He died for all. His death on behalf of all is connected with that aspect of propitiation which is for the world (1 John 2:2). As soon as the word sins is brought in, a separation must be made. In 1 Cor. 15:3 we read:

Christ died for {ὑπὲρ -- huper -- on behalf of} our sins.

This is not a sub-set of Christ dying for the sins of the world. There is no such thing taught in Scripture -- that Christ died for everyone’s sins -- or bore everyone’s sins in His own body on the tree. Death for all is not the same as death for the sins of all. Christ’s death for our sins is not a sub-set of the myth about Christ’s death for the sins of all. Much error involves treating something as a sub-set of something larger, when the larger thing, in reality, does not exist. The passage in 1 Cor. 15:3 bears on just such an error.
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Christ Bore Only the Sins of Believers; and, His Blood is Only Spoken of as Shed for Many

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE WORLD</th>
<th>BELIEVERS ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPITIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propitiation . . . for the world (1 John 2:2)</td>
<td>Propitiation for our sins (1 John 2:2; 4:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated that He is the propitiation for their sins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PURCHASE | | | | SUBSTITUTION |
|-----------|----------------|
| **PURCHASE** | | **SUBSTITUTION** |
| Bought the field (Matt. 13:44) | The assembly of God, which he has purchased with the blood of his own (Acts 20:28). |
| Deny the master that bought them (2 Pet. 2:1) | |
| not stated that He bought them with the blood of his own | |

| RANSOM | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|
| **PURCHASE** | | **SUBSTITUTION** |
| Ransom for (ὑπὲρ -- "on behalf of") all (1 Tim. 2:6) | Ransom for (ἀντί -- "instead of") 76 many (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45) |

75. The reader will recall that in a previous chapter the subject of PURCHASE was discussed. All was bought by Christ's death.

76. The "for" is "instead of" (ἀντί) many. It is strict substitution. When, as in 1 Tim., all are in view, it is simply "on behalf of (ὑπὲρ) all (W. Kelly).
Concerning the way Scripture speaks of these matters, we observe the following:

1. Why not learn from the systematic silence of Scripture -- that it is not stated that Christ died for the sins of all, not stated that He bore the sins of all, and not stated that He bore the sin of all in Isa. 53 -- that Christ did not bear everyone’s sins on the cross?

2. Why not learn from the systematic delimitation of Scripture that,
corresponding to that systematic silence, the passages which speak of sins borne by Christ speak only of the sins of many, not all?

3. Even in the case of the Jews in Isa. 53 there is this delimitation. Christ did not bear the sin of all of them.

4. Why not learn from the systematic delimitation of Scripture that, corresponding to that systematic silence, the passages which speak of Christ’s shed blood, only *many* are spoken of, *not all*?

5. And very remarkable is the fact that the assembly of God is purchased with the blood of His own.

6. Then there is the remarkable difference noted regarding “ransom for many,” which adds confirmation to the fact that actual *substitution* is seen in “instead of” (ἄντων) many, which is not the case in “ransom for all.”

7. And while Christ died for all, and died for us; remarkably, it is only said of the believer that Christ died for *our sins*.

8. Even in regard to propitiation, the delimitation is stated: while there is propitiation for the world, there is propitiation for *our sins*.

9. Thus the righteousness of God is *towards* all, as propitiation is for the world, as Christ died for all; but the righteousness of God is *upon* those that believe -- who are just those whose sins Christ bore substitutionally, the many for whom His blood was shed.

If there was a Scripture that stated that Christ bore everyone’s sins, it would have been long ago produced, and the lack of such a statement necessitates that the idea that Christ bore everyone’s sins must be *read into* such texts as “a ransom for all,” and He “died for all.” If it is not *read into* such texts, there would be no Scripture for the false idea. 77 And thus these certain Scriptures are tortured to make them say what they do not say, either for this purpose of some other, in order to have some Scripture for the notion.

Rom. 5:6 and 8 speak of Christ dying on behalf of us ungodly ones (v. 6), and also on our behalf while being sinners. Of course, all are ungodly, and sinners, but the passages are about the sub-set -- we believers.

Our brother is to be looked upon as one on whose behalf Christ died (Rom. 14:15). In 1 Cor. 8:11 our brother is looked at as one for whose sake Christ died. Some other passages are:

1 Thess. 5:10 -- “who died for us” – or, as Marshall has it, “concerning us.”

77. I have heard it said that the only sin for which a person will be judged is not accepting Christ as Savior. That notion would mean Christ bore all of a person’s sins but one. These notions come from the carnal mind. At the great white throne judgment, the unbelievers are judged “according to their works” (Rev. 20:13). And why so, if Christ had paid the penalty on the cross, having borne those sins in His own body?
Titus 2:14 -- who gave Himself on behalf of us.

Gal. 2:21 -- gave Himself on behalf of me.

Gal. 3:13 -- became a curse on behalf of us.

None of this indicates that Christ bore everyone’s sins in His own body on the tree. The believer grows in his appreciation that Christ died for him, while the unbeliever refuses the fact. But the believer knows that Christ bore his sins in His own body on the true; yea, and what is deeper, that He was made sin for us (2 Cor. 5:21), which has to do with sin in the flesh.

2 Cor. 5:14, 15 Does Not Support Substitution for All

J. N. Darby has discussed some of these false views:

I am aware that 2 Cor. 5:14 and following is a controverted passage; but I cannot but regret that, where it is so, they should lead people wrong, as I have no doubt they have. The question is, is the true sense, “then had all died,” or, practically, as in the Authorized Version, “then were all dead”? How does the love of Christ constrain him, as One dying for all, because saints have died to sin? But if all had died through Adam, Christ’s descending into death for them all is that by which we know love. The apostle judged that if one died for all, it was because death was the condition of all; and what makes it to me incontrovertibly the sense is, that he speaks of “they that live” as a portion out of them, whereas, if it be the saints dying with Christ, they are the same people. It was not a Messiah of the Jews he now knew, but a Christ who had died for all because of their condition, and was now glorified. The revised passage is, moreover, nonsense — “that one died for all, therefore all died.” How did Christ’s dying for all make all die? 78

As regards propitiation and substitution, they are points of great importance, and important to distinguish; but, in order to deny the true import of these words, and the truth connected with them, Dr. Bonar has made confusion, and indeed most mischievous error, out of it. That Christ, for God’s glory, stood as the representative man before God, and in a certain sense took our place, and died for all, making propitiation for the whole world, is true; and I add that if Dr. Bonar chose to call this substitution, though I should regret it as unfitting, and enfeebling its use in other vital aspects, yet it would not be my place to prescribe words to him. But he does a great deal more than this. By his hatred of the truth and fondness for his own views, he has upset the whole gospel. “The blood brought within the veil,” he tells us (p. 109), “contained a world-wide message, so that each one hearing of that atoning blood might at once say, then God is summoning me back to Himself,” etc. Be it so; but then “propitiation,” he continues, “rests on substitution. In all these symbolical transactions we have one vast thought, the transference of guilt from one to

78. Collected Writings 33:88.
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another, legally and judicially.” If this be so, then if each one hearing of it could apply it, the guilt of all had been transferred to Christ, and it cannot be untransferred, or transferred back again, for Christ has died under it, a work “perfectly valid for all ends of justice”; consequently there can be no imputation of sins to anybody at all—the guilt has been transferred.

Scripture carefully distinguishes propitiation and the transfer of guilt {substitution}, Jehovah’s lot and the people’s lot on the great day of atonement {Lev. 16}. Sin being come in, God’s glory was in question, and our sin too. The blood was brought under God’s eye as propitiation, and the sins of the people were laid by their representative on the head of the scape-goat. Both ends were met, God glorified in what He was, and the people’s guilt put away. So Christ appeared at the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; but besides that He was once offered to bear the sins of many. 79

The thing we do not find in Scripture is substitution for all. On the great day of atonement, there were two things in the sin-offering of the people -- the Lord’s lot and the people’s lot. The Lord’s lot was killed, because it met the whole character of God; God was completely glorified in Christ, and the gospel goes out to the whole world. Then with the people’s lot, the sins of the people were confessed on its head; that is the scapegoat; in that I find Christ for His people, and in the other atonement, Godward. That, of course, was for those whose sins he confessed. In Rom. 3 we hear of the “righteousness of God unto all, and upon them all that believe.” It goes out toward all, and is upon believers. Many a one will say that Christ bore the sins of the world; but if so, how can God ever impute them? He could not, nor does Scripture ever say so. Then the Calvinist only takes the blood upon the mercy-seat; really he denies the propitiation. We have the satisfaction to God’s glory, and then the gospel goes out and says, “We beseech you to be reconciled to God: come in.” When they come I can say, I have something else to tell you; Christ bore all your sins, and it is impossible God can ever impute them or any one of them. An evangelist would not be right in saying, “Christ bore all your sins.” If he makes it personal, God of course knows His own elect from all eternity, but we can only know them as they are shown out in life. 80

Christ ... has confessed all the sins of His people as His own, borne our sins in His own body on the tree. The two goats are but one Christ, but there is the double aspect of His sacrifice, Godward, and bearing our sins. The blood is the witness of the accomplishment of all, and He is entered in not without blood. He is the propitiation for our sins. But in this aspect the world comes in too. He is a propitiation for the whole world. All has been done that is needed. His blood is available for the vilest whoever he may be. Hence the gospel to the world says, “Whosoever will, let him come.” In this aspect we may say Christ died for all, gave Himself a ransom for all, an adequate and available sacrifice

80. Collected Writings 26:337.
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for sin, for whoever would come -- tasted death for every man. 81 ♦

Were then everybody's sins transferred to Christ? If so, all are saved, or His having borne the wrath 82 due to them is ineffectual and reversible. The whole argument of the book shows Dr. B. {Bonar} has confounded substitution which does suppose transference of guilt and crime from the guilty to another, a substitution of one person for another, as when a debt is paid (the illustration Dr. B. gives); while propitiation is to Godward. 83 ♦

To what absurdities has Scripture been subjected -- even that all died with Christ. 84

Christ's Blood Shed for Many

We have considered numerous distinctions made by Scripture, such as that Christ died for all but we do not read that He died for the sins of all -- while we do read that Christ died for our sins. And now we inquire: where is it written that His blood was shed for all? Might Scripture be wiser in its language than we are? The ransom is for all; and Christ died for all. This Scripture declares -- and this,


82. J. N. Darby wrote:

It has been attempted to say, there is no appeasement of wrath with God. The words Ιάσοκεθαι, ιλασομόζ, ιλασ τήροιν, all have exactly this sense. They meet the qualities or attributes in God which are necessary and must be maintained or He is not God as He is (or not God at all), to maintain what He is, His holiness and righteousness. But He is supreme in love (Collected Writings 10:349; see also 14:246).

W. Kelly observed:

According to the letter the NT no more speaks of “wrath” executed in the cross, than of propitiating God. And there is like wisdom in its abstention. But let all beware of denying one or other because of God’s gracious guard against abuse (The Bible Treasury 18:97, note).

83. Collected Writings 23:240.

84. J. N. Darby remarked:

In interpreting “If one died for all, then were all dead,” if people would get God’s mind, they would not say absurd things. As for all dying with Christ, I deny it altogether, and do not admit that we must get God’s mind through the Greek. It is a total departure from the apostle’s argument, and contradicts the next verse. The theory is that people live and die; but “they which live” are those who are not left in that state. The next sentence is demonstrative of it: “He died for all, that they which live”; that is not all. The aorist gives the historical fact, but it does not say that the historical fact is the consequence of Christ’s having died. Why did Christ go down there? It was because they were all in the pit; and then the point is that some live (not all), and if they live, they are to live to Him that died for them and rose again. If it were translated, “then all died,” it would be historical. There is no consequence in it, and “then” is not time, but “consequently”; the Greek in this verse for then is ara, which is nowhere time. It is not consequence, though it may be a fact. The proper force of ara is illative in later Greek. (That is, it introduces an inference). (Collected Writings 23:265; see also Notes and Comments 6:60.)
we have seen, is connected with the teaching regarding purchase by the Son of man -- which is connected with Christ being the propitiation for the world (1 John 2:2), a text which will be considered later in this series. But redemption is another matter. We are aware that only believers are redeemed. By what are they redeemed?

... knowing that ye have been redeemed ... by precious blood (1 Pet. 1:18, 19).

... in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of offences, according to the riches of his grace (Eph. 1:7).

85. In this connection Rev. 5:9 should be noted:

... and hast redeemed to God, by thy blood out of every tribe, etc.

Rev. 14:3, 4:

... who were bought from the earth ... .

... These have been bought from men [as] firstfruits to God and to the Lamb

In a footnote to Rev. 5:9, JND says:

Or 'bought,' as Rev. 14:3, 4.

Concerning Rev. 5:9, Marshall has "didst purchase" (τῇγόρασσα); and for Rev. 14, purchased (τῇγόρασσαμένοι). All are bought by the Son of man, and thus those who have divine life are purchased. Additionally, they are purchased also from among men.

86. The water that accompanied the blood from the Lord's side is very important, but not our subject here. Sin makes us both guilty and morally dirty. The work on the cross provides for God to deal with both of these things with the blood and water, respectively.
The new covenant for Israel, when all Israel shall be saved (Rom. 11:26), has for its blood, the blood of Christ (Matt. 26:28). The blood of Christ is used in a figurative way as that which the believers drinks (John 6:53-56). It signifies the appropriation of His death on the cross, which death has all the value of the atoning sufferings.

In Acts 20:28 we have a remarkable expression:

... the assembly of God which he has purchased with the blood of his own.

The propriety and piety of translating this passage thus was discussed by J. N. Darby. The point is that the belonging of the assembly to God is by blood. Next we have faith in His blood:

... who God has set forth a mercy-seat, through faith in his blood (Rom. 3:25).

But not only that:

... having now been justified in [the power of] his blood (Rom. 5:9),

connects the blood with justification – not to the exclusion of His resurrection, of course, (Rom. 4:25). Notice, too, how justification is connected with

87. Now for my own part I believe -- have always thought -- the reading ‘the church of God’ to be right. If *dia tou idiou haimatos* was the reading in this place, then “the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood” would be the only right translation; and so the English translators read it. But I confess I agree with Athanasius that such language is not according to Scripture analogy and its expression of the truth. It is not a question of the divinity of the Lord, one way or the other, but of the fitness of speaking of the blood of God. I do not think such an expression scriptural. I do not accept the title even of the Mother of God. I believe it revolts just and divinely -- given thoughts in the mind, and turns away from the true, eternal divinity of the blessed Lord. He who was God had a mother, and He who was God shed His blood; but I do not think Scripture speaks of God’s shedding His blood. I think it revolts the mind as wrong, unseemly -- I will say, profane. I know what a person means and I bear with it, because I delight in his holding the true, essential deity of the Lord. But I agreed with Athanasius, when I had never read him, when I examined the passage in this view, in thinking such expressions contrary to the analogy of the faith.

As regards the translation of *dia tou haimatos tou idiou* “by the blood of His own,” that it is Greek is I judge beyond controversy, in spite of the confident pretensions of some, and the slighting remarks of others. In John 15:19, we have this usage, which anyone may find in a dictionary. “If ye were of the world, the world would love its own” -- *to idion ephilei.* It is an unquestionable Greek usage. Of course, it can be translated, “by His own blood.” The question is, which is right. *To idion* is that which is specially near and identified with any one, as our word, “own.” Hence it is said, “He spared not his own Son.” God has purchased the church with that which was His own, nearest and dearest to Himself: a thought as apt and beautiful as possible here. Of that there can be no question. The singular seems to me more intimate than the plural, but I could not here give any proof that I am right. At all events, no expression would be more appropriate, hardly any, it seems to me, so strong. God purchased the Church with that which was most near to Himself and most dear to Himself. This seems to me a most forcible expression, peculiarly expressive in the circumstances -- more so, it seems to me, than that which would have expressed the relationship of the blessed Lord to His Father, whatever the essential importance of that may be in its place. The force of the sentence is in the word ‘idion’ (English own), which is to me a deeply touching expression (Collected Writings 34:107).
redemption (Rom. 3:24). We have been redeemed by precious blood (1 Pet. 1:18, 19); have redemption through His blood (Eph. 1:7).

Moreover, we are brought nigh by the blood of the Christ (Eph. 2:13) and have peace by the blood of His cross (Col. 1:20). It is the blood of the Christ that purifies our consciences from dead works, to worship the living God (Heb. 9:14). We enter the holiest by the blood of Jesus (Heb. 10:14).

To him who loves us, and has washed us from our sins in his blood, and made us a kingdom, priests to his God and Father: to him [be] glory and the might to the ages of ages. Amen (Rev. 1:5, 6).

So we see how the blessedness of the appropriation of the value of Christ’s death is connected with the blood. And when one has appropriated that value, he is in the good of substitution.

And finally, let us notice that when Scripture speaks of the forgiveness of our sins, and an aspect of the work of Christ is mentioned, it is connected with blood and/or redemption. Eph. 1:7 was quoted above and to that we should connect Col. 1:14. Besides that, Heb. 9:22 says:

... without blood-shedding there is no remission.

THE BLOOD SHED FOR MANY

In connection with the introduction of the Lord’s supper, the Lord Jesus said, concerning the cup:

For this is my blood, that of the [new] covenant, that shed for {περὶ --- "concerning," Marshall} many for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:28).

This is my blood, that of the [new] covenant, that shed for {ὑπὲρ --- on behalf of} many (Mark 14:24).

This indicates that the blood was shed for others besides those who will be under the new covenant. But it says “for many” not ‘for all.’ And here there is a difference from the ransom. The words “ransom for many” had been stated by the Lord, whereas in the due time, as we saw, the testimony rendered was that He was a “ransom for all.” But, it was not subsequently said that His blood was shed for all.

Concerning the Lord’s supper and the blood shed for many, the following remarks by JND are helpful:

The Lord then institutes the supper, putting first Himself, then the blood of the new covenant, then its being shed for many, in the place of the Jewish passover, the old covenant, and {in place of} the limitation of everything to that people. This is the distinctive character of the supper here, suited to this Gospel {Matthew}. 88 Mark’s account is essentially the same. Luke’s is much more personal and connected with (surely divine, but also) human affection to the disciples. But in all it is the blood of the new covenant, or the new covenant in

88. {See also Collected Writings 24:66, 197.}
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His blood. In Matthew it is leaving association with them, breaking with men, even with the disciples down here, drinking no more of the fruit of the vine; only in Matthew and Mark His drinking it again with them after a wholly new sort is also spoken of. It was the simple and blessed testimony of the displacing all that was before, man and any previously presented ground of man’s relationships with God.

No new covenant was yet established; but the blood on which it was to be founded was shed, and it could be announced so that Judaism was closed, that is, man’s relationships with God as in flesh, and on the footing of man’s righteousness; also closing any connection between the Lord come in flesh and man. His body, but His body as dead, was given as meat indeed. This carried the double testimony that there was no possible connection any more between man in the flesh and God; 89 but also, that redemption was wrought, the true passover offered. Hence, as before that, death was death to man, now he lives by death, the death of Christ. It is not here as in Luke, “Do this in remembrance of me,” but His separation from His disciples is strongly marked. He does not eat or drink with them, but gives what was the sign of His death to them, the sign of a perfect redemption by His death, but that His death, not His life with them was their portion with Him. This was a total and mighty change, the essence of their whole relationships with Him and having an eternal character. Death was the portion of the Son of God as man down here, and their part with Him and with God was founded on it.

The blood was shed for many for the remission of sins, and the new covenant was founded on it; all was dispensationally changed, but all was eternally founded also as to man, the believer’s relationships with God. But present association was wholly broken off till renewed in a new way in His Father’s kingdom. This is an expression of Matthew’s Gospel like the kingdom of heaven. It is the higher and heavenly part of the kingdom. 90 In chapter 13 {Matt. 13:41-43} we find it in the explanation of the tares and the wheat. We read, “The Son of man shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend . . . then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father,” that higher part where they shall be in the same glory as Christ Himself, predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself: only here it is My Father; there, “their.” Then Christ will anew, but in a blessedly new way, 91 enjoy companionship with His disciples and they with Him. Blessed place and blessed familiarity! If the Lord has given up the companionship of His disciples, it is to accomplish their redemption; and He waits, as we wait, to renew it in a better place and in brighter scenes, but as truly and more intimately than they could have it here. Nothing more beautiful or touching than this intimation of the Lord at the moment of His departure. He showed where His heart was, His love to us. And they sung a hymn together,

89. {It marked the end of the probation of the first man. After the cross, man is no longer under testing.}
90. {The future kingdom will have, so to speak, two spheres: the earthly, which is the kingdom of the Son of man; and, the heavenly, which is the kingdom of the Father.}
91. {See Collected Writings 25:21; Synopsis 3:139}. 
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and went out to the mount of Olives, His wonted resort. 92 ♦

It is the new covenant in His blood, and, further, shed for many. It is thus shed blood alone which is before us in the Eucharist. It is an abiding witness that, as to God’s part in it, the foundation of the covenant is laid in the blood of the Mediator of it, and that that blood is shed for many. It is further a sign of the unity of the body, so that those who take part in it are there as one body in Christ, identified withal with all true saints. 93 ♦

Isaiah 53

It is quite clear that Isa. 53 directly concerns the Messiah and Israel. But in the NT we see that some of what we have here is also applied to Gentiles.

Isaiah portrays the Lord Jesus here as the one rejected by the Jews. However, God will have a future remnant from among them and they will be brought into an acceptance of Christ. In Isa. 53:4 we read that:

... we did regard him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

But they will yet come into the understanding that Christ bore the cross for them (Isa. 53:5, 6). The words “our” and “we” in the verse refer to the remnant, not the entire nation – though when the future purging of the Jews (Ezek. 20; Zech. 13, 14) is completed, those left living will compose the nation of those that are all saved (Rom. 11:26). In these two verses (Isa. 53:5, 6) we have substitution – answering to the scape-goat of the day of atonement. The words “wounded,” “bruised,” “chastisement,” and “stripes” are figurative words used to describe Jehovah’s dealing with Him on the cross, as their substitute. Peter spoke of this when he wrote:

... who himself bore our sins on the tree... by whose stripes 94 ye have been healed (1 Pet. 2:24).

These words convey to us that the Lord Jesus was bearing punishment on the cross under the hand of God.

The punishment that He endured was for “transgressions” and “iniquities” (v. 5). His soul was made an offering for sin. Concerning the word sin in v. 10, JND has a footnote which says:

Asham, ‘trespass-offering;’ see Note b, Lev. 5:1.

So sin in Isa. 53:10 does not refer to the principle of sin in our nature as fallen (as in Rom. 6 and Rom. 8:3), but to acts of sin; i.e., sins as acts, for which

92. Collected Writings 24:197-199.
94. JND has a footnote to this word, saying:

Or, ‘bruise.’ Though the word is in the singular, it is literally the marks left by scourging. ‘Stripe’ does not convey this.

He does not mean that 1 Pet. 2:24 is speaking of literal scourging marks as healing us, but what the word means. The word is used figuratively concerning the sufferings under the hand of God.
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Chapter 7: Died for All, Blood Shed for Many

Christ bore substitutionally and made restitution, as sin in the trespass offering (Lev. 5). As Peter said, He bore our sins in His body on the tree (1 Pet. 2:24).

Writing to Christians during the time while God is forming the bride of Christ, Peter speaks of Christ as having borne “our sins,” not everyone’s sins. The fact of a limitation is true also in Isa. 53, where Jews are in view. If Christ bore everyone’s sins, then He bore the sins of every Jew. But Isa. 53 does not support that:

. . . by his knowledge shall my righteous servant instruct many in righteousness: and he shall bear their iniquities (Isa. 53:11).

There is a footnote to the word “many” in JND’s translation which says: Lit. ‘the many,’ i.e., those that are in relationship with him.

The Jews whose iniquities Christ bore are limited – not every Jew; and thus Christ did not bear everyone’s sins. Further, in Isa. 53:12 we read:

. . . he bore the sin of many.

No, this is not a sub-set of “He bore the sins of all.” There is no such general statement, nor teaching, in the Word of God.

Stripes, chastisements, bruises, wounds, inflicted on Him, and that by Jehovah being pleased to bruise Him, surely speak of punishment, and punishment for us; for it was for our iniquities, our transgressions; and it was that which made our peace and healed us, if indeed we are healed. And this is the more distinctly and remarkably brought out, because it is in contrast with the false judgment the Jews had formed of Him -- that He was stricken and smitten of God, as suffering under His disapprobation. “We hid as it were our faces from him; we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.” Now they found out He had borne their griefs, and carried their sorrows: and, lest the thought might stop short at His only bearing them (for He did so bear them in the sorrow of His heart), the Spirit in them adds, “But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities,” etc. And lest there should be any mistake as to whence this

95. J. N. Darby wrote:

And so, when they look on Him whom they have pierced, will it be fulfilled in its direct and glorious meaning, for they above all were of the travail of His soul. “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem,” etc. “He came unto his own,” etc. So Peter in his first address. It does indeed fully, in offering of atonement apply to the Gentile, as Paul was commissioned specially to declare, i.e., the power of it, but in specialty of promise it belonged to the Jew, whose (see Romans) “the promises” were, and the “oracles of God,” and “of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came,” as here particularly set forth. Nor is this ever departed from in Scripture: “It was necessary that the Word of God should have been first preached unto you, but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so,” etc., which was his special office; so here, where the general truth of Christ’s mission, and the principles of divine truth exhibited in Christ, and to the Gentiles -- in a word, what we are wont to call the Gospel -- was to be set forth for the Church, as applicable to men, the larger scope of these promises, “a light to lighten the Gentiles, the glory of God’s people Israel” was not forgotten (Notes and Comments 6:77).
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came, we read further, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to
grief" (Isa. 53:10). Indeed it would be mere folly to say that the wicked Jews
had wounded him for their iniquities; nor could they, nor would they, say they
were healed by His stripes.  

The notion that Christ bore everyone’s sins involves this punishment of Christ on
the cross for everyone’s sins and then the sinner being eternally punished for
them again when, having been judged according to his works, he is cast into the
lake of fire (Rev. 20). What underlies these false notions is uncleanness about
propitiation and substitution.

We should beware of leveling everything so that saints of various ages all
have common blessings or of the other extreme of allowing for no common
blessings at all. While the Christian has blessings flowing from the cross, so does
Israel. And while some are common (for example, the forgiveness of sins), there
are differences. JND remarked:

As all my sins were future when He died for them, so when once I am not in the
flesh all that belongs to it faith looks on as past as to atonement and
righteousness when He died. For so, and so only, could they be put away. But,
as risen, I come into the holiest, not only because I am cleared from sins (a
process which, in itself, went no farther than judicial acknowledgment of me
where I was responsible), but according to all the value of that in which Christ
is entered in. This, I repeat, is our only proper present position; because the old
man, who was the responsible man in this world, is viewed as dead and buried,
so that we are not in the flesh. Hence, though we were responsible, and the sins
were borne and atoned for, we are not at all now in the place, and condition, or
nature, in which that government and dealing took place; it is over for us. The
bullock, the fullest and highest value of Christ’s sacrifice, is ours, and represents
our present standing. The two goats clearly show that the same one sacrifice of
course applies to both parts of His work; our being presented to God according
to His nature, and the putting away of sin, which was inconsistent with our duty
as children of Adam.

But the application is, in a measure, different when Israel comes in
question: because they do not enter into the holiest through the rent veil, the new
and living way. They know the value of Christ’s sacrifice when He comes out,
and they look on Him whom they have pierced. They are under the weight of
multiplied transgressions as a nation, and stand on that ground, and in flesh --
have not to do with Christ within the veil, but when He has come out. I need not
say, it is no new sacrifice. Isa. 53 presents to us their recognition of the One we
already own. They are not in heavenly places in Him; but He appears to and is
with them, to bless them in the earth. They are accepted according to the
righteousness of God as a moral governor.

96. Collected Writings 7:66.
97. Collected Writings 10:202
Chapter 8

Propitiation for SINS
-- only for Believers --
and,
Propitiation for the World

1 John 2:2

Commenting on 1 John 2:2, W. Kelly pointed out the difference between propitiation for the sins of believers and propitiation for the world:

. . . here we have another thing to observe. The apostle says that the propitiation of Christ is not for our sins only. It is also “for the whole world.” Now we never find the propitiation for sins, except definitely for those that believe, as of old; now for those that are God’s children. Christ is a propitiation in a general way for the whole world, but only “for our sins.” There is a marked distinction, when he speaks of the whole world. This makes the putting in of “the sins” objectionable, when the world is in question. It is going beyond Scripture. If the Lord had been the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, the whole world would get its fruit and go to heaven. He bore their sins in the way He bore ours, what has God against them? He is the propitiation for our sins; He has annulled them for ever, blotting them out with His blood. Were it thus for the world, it would stand clear.

There Calvinism again is shallow, hard, and wrong. Propitiation is not merely a question of God’s children. God Himself had to be glorified as to sin, apart from our salvation, His nature in love vindicated as to His worst enemies. We may see the instruction afforded on the two truths by the type on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16). On that day there were two goats for the people of Israel. One of those goats was Jehovah’s lot; the other was the people’s lot. Now it was only in the people’s lot that all their sins were confessed. This was not the case with the first goat; and it was sacrificed. In this there appears a marked difference. As to one goat, Jehovah’s lot, it was for His glory, tarnished in this world by sin, by His grace, to satisfy the exigencies of His nature. He must needs be glorified about sin. But this did not as yet take up definitely the burden of the sinner. For his remission the sins must be confessed distinctly and positively; and so Aaron did, laying both his hands on the head of the live or second goat, the people’s lot. The first goat was killed, and its
blood brought into the sanctuary as everywhere, within and without. Here is the propitiation in typical way, which so far makes it stand good for the whole world, that the glad tidings might be preached to every sinner.

The doctrine is here and elsewhere. The type of it helps to illustrate the marked difference. The sacrifice of Christ has perfectly glorified God's nature, so that He can rise supremely and send forth glad tidings to every creature. But there is something more needed for sinners to be saved. "Christ bore their sins in His body on the tree." This is never said about "the world"; there is always a sufficiently careful guard. But because God has been perfectly glorified as to sin in the sacrifice of Christ, He can by His servants, as it were, beseech and entreat even His enemies: Be reconciled to God. God's love is the spring. Christ's death is the way and basis for the gospel. It does not necessarily save every creature, but declares God is glorified in Christ. If there were not a soul converted, God would be glorified in that sweet savor of Christ.

But it is well to note that the difference is great between the two. If God left all to man, not one could have been saved. It is by grace that we are saved. To the elect He gives faith; and there is where the propitiation for our sins comes in. None with the fear of God thinks all are to be saved, or denies that grace makes the difference between a believer and an unbeliever. The Day of Atonement bore witness that the first thing was to glorify His own nature; and this apart from effacing the sins of His people. It was of still higher moment that His truth should be vindicated, His holiness and His righteousness, His love and His majesty in Christ's cross. Therein as nowhere else good and evil came to issue, for the judgment and defeat of evil, and for the triumph of good, for the reconciliation not only of all believers to God, but of all things (not of all persons), and for new heavens and a new earth throughout eternity. The basis of this was laid in what the slain goat (Jehovah's lot) typified. But in order to extricate the people from their sins, He would show them His great mercy; and so they are in the second place taken up definitely, and their sins laid on the live goat, which carried them away into a land of forgetfulness, that they might be remembered no more. It is the distinction of propitiation and substitution.

Here we read that our Lord is the propitiation for our sins, "and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." Particular care is taken not to identify God's children and the world. Hence it is not said "for [the sins of] the whole world." 98 There is the danger of adding to Scripture, and the duty of believing Scripture only. Man's addition makes the difficulty; adhering to God's word solves it, while it says enough to proclaim divine mercy to the whole world. There God's nature and love are vindicated. That He is a Savior God appears to all men. He sends the message of grace to every creature.

He charges all men everywhere to repent: but in order to be saved, first is the effectual call of the sinner according to the divine counsel; secondly, the working of the Holy Ghost in the heart of the believer in receiving Christ. This is not the case with "the whole world"; and it is vain to deny that which is a fact. But here we have the Scripture that explains it. When you believe in our

98. There the translators were rash.
Lord Jesus, we too can say, following the word, He bore your sins away; but we are not entitled to say so to the unbeliever, nor to “the whole world.” Faith only is entitled to speak thus. The fact is that this type is only a particular witness to the great principle of Scripture, dogmatically laid down in the clearest terms of the New Testament. Take the distinction between “redemption” (Eph. 1:7) and “purchase” (2 Pet. 2:1): the true key, which opens the Calvinistic and Arminian dilemma. For they both confound the two truths, so that each is partially right, and partially wrong. The Lord by His death “bought” all creation, and every man of course, “false teachers” and all. It is at their everlasting peril that they deny His rights and rise up against their Sovereign Master. But none are “redeemed” save those who have through faith in His blood the forgiveness of their trespasses. Hence the Calvinist is as right in holding particular redemption, as the Arminian in maintaining universal purchase. But they are both in error when they fail to distinguish purchase and redemption. By His death on the cross the Lord added to His creator rights, and made every creature His by that infinite purchase. All are His, and not their own, as the believer only and fully acknowledges. But redemption delivers from Satan and sins; and this is nowhere the portion save by faith.

Take again another form of the truth in Heb. 2:9, 10. Christ by God’s grace tasted death for every thing, including of course every man (compare vv. 7, 8). All were purchased. But the language quite differs from ver. 10, where we hear of God, in bringing “many sons” to glory, perfecting the Leader of their salvation through sufferings. When the two distinct truths are confused, not only precision is lost, but the truth suffers from the heart’s lack of enlargement through knowing universal purchase, and from evaporating into vagueness through ignorance of the speciality of redemption.

Q. 1 John 2:2. Was Christ a propitiation “for the sins of the whole world?” Does John 1:29 teach this? Does 1 Peter 2:24 apply alike to all, believers and unbelievers? W.R.W.

A. It cannot be urged too plainly or often that “the sins of” is an interpolation, not only uncalled for, but an addition which goes beyond the truth and is therefore false, as all exaggerations must be. “For our sins” is in pointed distinction. “For the whole world” is ample ground of encouragement for preaching the gospel to those who are still in unbelief, without warranting the dangerous delusion that the sins of the whole world are gone. This would naturally lead to telling every body that he is forgiven, in open opposition to the general warning of scripture to all the unconverted. Hence it is not just to confound this last member of the sentence with 1 Pet. 2:24, which rather coalesces {“coalesce” means a coming together to form a whole} with Christ’s being a propitiation for our sins. He was our substitute; when men believe the gospel, we and they can say this of them. But He is a ransom for all, as He is a propitiation for the whole world. John 1:29 goes on to the complete taking away (not “bearing our sins”) of the sin of the world, as will be manifested in the new heavens and new earth, like Heb. 9:26. The sacrifice is already offered and accepted; but all its results are not yet come and enjoyed. It will be applied
to the millennial age, and completely in the eternal day. To say that judging “according to works” does not mean “sins” is mere quibbling. The “works” of the unbelievers, of the wicked, are nothing but “sins”; for which, when raised, they will have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone, the second death. 100

Propitiation for the World

... and he is the propitiation for our sins; but not for ours alone, but also for the whole world (1 John 2:2).

DEATH, NOT BLOOD, IN PROPITIATION FOR THE WORLD

Propitiation involves the vindication of God regarding sins outrage against His nature and majesty and glory. His sovereignty is attacked, His glory thrust aside, as far as the tendency of self-will is concerned. Moreover, His dealing with sin raises the question of the righteousness of God.

Propitiation is Godward and has to do with maintaining His glory. Because God has been propitiated, the basis for His actings in grace has been provided consistent with that glory. For the world, the gospel goes out because of the death of Christ. The chart below illustrates how the death of Christ and propitiation for the world are related. That is the death, not the blood. We are considering this in accordance with how Scripture presents this matter. The blood is spoken of in Scripture as connected with propitiation for the believer. That may not fit with theories we may have about this subject; but what we want is how Scripture presents the matter to faith, for faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. Later we shall consider how propitiation for our sins, and substitution for our sins, coalesce, forming one whole (atonement) for the believer.

Propitiation for the world (Christ died for all) lays the basis for approach to God, the gospel going out to all. Approach to God must be done in consistency with God’s nature, and in accordance with His glory, and He himself has provided for that. But will man approach to God in virtue of the propitiation? There are Calvinists who say that Christ died for only the elect. 101 Thus they have to understand certain Scriptures differently than what they actually express. The Scripture is express that Christ died for all:

... having judged this: that one died for all, then all have died; and he died for all, that they who live should no longer live to themselves (2 Cor. 5:14, 15).

It is true that Romans looks at man as alive in sins (and running from God as fast

100. The Bible Treasury, New Series 2:302.
101. See Paul Wilson’s refutation of the notions expressed by A. W. Pink, Christian Truth 12:275, 301. On p. 319ff he dealt with “reprobation.”
as he can) but Ephesians looks at the sinner as dead: *dead in trespasses and sins* (Eph. 2:1). Man is without life towards God and is viewed as dead. In 2 Cor. 5:14, 15 we read that “all have died.” That is the state of all men as regards life towards God. Now, Christ’s death here is viewed as proving just that state to be the state of all men: i.e., they are all dead. 102 All, not the elect merely, had died. And Christ died for all those dead ones. There are some of those dead ones who receive life from God, and they should no longer live unto themselves as the rest do. There is an aspect of the death of Christ that is for all, but it is life-producing only in some cases.

In 1 Tim. 2:6 we read:

... who gave himself a ransom for all . . .

This means a ransom *in place of* but not in the way of what we mean by substitution and redemption. Christ has purchased (bought) all. In Rom. 3:22 we see the distinction again:

... righteousness of God towards all, and upon all those who believe.

There is an aspect of the work of Christ that has all in view, yet the righteousness of God is only on some, i.e., on those who believe. It is *redemption* and substitution that is *particular*, i.e., specific -- for believers only.

A false view that Christ died only for the elect falsifies the love of God in John 3:16, when some take “world” to mean the ‘world of the elect.’ And so some take God’s command to all men to repent (Acts 17:30) to mean ‘all the elect.’ Concerning these two verses, John Calvin held that “world” means just that; and “all men” in Acts 17:30 means just that: all men.

So there is an aspect of propitiation which is for the world, for Christ died for all men. His death, not His blood, is brought before us in Scripture, regarding this aspect of His work on the cross. Substitution as bearing our sins in His own body on the tree is only about believers, and this alone is brought before us in connection with His blood.

**WHAT BENEFIT DOES THE WORLD GET FROM PROPITIATION?**

J. N. Darby did not care for this question

What benefit does the world get from [propitiation]? It puts everything on a false and low ground, as if the end and only object of God’s ways -- leaving out the claims of His glory and nature in that which angels desire to look into. I agree in general with what you say; but “the Lord’s lot” was not for the sins of the people, as guilt, though God’s holy and righteous nature was met in respect of their sin. The blood was sprinkled first, on and before the mercy-seat -- God’s throne in the most holy place where God dwelt -- and the altar of incense. The atonement was for the “holy place . . . that remaineth

---

102. This fact shows that the death of Christ marks the end of the testing of the first man. The result of the testing was that all have died (or “had died”). Christ’s death denotes that fact.
among them." “That is for the people,” (v. 15) {Lev. 16} is in contrast with Aaron and his house. But what was cleansed and hallowed was the holy place, and the altar, no doubt, because of the tabernacle being among them. As meeting God’s nature and character, it was the basis of all (cp. Heb. 9:23-26 and 27, 28). The taking away the sin of the world was to have “a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” -- is the fruit of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God. Thank God! our sins are taken away, too, but that is a different thing from putting away sin.

It is deplorable to make putting away our sins, true and blessed as it is, the end of all. God has been glorified in Him (John 13) in such sort, that Man is in the glory of God. In the scapegoat, God’s people were represented in their head -- the high priest -- and those only who, as such, were identified with him. In the other there was no such representation -- a most important principle. Though the people’s uncleanness were the occasion of it, it was the Lord’s lot, His dwelling-place which was in question, and transgressions not in question, save as the means of its defilement; and the blood was under God’s eye as the ground of all God’s dealings till, and making the security of, the new heavens and the new earth. (See John 13:31, 32.) Through the cross, God Himself has been fully glorified, and in virtue of it Christ Himself has entered into the glory of God as Man, though He had it before the world was. (So Phil. 2) Man’s sin was absolute, Satan’s power over all the world, man’s perfection absolute in Christ when absolutely tested, God’s righteous judgment against sin displayed as nowhere else, and perfect love to the sinner, His majesty made good. “It became him” (Heb. 2). No doubt our sins were borne too, thank God! that we might have part in the results; but blessed as this is for us, it was really a secondary thing to the basis of the glory of God in the universe, and the bringing all into order, according to what He is fully displayed. So John 17:4, 5. But in John’s gospel there is not a word of the forgiveness of our sins, save as administered by the apostles.

Finally, the people were not represented in the blood on the mercy-seat and holy place; their sins gave occasion to its being done but the cleansing was of God’s dwelling-place, that that should be fit for Him, and what He was, perfectly glorified by Christ’s death -- to be for ever before Him as eternal redemption. The two goats made but one Christ in different aspects. But propitiation alters the whole ground of God’s dealings with man. It is the display of God’s mercy maintaining God’s righteousness, but opening the door to the sinner -- the ground on which I preach the gospel, and can say to every sinner, The blood is on the mercy-seat; return to God, and it will be His joy to receive you: it is not necessary for Him to judge you if you so come, for His righteousness is fully glorified, and His love free. This may bring out the evil will in man, but it is then “ye will not come to me that ye might have life.” There is death in substitution -- He “bore our sins in his own body on the tree” -- “died for our sins according to the scriptures”: as I have said, the two goats are one Christ.

The word “lost” is not a different word. Christ came to seek sinners, not repentant sinners. God leads to repentance. We have the repentant sinner in
the third parable -- the seeking in the two first. (Luke 15) The “lost” in them
has, of course a physical sense as a figure, but there was no thought of their
disposition to return. It is a miserable denial of the gospel; “God commendeth
_his_ love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”
The figure of their being carried clean away, not to be found, may be given,
but that forgiveness and redemption are by blood-shedding is stated
everywhere -- no remission of sins without it. “We have redemption through
his blood, the forgiveness of sins.” Luke 19:10 is also “lost” -- the same
word . . . 103

Propitiation for Our Sins

. . . and _he_ is the propitiation for our sins; but not for ours alone, but also for
the whole world (1 John 2:2).

PROPITIATION HAS IN VIEW GOD’S NATURE AND GLORY

There are two aspects, or two major features, to the work of Christ on the cross:
propitiation and substitution. However, concerning propitiation, there are two
aspects involved:

1. Propitiation for the world -- which is not propitiation for sins.
2. Propitiation for _our_ sins.

Below is a chart meant to illustrate the difference between “propitiation . . . for
the whole world” and propitiation for the sins of believers. It should be noted that
in Lev. 16 we have a type of atonement for the people of God composed of
propitiation and substitution (the two goats of the one sin-offering). There is no
OT type of atonement for the world, of course; but neither is there an OT type
of propitiation for the world. It is in connection with the unfolding of these truths
doctrinally, in the NT, that God speaks of “propitiation for the world.” This
subject is brought out consequent on the God-glorifying work of propitiation.
This is founded on the God-glorifying work of Christ which provided the
righteous basis upon which God could proclaim the gospel to all. “Propitiation
for our sins” goes further and indicates that God is glorified _specifically_
concerning the believer’s sins. _Christ Himself is the propitiation_ and this denotes
the impartation of the glory and value of His Person to the work, it having the
value and glory of Himself. And with respect to our sins, God’s holy nature and
His glory have had that very value and glory presented to Him. This is especially
typified by the cloud of incense accompanying the presentation of the blood in the
sanctuary rising up from the hot coals from the altar of burnt-offering and
covering the very mercy-seat upon which abode the Shekinah (Lev. 16:2, 12,
13). It was glory meeting glory! Is that a coalescing of the glories?

God’s nature and glory is thus necessarily satisfied and honored and this

opened access to God. But the unbeliever will not come. The believer comes and finds both propitiation and substitution for his sins by the death and blood of Him Who Himself is the propitiation; and who is in the presence of God for him as his advocate.

**WHAT ABOUT LIMITED OR UNLIMITED “ATONEMENT”?**

Discussions often center on “limited atonement” versus “unlimited atonement.” Perhaps there is usually confusion in this way of stating the matter. In the NT we have “propitiation . . . for the world” as well as a “propitiation for our sins.” “Propitiation . . . for the world” is an *unlimited aspect* of propitiation while “propitiation for our sins” is *particular*, i.e., limited to believers, as is substitution (which involves redemption). If we understand this to be the case, we should understand that, strictly speaking, the word atonement as applied to the work of Christ, is only applicable to believers. This results in a limited atonement and yet there is an unlimited aspect of propitiation. Perhaps we can see how the phrases “unlimited atonement” versus “limited atonement” used in controversy over this subject do not do justice to this matter as not taking into account the *two aspects of propitiation*. The truth of this matter is more comprehensive than phrasing the issue the usual way in the on-going controversy over the extent of the atonement would indicate. At any rate, we are seeking understanding, and perhaps the chart below may help in that objective.

**THE LORD’S BLOOD WAS SHED AFTER HE WAS DEAD**

It is instructive to observe that the Lord Jesus’ blood was shed after He was dead; necessarily so. It could not be that He would bleed to death. First, that would violate John 10: 18. He bowed His head; it did not droop. Accordingly, it was an act of will to deliver up His spirit

... and having bowed his head, he delivered up His spirit (John 19:30).

Moreover, the death and bloodshedding were distinct things and fit with what we are considering concerning His death having a bearing towards the world (and believers also, of course), but his blood was not for the world but for the believer. So His death was not by bloodshedding. While the death and bloodshedding, with the atoning sufferings, comprise the one work, these are the three elements to the one work. Only the believer has the blood applied to him.

**CONNECTION WITH CHRIST’S ADVOCACY**

It would have been better to have included 1 John 2: 1, 2 with ch. 1. And, the advocate is the one who rendered *Himself* as the propitiation for our sins -- sins in view of which He is the advocate. So, not only is He “Jesus Christ [the] righteous,” qualified in that way to deal with the matter, but He is the very one who expiated those sins judicially. It is *Himself* that is the propitiation for our sins, imparting the glory and value of His Person to the accomplished work.
Chapter 8: Propitiation... Believers... World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATONEMENT ONLY FOR THE BELIEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the believer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propitiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coalesce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPIATION general

- Propitiation for the world (1 John 2:2).

### PROPIATION for our sins

- Propitiation for *our sins* (1 John 2:2; 4:10; see Heb. 2:17).
- Propitiation is *Godward*: He glorified God about *our sins*.

### SUBSTITUTION for our sins

- Our substitute bore *our sins* in His own body on the tree (1 Pet. 2:24).
- Bore the sin of many (Isa. 53:12).
- Substitution is *manward*:
  - He made *our sins* His own.

### This is general.

This meets God's glory generally.

### This is specific.

This meets God's glory specifically.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This meets man's need specifically.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>specific.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPITIATION for our sins</th>
<th>SUBSTITUTION for our sins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Propitiation for *our sins* (1 John 2:2; 4:10; see Heb. 2:17). | Our substitute bore *our sins* in His own body on the tree (1 Pet. 2:24). Bore the sin of many (Isa. 53:12). Substitution is *manward*:
  - He made *our sins* His own. |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is specific.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>specific.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This meets man's need specifically.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>specific.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This meets man's need specifically.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>specific.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specifically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104. By “coalesce” is meant that these two truths come together and form a whole. While the death of Christ is included (of course!) the “blood” is used exclusively in application to believers, in contrast to unbelievers.

These two aspects of the work for the believer are seen in the two goats of the one sin-offering on the great day of atonement (Lev. 16:5). This illustrates what is meant by “coalesce” here. The blood of one goat was presented in the sanctuary (this speaks of propitiation) while the goat upon whose head the sins were confessed was sent away to “a land apart” (this speaks of substitution).

One goat brings before us the satisfaction for our sins (propitiation) while the other goat brings before us the transference of sins and guilt (substitution). See Collected Writings 23:265, 266 as well as 31:375, 376.
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THE CHART

The chart illustrates how propitiation for our sins and substitution for our sins coalesce, i.e., come together as a whole, for the believer. And, let us take note again that while the death of Christ has an aspect with the world in view, the blood is only spoken of regarding the believer. The blood of Christ has to do with the application of the work of Christ to the believer. The blood has as its value the death of Christ, which has the value of the atoning sufferings in the three hours. The blood includes all and is applied to the believer. This is true of the water of cleansing also, for out of the side of the dead Christ came water and blood. Sin had made us filthy as well as guilty and God has met all our condition. The water is not for the world anymore than the blood is. The water and blood are what is applied by divine grace. Properly speaking, atonement is only for the believer. What is depicted on the chart is not likely to satisfy either the Arminian or the Calvinist. The fact is that the unfolding of dispensational truth was accompanied by the more proper view of very many truths. And when we think of the unfolding of the truth of the ending, in the cross, of the first man's standing (in Adamic responsibility, under testing), there was much important gain in apprehending God's thoughts and the true Christian position. The work of Christ does entail the end of the testing of the first man; and necessarily God is glorified in the second man, under whose headship the Christian is. Hence we are to reckon ourselves dead as having died with Christ (Rom. 6); and our new position is being seated in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:6). We are taken into favor in the Beloved (Eph. 1:6). He Himself is the measure of our being taken into favor; as also He Himself is the propitiation for our sins (1 John 2:2). How could anything be greater than that of which He Himself is the measure?

PROPITIATION, ATONEMENT, AND RECONCILIATION

J. N. Darby commented:

“Atonement” occurs but once in the New Testament, and there it should be (Rom. 5:11) reconciliation; and expiation occurs but once in the Bible (Num. 35:33), and that is in the margin, “no expiation for the land”: so we may drop that word. Propitiation is towards God. There is the holy and righteous character of God to be met; and this is propitiation. God is not changed by it; but, being righteous and holy, this is responded to, that His love might go out according to righteousness and holiness, and mercy and righteousness be consistent. Atonement is more when the blood is applied. Blood was sprinkled upon the altar, because sin was there, blood of atonement. It is the actual putting away of sin by the sprinkling of the blood. The idea is, a thing or person is in a state in which they cannot have to say to God, as here “the iniquities of the children of Israel among whom I dwell”; and that condition must be dealt with. You must have the blood where the sin has been, you must have it for God to be in relationship with such. The blood is brought in, and the thing sprinkled, and so the thing is put right. Here reconciliation is the same word.

In the two goats are the two aspects of what Christ did. The twofold view
Believers... World

Chapter 8: Propitiation... is most interesting; as in Christ the Apostle and High Priest, like Moses and Aaron. Atonement signifies life given and accepted as sacrifice for life forfeited; remission is the deliverance of those who appeal from the sentence of death, and thence it is the forgiveness of the sins that caused their condemnation.

"Atonement" is the greatest blunder in Rom. 5:11. We are said to be "reconciled" in v. 10. Then v. 11 speaks of "our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation," not the atonement, which has nothing to do with the sins on our side; atonement is for God.

When I think of propitiation, I think more of the person propitiated and what is due to him; reconciliation deals with circumstances too. It has nothing to do with our nature in the Old Testament. We have a nature that always likes to break the law; and we learn what that is. When I find I have a nature that cannot be subject, I say, Here is a pretty business; and this all comes out in the New Testament. The remedy is, not merely that Christ has died, and whatever Christ did is mine, but that I am dead with Him (Rom. 6).

Atonement is for guilt. When I look in the Old Testament, I see guilt blotted out, and not a nature judged; that is the thing for which the atonement provides, and I do get the blood put upon the mercy-seat where God Himself sits; and when I know what His nature is, I get the fact that here God's nature is met, not my own dealt with as in the cross of Christ. For nature, my nature, is not known under law to be dealt with. So, if David says, "Create in me a clean heart," would he have spoken thus, if he had known that his heart in the flesh could not be made clean? Again, if Naaman was clean altogether, it is a figure for now. But then there was no flesh lusting against the Spirit, nor even the two natures contrary one to the other, as a state existing and explained to the believer. With the new nature, I have now the privilege of knowing that the old is dead. I have the new man and the old; but the old is condemned in death. "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin condemned sin in the flesh"; and I not only die daily, but know that I am crucified with Christ.

The atonement is another thing; in it God's nature is met, and this is the point. I have nothing about man's nature; God's nature has been dishonored by sin, and He is there sitting with things before Him which He will not stand. This is the fact, and therefore the blood is put under His eye; that is, Christ has done it, and God says, "When I see the blood, I will pass over"; but sin is all considered in the lump, so to speak here. When we find nature and conflict with nature, it is a question of the Holy Ghost. This applies to nature only in the way that it applies to sin at large...

The scripture that made the question, whether Christ was a sin-bearer all His life, quite clear to me was, "he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." He must be proved all His life to know no sin, and then He can be made sin. To bear sins in life makes atonement without blood, but "without shedding of blood is no remission." Why should the Lord be saved from "that hour" if it had been going on all His life? And there is another thing if followed up: it takes a person back and unites him to Christ before He died, which is false. "Except
a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."  

The reformation doctrines that Christ died to reconcile the Father to us, and the doctrine of Christ's vicarious life, contributed to some wrong views regarding atonement. J. N. Darby wrote:

The doctrine of the Reformation put forth the view that Christ died to reconcile His Father to us -- a statement every way erroneous, confounding the name of relationship in blessing with God in His nature; and teaching, what scripture does not, that Christ's work was to reconcile God to us, to change His mind. But others have used this to deny real propitiation and atonement.

"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." He did not need to have His mind changed. But a righteous and holy God could not pass over sin as nothing, and if God so loved, the Son of man must be lifted up. God was not (as a heathen god) one who had to be propitiated that He might not be against us; but He did require that the righteousness and holiness should be maintained in the universe. I think you will find that the New Testament never says God was propitiated, but you will find Christ was an ἱλασμός for our sins. (1 John) And that Christ was a priest ἵλακεσθαι τὰς ἐμαρτίας. It is not, as in Homer, [II. 386] ἐντὸς ἱλάκεσθαι. We have the imperative in Luke 18 ἰλασθήτε, "Be gracious." We have never God for the object of ἱλάκωμαι in the New Testament; but we have sins; and it seems to me to set the point on very clear ground.

He was quite correct when he wrote:

As to doctrine, we read in the second article, "That Christ died to reconcile His Father to us" -- a statement quite inconsistent with the gospel on its fundamental principle, which flows from the Father sending the Son out of His own voluntary and uncaused love. This mission of the Father from His own mind is of the very essence of the gospel; the error is an abuse of one part of the gospel, in which Christ made satisfaction for sin, to destroy another, the fountain from which it flowed, in which God gave Him so to make the satisfaction. It strikes at the root of all the liberty and settledness of peace of the people of God.

The work of Christ glorified God (John 17:4) about sin, which seems to be a deeper matter than rendering a satisfaction, though that is true in itself. In Lev. 16 the cloud of incense rising up from the hot coals from the altar, before the mercy seat, speaks of Christ's glory meeting the glory of the Shekinah between the cherubim. It was glory meeting glory, as J. T. Armet pointed out. The cloud of the incense covered the mercy seat; and God look out through that cloud of glory. That cloud of incense was essential to propitiation being effected.
Chapter 9

Bearing Sins was Only on the Cross

The Cross, the Place of Sin-Bearing

It is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul (Lev. 17:11).

. . . who himself bore our sins in his body on the tree . . . by whose stripes 108 ye have been healed (1 Pet. 1:24)

. . . who has not need day by day, as the high priests, first to offer up sacrifices for his own sins, then [for] those of the people, for this he did once for all [in] having offered up himself (Heb. 7:27).

. . . having been once offered to bear the sins of many (Heb. 9:26).

This is he that came by water and blood (1 John 5:6).

. . . and having knelt down he prayed, saying, Father, if thou wilt remove this cup from me: -- but then, not my will, but thine be done . . . And being in conflict he prayed more intently. And his sweat became as great drops of blood falling down upon the earth (Luke 22:42-44).

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (Matt. 27:46).

Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree (Gal. 3:13).

In Gethsemane He looked upon the awful cup, the cup of being made sin, of bearing our sins, of being forsaken of God. And He shrank from the horror. It was fitting to shrink from it. He was the Holy One. It would have been a moral imperfection not to shrink from this. It was part of the perfection of the Holy One, the One come in dependance as man, to so pray. But He took the cup. In the first three gospels where the Lord Jesus is presented in some human station we have this scene in Gethsemane; whereas in John, where He is presented as the Eternal Son come here to glorify God and ascend up where He was before, we read:

The cup which my Father hath given me to drink, shall I not drink it

108. In his translation, in a footnote to the word stripes, J. N. Darby said:

Or 'bruise.' Though the word is in the singular, it is literally the marks left by scourging. 'Stripe' does not convey this.
How perfect is every Scripture in its place!

The Scriptures cited point to the cross as the place for sin-bearing. They do not point to the idea that Christ bore sins all His life. J. N. Darby wrote:

I go on to state further my own views on these points. I hold as to expiation or atonement fully and simply what every sound Christian does: The blessed Lord’s offering Himself without spot to God and being obedient to death, being made sin for us, and bearing our sins in His own body on the tree; His glorifying God in the sacrifice of Himself; and His substitution for us; and His drinking the cup of wrath. I believe, though none can fathom it, that what I hold, and have taught, and teach, makes this atonement clearer. I mean the not confounding the sufferings of Christ short of divine wrath with that one only drinking of the cup when He was forsaken of God. I see this carefully brought out in Psa. 22. In the midst of cruel sufferings, of which the Lord in Spirit speaks prophetically there, He says, "But be not thou far from me, O Lord," twice over. Yet (and that is the great fathomless depth of the psalm) He was, as to the sorrow of His soul, forsaken of God. With that no other suffering, deep and real as it was, can be compared. But the Holy Ghost makes here the distinction in order to bring out that wondrous cup, which stands alone in the midst of all things, the more clearly. And this makes other suffering more true and real to the heart, and the drinking of the cup (that on which the new heavens and the new earth subsist in immutable righteousness before God, and through which we are accepted in the Beloved) has a truth and a reality which nothing else gives it. The mixing up accompanying suffering with this, in their character,weakens and destroys the nature of both. We come to the atonement with the need of our sins; once reconciled to God, we see the whole glory of God made good for ever in it. I add, as regards Christ’s relationship with God, I have no view but what I suppose to be the common faith of all Christians, of His being His beloved Son in whom He was well pleased, that, as a living man here below, divine delight rested upon Him. Though never so acceptable in obedience as on the cross, there He was as, for God’s glory, bearing the forsaking of God. That of course was a special case. 109

In 1860, JND wrote an article, I Peter 2:24, 110 a devastating critique of the notions that Christ’s life was vicarious and that “His sufferings during the time of His active service were penal.” The reader is referred to this article for details of this matter as well as the attempt to change the translation of 1 Pet. 2:24 to make it compatible with such teachings.

How Many Sins?

We may look at it in all its breadth and compass; Jesus confessed our sins, bore them, and was bruised on their account. If He has opened your heart to believe in Him as bearing sins at all, then all your sins are put away; you must either deny that He was bearing sins at all, or you are justified. Here is the certainty of peace; and we stand justified from all things, and Jesus looks at us in this character, not at any particular time, but in order that He may present us to God. There is no question of past or future transgression, but He bore our sins. Hold fast this. There is, indeed, the frequent consciousness of faults. While faith says our sins are put away, still in looking at ourselves we see evil; and now we find how graciously the Lord provides for this defilement. The priest that offered the sin-offering was to eat it (Lev. 6:26).  

God speaks plainly of wrath, indignation, vengeance, because of sin. What was the wrath due to sin, which Christ bore when He bore our sins in His own body on the tree? It is not a speculative question, of what might be, but of what saves you! Do you believe, that what Christ bore, when He made His soul an offering for sin, was merely the amount of a certain temporary suffering? that this was what sin amounted to in the presence of God? and that this too was what God's wrath amounted to? Do not be led astray by any abuse of the blessed truth that it was Christ's divine nature that gave infinite value to His work. It did so, blessed be God. But He "bore our sins in his own body on the tree." And "it pleased the Lord to bruise him." "He was wounded for our transgressions." "The chastisement of our peace was upon him, with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53). Now was what He bore for us, for you, a mere amount of temporary punishment, or the holy wrath of God, the awfulness of God's forsaking Him while He was alive, His soul being made thus an offering for sin? That wrath which shuts out from His presence, while the soul can know what it is -- is not this what we have deserved? It is not merely torment and then ceasing to exist; though Christ, as a divine Person, gave infinite value to His work...

“Why Has Thou Forsaken Me?”

Psalm 22

From Words of Truth

The cry in this psalm is pre-eminently the cry of one forsaken of God. In this the psalm stands alone. Not, indeed, that we do not find other sufferings of our Lord in this psalm, but that which gives it its distinctness from all other psalms.

111. Collected Writings 19:235
112. Collected Writings 7:11, 12
is this cry of abandonment. It is a cry to God, and that, as the psalm says, both when He was not heard, and when He was. Other psalms speak of Him as the perfect man, the one who ever trusted in God; the sixteenth Psalm is specially His language as the trusting one; other psalms speak of His sufferings from His enemies, and what He endured at the hand of man; but in Psa. 22. it is not His enemies that are before us, though they are mentioned afterwards, but it is Himself, His cry to God Himself.

It is that solemn moment with which nothing can be compared, when upon the cross He took up the whole question of sin before God; and good and evil were brought to an issue in the only Person that could solve the riddle!

It was atonement. Not that this alone appears, in the psalm, but it is its first and deepest thought and truth. Indeed, the psalm shows that there was no sorrow that He knew not; -- no shame from which He was saved, nothing of wickedness, on man's part, lacking -- surrounded by dogs and ravening lions, nay, man, more cruel than all, baser than all, man alone guilty, though led on by a mightier rebel than himself. All this we find, but more wondrous and beyond all else, God was there, and there as the judge of sin. God was then forsaking Jesus, because of sin, It is this with which the psalm opens. It is this verse which the Lord Jesus Himself singles out from the psalm, when He cries under God's abandonment upon the cross. God has given these words to us, as the utterance of His own beloved Son. when, in accomplishing that work which we need for eternity, He was made sin for us.

The Lord Jesus was not meeting Satan at the Cross. He had met Satan after His baptism, and had conquered him. He had acted upon this victory everywhere in His ministry. He having bound the strong man in the wilderness, afterwards He spoiled his goods as He went about doing good. The Lord Jesus had also, in Gethsemane, after His ministry was closed, passed through the conflict with Satan as the power of darkness. On the Cross it is neither Satan nor man. It is sin before God, and He who knew no sin, glorifying God as God about sin in death.

This was no question with His Father. He was ever the beloved Son in whom the Father was always well pleased, and never more so than on the cross. But sin is against God, and it is this He has taken up, and He goes through it before God in death. Our hearts delight in it, and rest in it. When God touches the question of sin, atonement is made. Atonement has two parts. It is expiation before God, and substitution for our sins. The latter is not the subject of our psalm. We find it in other psalms. Both are figured in the ritual for the day of atonement, in Lev. 16. There was Jehovah's lot, and Israel's lot. The blood of the sin-offering carried in where God was, and the actual transgressions of the congregation confessed by Aaron on the head of the scape goat. The former is taken up in this psalm. It is the grand and most important part of atonement, where all is important. It is Jehovah's lot -- the expiation of
sin before God. God is seen here in all the forms of His moral being, dealing with sin in the Person of one who is able to take it up, and go through it all perfectly. Herein is the infinite grace of God – one who, when forsaken of God, had therein reached the very highest point in glorifying God. This is the meaning of the words, “Thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns.” Did the glory of His Person shelter Him from suffering? Not so. It was that which enabled Him to endure it, and to feel it all as none other could. The Lord felt everything perfectly. If there had been the smallest insensibility it had not been perfection. In the cross sin was disposed of righteously, and for ever, not by power, but by suffering. The Lord went through it all and was heard. “Thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns.” The answer was in resurrection. We find it in the next verse “I will declare thy name to my brethren.”

Death, and death alone, disposes of sin, so that the sinner, receiving the testimony to this perfect work of Christ, might be put absolutely without sin, as to his conscience, in the presence of God. Thus the work of Christ brings the soul to God -- not only to the Father, but to God. Thus it is not merely love which is displayed, but in the Cross we have also a foundation of righteousness. God is fully revealed as God. The atonement was not wrought before the Father as such. It was not as Father that God dealt with sin in the person of Christ. It was the Father’s delight in [Christ’s] doing the work, but the work was before God, the work was about sin, and the result of the work is that the righteousness of God is declared. God having thus dealt with sin in atonement is the only firm footing for the soul; without this, all truth, and especially heavenly truth, will only elate the soul, or leave it a prey to Satan’s delusions.

In the cross, the Lord Jesus, as Son of Man, glorified God, when made sin. All through His life He glorified His Father. Even at twelve years of age we hear Him say, “Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business?” At His baptism we see how the Father cares for His glory. “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.” Not “hear ye him” yet for the time for this had not come, but He was always the beloved Son, in whom the Father was well pleased. And herein we see the evil of the teaching, which speaks of the Lord as the sin-hearer in life. If it could have been, He would not have been before the Father, as the One in whom He was ever well pleased. Had He been always bearing sin, He had always been forsaken of God, and to say this is a virtual denial of the personal glory of the Son of God.

But now that He has passed through the unparalleled hour, when, made sin, He was forsaken of God, and having died, He enters in resurrection into the blessedness of His own relationship, and declares it as that into which He now can bring all His people, it is now, “Go and tell my brethren, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God.” It is not “our
Father" now: that would be beneath His glory. It is His own relationship as man, and into this He brings, by His own work, those for whom He has wrought redemption; and more, it is the place He then took on high. It is into this blessed relationship and access to the Father the Lord now brings His people, and not only so, but He himself is in their midst, leading their praise.

"In the midst of the congregation will I sing praises unto Thee." This is the characteristic praise of the Church of God, and it is the more remarkable to find it here, as the psalms do not bring out the Church’s portion, but Israel’s. It is the worship of those, whom the Lord brings into His own relationship to God His Father. It is the worship of those who stand consciously in the full results of His atonement, and are brought into the same nearness to God as He is in, when He says, I ascend unto My Father and your Father, to My God and your God, and He in their midst leading the worship. It is the worship of saints, and not of poor sinners as such worshiping. This is peculiarly the worship and position of saints now. There will never be anything like it again. The day is coming when the earth’s groans shall cease; when heaven and earth shall be filled with praise; but there never will be a day such as this. It will not be worship in the holiest then, or the name of the Father on the lips of those who worship. This psalm proves it. It is “thy name” declared “to my brethren” in Psa. 22:22. The next verse the Lord calls on those “who fear Jehovah” to praise Him. This verse brings us on to Jewish ground. It is not the Lord leading the praises in the Church, but calling on those that fear Jehovah, and the seed of Israel, to praise. Jehovah, and not Father, is the title now. The call to praise is upon the ground of the same work. “For he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted; neither hath he hid his face from him, but when he cried unto him, he heard.” The praise is founded upon the work of the cross, when He cried, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,” and was heard; and now the public answer is given, in the Father having raised Him from the dead. It is the call of praise on the ground of atonement. This is very distinctly marked in the 25th verse. Then it is the Messiah’s praise in the great congregation. But it is not now in the midst of the Church, as verse 22nd. We have the two positions in John 20. On the first day of the week when the Lord appears in their midst, and besides saluting them with peace, breathes on them and says, “Receive ye the Holy Ghost”; and on the eighth day when Thomas owns Him with the confession, “My Lord and my God,” and where we have no breathing on them, and no mention of the Holy Ghost. Thomas confesses Him according to Jewish faith, but there is not, in this second scene, anything that speaks of association with Christ. It is not the blessedness now of union, nor even of association; but of the Lord paying His vows in the great congregation, as the Head of Israel, and they are gathered as a people round the Lord their God. Then we find the meek. “The meek shall eat and be satisfied.” They shall now enter into earthly blessing. It is the accomplishment of the promise; -- “The meek shall inherit the earth.” Then the blessing flows
out, and “all thee ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.” To apply this now is only to deceive. It is a baseless fable now. Then it will extend to all the kingdoms of the nations. “For the kingdom is the Lord’s, and he is the governor among all nations” . . .

Notion of Bearing the Sins of All

J. N. Darby wrote:

Dr. W. says:

The atonement spoken of in Scripture was an atonement by which the sins of the world were removed.

No such thought is found in Scripture; that He is an ilasmos for the world is said, but that the sins of the world are removed is wholly unscriptural. If so, there could be nothing to judge men for; for they are judged according to their works (Rev. 20:13), and the Lord says: “If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins”; and the apostle, “Because of these things the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience.” It is said of Christ that He is o airon, not of the sins, but of the sin of the world, and that He baptizes with the Holy Ghost, not that He has taken away our sins. This taking away of sin will be completely fulfilled only in the new heavens and the new earth, and He, as Lamb of God, is this taker away; but that the atonement spoken of in Scripture was one by which the sins of the world were removed is utterly and wholly untrue. 114

W. Kelly responded to the following question:

Q. 1 John 2:2. Was Christ a propitiation “for the sins of the whole world?” Does John 1:29 teach this? Does 1 Peter 2:24 apply alike to all, believers and unbelievers? W.R.W.

A. It cannot be urged too plainly or often that “the sins of” is an interpolation, not only uncalled for, but an addition which goes beyond the truth and is therefore false, as all exaggerations must be. “For our sins” is in pointed distinction. “For the whole world” is ample ground of encouragement for preaching the gospel to those who are still in unbelief, without warranting the dangerous delusion that the sins of the whole world are gone. This would naturally lead to telling every body that he is forgiven, in open opposition to the general warning of scripture to all the unconverted. Hence it is not just to confound this last member of the sentence with 1 Pet. 2:24, which rather coalesces {“coalesce” means a coming together to form a whole} with Christ’s being a propitiation for our sins. He was our substitute; when men believe the gospel, we and they can say this of them.

114. Collected Writings 29:264.
But He is a ransom for all, as He is a propitiation for the whole world. John 1:29 goes on to the complete taking away (not “bearing our sins”) of the sin of the world, as will be manifested in the new heavens and new earth, like Heb. 9:26. The sacrifice is already offered and accepted; but all its results are not yet come and enjoyed. It will be applied to the millennial age, and completely in the eternal day. To say that judging “according to works” does not mean “sins” is mere quibbling. The “works” of the unbelievers, of the wicked, are nothing but “sins”; for which, when raised, they will have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone, the second death.  

Chapter 10

The Showing Forth of
The Righteousness of God
Romans 3:19-26

The Righteousness of God 116

GOD’S RIGHTEOUSNESS DISPLAYED

Sin is measured by God’s glory and righteousness, by what He is; and also by what the cross means. By the righteousness of God 117 is meant God’s consistency with what He is in His nature as light and love. It is in the NT

116. There is a section on the righteousness of God in Selected Ministry of A. H. Rule 1:59-68.
117. The remarkable fact may here be noticed that confessedly the majority of commentators, who shrink from the plain meaning of the phrase in Phil. 1:17 (sic -- Rom. 1:17?), and even in Rom. 3:21, 22, confess that in Rom. 3:25, 26, it does signify, not God’s mercy, nor His method of justification, or act of justifying (which in Greek is expressed by dikaiosis), nor that righteousness which is acceptable to God, but His justice. Here this is allowed to be the proper meaning of the terms, and what the context demands. Not merely did justice seem compromised by pretermission of past sins, and therefore require vindication, but the work of Christ had so glorified God in the judgment of sin that it was only just for God to remit sins, yea, to justify him that is of faith in Christ Jesus. And so, it cannot be denied, the apostle but explains what he means by dikaiosune Theou, when he adds that God set forth Christ a propitiatory, or mercy-seat, that He might be just and justify the believer.

If then it be so, that dikaiosune Theou can only mean God’s righteousness where it is fully expounded (as in vv. 25, 26), how unreasonable to give the same phrase a different force in the same context! (Rom. 3:21, 22, just before.) If this be owned, with what consistency can one question its meaning in Rom. 1:17? Even Rom. 3:25 makes this apparent, for there beyond controversy the phrase means the consistency of God with His character (that is, His righteousness) in judging the world which rejects Christ, as the other passages shew His righteousness in justifying those who believe in His name. Compare also Matt.6:33, James 1:20. Elsewhere (save in 2 Cor. 5:21, which stands alone in using the abstract for concrete, but otherwise strengthens the same truth) the terms in the Epistles of Paul signify God’s justice in justifying those who, resting by faith on Jesus and His blood, are accepted in all the value of His acceptance before God. (Collected Writings 23:332, 334).
that we read that God is light (1 John 1:5) and God is love (1 John 4:8) -- and it is in that order that we read of it. That is a moral order of unfolding this in the Scripture: light first, then love. That is what God is: light and love. He must necessarily act in accordance with what He is in Himself as light and love. To do otherwise would be inconsistency, and therefore unrighteous.  

In the OT, the righteousness of God was not shown forth, i.e., not manifested. The righteousness of God could not be manifested until Christ had shed His precious blood, offering Himself as a propitiation, rendering a satisfaction to God for the outrage of sin against His nature, majesty, and glory; and glorifying God in doing this. This propitiation is the foundation upon which God has based, and bases, His ways in grace. Whatever grace God had shown to any before the cross was based upon His looking forward to the work of Christ on the cross; and it was necessary that God be shown to be righteous in having done so. But it was not manifested in the OT how that God was righteous in this.

The showing forth, the manifestation of, the righteousness of God, has as its foundation the cross, wherein what God is as light and love was expressed. What God required as light was provided by what God is as love. Christ Himself, as the propitiation, is the display of God as light and love. And Christ Himself is both the propitiatory sacrifice and the mercy-seat, the propitiatory of Rom. 3:25.

The glory of God, the glory of Christ, accounting the believer righteous before God, and the justification of the believer are all involved with the righteousness of God and its actings in its manifestation:

118. In connection with God being light and love, the following remark by J. N. Darby is apropos:

I do not say love caused, for it was infinite love gave the Son to be the lamb of propitiation; but that love wrought by a work which maintained the righteousness and holiness of God in forgiving and justifying: and, though the word may be used for the effect, it is applied to God in the New Testament, and its meaning is "propitiation" or "appeasing." "Reconciling," which is applied to believers, is a totally different word, katallasso katallage. The ilasmos was offered to God, ilasterion was where His blood was placed on God's throne, and it was God who was the object of ilaskomai, man of katallage (1 John 2:2; Rom. 3:25; Heb. 2:17); and as to katallasso, see Rom. 5:10, 11; 2 Cor. 5:18-21; Col. 1:20, 21 (Collected Writings 29:260).

And it is an unhappy thing, because the effect of atonement (when wrath would justly come out against us) is to cleanse and reconcile us, to weaken the truth of that righteous wrath, and its being righteously arrested by the precious blood presented to God, and that bearing of sins, which makes it righteous in God to justify the ungodly and forgive their sins. Appeasing God, ilaskomai, placare, let the word be what it may, is not changing God, but glorifying and satisfying God's righteous judgment; so that He may say, "when I see the blood, I will pass over (Collected Writings 29:277).
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In John 16:10 we see wherein the righteousness of God has been shown; namely, that God has set Christ at His right hand in His own glory, because Christ has perfectly glorified Him. The righteousness consists in this, that the Father has exalted Christ as Man to His own glory -- the glory which He had with Him before the world was; and God, as a righteous God, has glorified Him because He has been glorified in Christ on the cross; John 17:5; ch. 13:31, 32. In the above-cited passage (John 16:10), the Lord says: The Spirit "will convince the world of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more." By the rejection of Christ, the world has for ever lost Him as come in grace; but God has accepted and glorified Him. When the Lord speaks of the world, in John 17:25, He says, "Righteous Father!" on the other hand, in His prayer for His own, He says, "Holy Father!" (v. 11). Thus the proof of the righteousness of God lies in His having glorified Christ. When God was in Christ in the world, it had either to accept or reject Him. It has rejected Him, and is thereby judged, and will see Him no more until He come in judgment; but Christ, as Man, has perfectly glorified God in all that He is, and God according to His righteousness has glorified Him. Now the gospel announces this righteousness of God; namely, that Christ, in what He has done for us, having glorified God, has been glorified as Man, and is seated at God's right hand, clothed with divine glory; moreover, that our position before God is the consequence of what Christ has accomplished. Our justification and being glorified are a part of the righteousness of God; because what Christ has done to glorify God, has been done for us. We are the righteousness of God in Him; 2 Cor. 5:21. Christ would lose the fruit of His work if we should not be with Him in glory as the fruit of the travail of His soul, after He has glorified all that is in God, although in ourselves we are absolutely unworthy. 119

W. Kelly answered a question about what was the righteousness of God:

"The righteousness of God" embraces the entire display of God's ways in Christ, one of the least of which, if we are to compare things which are all perfect in their place, was His accomplishment of the law here below. For the law was not intended to express fully and absolutely God's nature and character. It stated, if we may so say, the lowest terms on which man could live before Him. It was the demand of what God could not but require, even from a sinful Israelite, if he pretended to obey God. Whereas, though the Lord Jesus was made under the law, and submitted in His grace to all its claims, He went much farther, even in His living obedience, and infinitely beyond it in His death. For the righteousness of the law threatens no death to the righteous, but necessarily proclaims life for his portion, who magnified and made it honorable. But God's righteousness goes immeasurably deeper as well as higher. It is a justifying righteousness, not a condemning one, as that of the law must be so to the sinner who has it not. Hence the Lord Himself established the sanctions of the law in the most solemn way by suffering unto death under its curse: He bore the penalty of the ungodly, of which substitution the Ten words

knew nothing, because they are law, and so to die is grace. There was no mitigation, much less annulling of the law’s authority. Divine righteousness provided One who could and would settle the whole question for the sinner with God. Nor this only; for God raised Christ from the dead. He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. He was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father; His moral being, His purposes, His truth, His love, His relationship, His glory, in short, was at stake in the grave of Christ. But God raised Him up, and set Him at His own right hand in heaven, as a part of His divine righteousness; for no seat, no reward inferior to that, could suit the One who had vindicated God in all His majesty, holiness, grace, and truth, who had, so to speak, enabled God to carry out His precious design of justifying the ungodly, Himself just all the while. Thenceforward, to him who has faith, it is no longer a question of the law or of legal righteousness, which rested on the responsibility of man, but Christ having gone down into death in atonement, and thus glorified God to the uttermost, the ground is changed, and it becomes a question of God’s righteousness. If man has been proved by the law to have brought forth wrongs, and only wrongs, God must have His rights, the very first of which is raising up Christ from the dead, and giving Him glory. Hence the Holy Spirit is said, in John 16, to convince the world of righteousness; and this, not because Christ fulfilled that which we violated, but because He is gone to the Father, and is seen no more till He return in judgment. It is not righteousness on earth, but its heavenly course and character, in the ascension of Christ, which is here spoken of. So again, in 2 Cor. 5, it is in Christ glorified in heaven that we are made, or become, divine righteousness. It is plain, then, that the phrase, though no doubt embracing what Christian’s mean when they speak of Christ’s righteousness imputed to us, is a far larger and more glorious thing. It includes not only that which glorified God on earth in living obedience, but the death of the cross, which if it met the deepest need of the sinner, broke the power of Satan in his last stronghold, and laid the immutable foundation for God’s grace to reign through righteousness. Thus in Rom. 1:17, God’s righteousness is said to be revealed in the gospel in contrast with man’s righteousness claimed in the law; and being revealed, it is "from faith," not from law-works: that is, it is a revelation on the principle of faith, not a work to be rendered on the ground of human responsibility. Therefore it is to "faith." He that believes gets the blessing. In Rom. 3:21, 22, it is formally contrasted with anything under the law, though the law and the prophets witnessed respecting it. It is "God’s righteousness without law," by faith of Jesus Christ, and hence "towards all men" in native tendency, but taking effect only "upon all them that believe." It is here in special connection with redemption, and therefore it is added through faith in His blood. See verses 24-26. In Rom. 10, it is shown to be incompatible with seeking to establish one’s own righteousness, God’s righteousness being complete, and the object of faith in Christ has to be submitted to, or we have no part or lot in it. 2 Cor. 5 rises higher, and shows what the saint is, according to the gospel of the glory of Christ -- made divine righteousness in Him risen and glorified. Hence in the later epistle to the Philippians, the ripe sample and development of Christian experience, Paul, transported even to the last with this new and divine righteousness, shows us that, compared with it, he would not have the righteousness of the law if he could. For what was of the law had glory no
longer in his eyes because of the glory that excelled -- that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness of God through faith (Phil. 3). Far from superseding practical godliness, this righteousness of God in Christ strikes deep roots in the heart, and springs up in a harvest of kindred fruit, which is by Jesus Christ to God’s glory and praise (Phil. 1:11).

It is a singular fact that, while God used Rom. 1:17 to Luther’s conversion, and we may say to the Reformation, neither he, nor his companions, or their followers, ever apprehended the full truth conveyed by this blessed expression -- "righteousness of God." Hence it is habitually mistranslated in Luther’s German Bible, where δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is rendered "the righteousness which is available before God." This, evidently, is far short of the truth; for a legal righteousness, if accomplished by man, would have availed before God. But God, in His grace, has accomplished in Christ and given an incomparably higher, i.e., a divine, righteousness, and nothing less than this are we made in Christ. Perhaps the imperfect view entertained by the great German Reformer may account in large measure for the fluctuations in his enjoyment of peace. The same thing applies to most Protestants up to our day, even where they are devoted Christians, and perhaps from a similar cause; for they have advanced little, if at all, beyond the light on this head possessed by Luther. 120

**NO JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS OF LAW**

No doubt many Christians have no room in their “theology” for the statement that the law did not show forth, manifest, the righteousness of God. They might point to a Scripture which speaks of the righteous requirements of the law (Rom. 8:4) and think their “theology” is proved. But, the fact that the law had righteous requirements does not at all address the matter of the NT doctrine of the manifestation of the righteousness of God. False views like that lower the spiritual apprehension and hide truth from those who hold such notions; but more importantly, it misrepresents the display of God’s glory in Christ. I do not say that this is intentional, but it is true nonetheless.

The fact is that the express teaching of Romans is that the righteousness of God is shown forth apart from the law. The Spirit had indicted all as exposed sinners:

... for we have before charged both Jews and Greeks with being all under sin ... (Rom. 3:9). 121

Moreover, concerning the law:

Now we know that whatever the things the law says, it speaks to those under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world be under

---

120. *The Bible Treasury* 1:196

121. Why does the Scofieldian age-ism system claim that man is being tested now when the conclusion of testing was long ago reached -- “all under sin” (Rom. 3:20) and dead (2 Cor. 5:14)?
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judgment to God. Wherefore by works of law 122 shall no flesh be justified before him; for by the law [is] knowledge of sin (Rom. 3:19, 20).

It is a myth of the same "theology" mentioned above that the law is a "transcript of the mind of God," in effect limiting God to what the law expressed. Coupled with this is the false notion that Adam had the law. 123 The truth is that Adam had a law, not to eat of a certain tree; but it is an idle notion that he had the law. The ones who had the law were the Jews. The Gentiles never had it, as is recognized in Rom. 2:14 and elsewhere. This same book (Rom. 9:4) states that the law-giving belongs to Paul's kinsmen according to the flesh.

In Rom. 3:19 we see that the law speaks to those under it. What was the purpose for its speaking? We should understand that in the OT it was man as in his Adam standing, called the first man in 1 Cor. 15:47, that was under testing, under probation. The testing took various forms. It took a distinctive form in Israel under the law. Israel represented the first man being tested by law. Israel was a sample, was a representative, of the first man. The law addressed itself to man in the flesh, to man in Adamic standing, but in the persons of the people of Israel. And as the sample, the representative, of the first man, the law was given to Israel and in this test the first man failed. Finally, they were also tested by grace and truth in the Son (John 1:14) and rejected the revelation of the Father in the Son (John 15:24); as also they were tested by the kingdom, and rejected the King and the kingdom as embodied in Him (Matt. 12:28). All testing of the first man was completed, and thus the time for the showing forth of the righteousness of God arrived - when man was fully exposed to be unrighteous and totally lost.

Israel, then, stood as representing the first man in these particular tests; and so the results are applicable to every individual ranged under that sweeping classification: the first man. Therefore it is that Rom. 3:19 applies the result to the entire world - "that every mouth may be stopped." Oh, men keep blabbering against God, but like the man who came into the wedding without the provided wedding garment, he was "speechless." There will certainly not be one word of back-talk at the great white throne judgment. The second thing stated as the result of the test under law is: "and all the world be under judgment to God." 124 In a footnote to the word "be" J. N. Darby says:

i.e., 'become in that state,' not future, but the existing consequence.

122. Note that the point here is not the law, but law as a principle of approach to God - though the law is a particular form of law, and is, of course included under this larger view.
124. Why does the Scofieldian age-ism system teach that the probation of man is continuing when sentence is already passed by God?
The world is already judged. The Lord Jesus had anticipated that just before the cross: “now is the judgment of this world” (John 12:31).

The state has been exposed by God, the sentence has been passed, but the execution of the sentence (committed into the hands of the Son of man, John 5:27) awaits its appointed time.

THREE POINTS REGARDING THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD

The Revelation of Righteousness of God. In Rom. 1:16, 17 we read:

For I am not ashamed of the glad tidings; for it is God’s power to salvation to everyone that believes, both to Jew first and also to Greek: for righteousness of God is revealed therein, on the principle of faith: according as it is written, But the just shall live by faith.

You should have noticed the absence of the word the in front of the word righteousness. A footnote to this verse, by JND, is very helpful regarding this:

‘Righteousness of God.” The absence of the article may arrest the mind here, and in some other places, in this part of the epistle. It is likely to do so, because the righteousness of God is now a known doctrine; not so when the apostle Paul taught. The righteousness of God was a wholly new thought, as was indeed wrath from heaven: wrath on earth was not. The gospel, or ‘glad tidings,’ was the power of God to salvation, because righteousness of God (that kind of righteousness) was revealed - not a righteousness required of man. See ch. 3:21.

The Manifestation of Righteousness of God. Rom. 3:21 says:

But now righteousness of God is manifested, borne witness to by the law and the prophets.

The passage goes on to tell how it was manifested. The manifestation of it based upon what God has done by and through the cross. This passage, as is true of Romans, has to do with the actings of God’s righteousness and His accounting persons righteous.

Non-submission to the Righteousness of God. While most people will not submit, Rom. 10:3, 4 speaks particularly of resistance by the Jews:

For they, being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and seeking to establish their own [righteousness], have not submitted to the righteousness of God. For Christ is [the] end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believes.

God’s Righteousness and the Law

GOD’S RIGHTEOUSNESS MANIFESTED WITHOUT LAW

We have arrived at Rom. 3:21. Connect this directly to the end of Rom. 1:17 and think of the intervening text as forming a parenthesis:
For righteousness of God is revealed therein, on the principle of faith, to faith: according as it is written, But the just shall live by faith (Rom. 1:17).

(Parenthesis: Rom. 1:18 through Rom. 3:20)

But now without law righteousness of God is manifested, borne witness to by the law and the prophets (Rom. 3:21).

Law has to do with man's righteousness, and in that there was total failure. When is, or was, the righteousness of God manifested? We read, "But now." Not in Israel; not under the law; not before the cross; but now. It involves the cross and the display of what God is, and is now manifested. Certainly Christ lived a righteous life; but His personal righteous living and law-keeping is not what is meant by the righteousness of God. Yes, it required that the Holy One, who knew no sin, should be the propitiation and the substitute, and the cross could not be what it is without the Holy One having given Himself; but the righteousness of God, which the believer is made (2 Cor. 5:21) is not the righteousness of Christ or His righteous law-keeping transferred to us. The idea violates the direct statement of this Scripture.

God's righteousness, says this Scripture, is manifested without law. The idea of Christ's righteous law-keeping put to our account does indeed bring in the law via that route. "Without law" means 'apart from.' It is apart from the law that God's righteousness is manifested:

125. This righteousness stands in no relation to the law, which was only the perfect rule for man. But God cannot measure His righteousness by the standard of man's righteousness, or his responsibility. It is according to this standard that He judges those who have had the law. His righteousness must be measured according to His own nature, and His nature is revealed in what He does. He must glorify Himself; that is to say, manifest Himself; for with God to be manifested is also to be glorified. If He judges, He judges man according to his human responsibility; if He acts, it is in accordance with His own nature. The law knows nothing of this nature; it says we ought to love God, but what is He? The law is adapted to man and his relationship towards God. The righteousness of God stands entirely outside all question of the law, of every description of law, unless the nature of God be regarded as such. He is a law for Himself, perfect in His nature. His righteousness is now shown in what He has done with regard to the Person of Christ, by having set Him at His right hand as the result of His finished work. The law and the prophets testified of it. The righteousness of God has been exercised in the acceptance and glorifying of Christ in virtue of His work, and in this acceptance we share by faith, because He accomplished this work for us. Precisely because it is the righteousness of God founded on the work of Christ, in that He died for all, it has to do with the whole world and with all men. All who believe on Christ, whether Jews or heathen, have part in it, and in all the privileges which flow from it. Were it human righteousness it would have to be according to the law; were it according to the law only the Jews would have had part in it, because they alone had the law. But as it is the righteousness of God it is manifested for all, and righteousness is reckoned to all who believe. Thus the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ is manifested for all sinners; it rests on all who believe in Him. "For there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Collected Writings 33:234, 235).
... for if righteousness [is] by law, then Christ has died for nothing (Gal. 2:21).

For if a law had been able to quicken, then indeed righteousness were on the principle of law (Gal. 3:21).

There is no such thing as any kind of transference of law-righteousness from Christ to the believer, nor any imputation of law-righteousness from Christ to the believer.

The teaching of Scripture concerning Christ is vicarious sufferings on the cross, not vicarious obedience during His entire life. What is brought before us in Scripture in connection with God’s righteousness is God’s grace (v. 24), redemption (v. 24), mercy-seat (v. 25), and blood (v. 25).

Let us notice here a particular Scripture that is erroneously used to get the law connected to the Christian:

There is a text referred to, "By one man’s disobedience, many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, many shall be made righteous" {Rom. 5:19}. But so far from there being a word of law or obedience to law here, it is in express contrast. "Moreover the law entered," pareiselthe, was no part of this great scheme in the two Adams, only came in by the by that the offence might abound. Mark, no word about keeping it. It had an object; it was to convict -- bring in offence -- make sin sinful. So Luther, passim. The obedience of Christ is in contrast with law. It is a monstrous idea to make Christ’s obedience merely legal. He kept the law, surely; He was born under it, though as Son of man above it in title. But His obedience was absolute. What righteousness of the law called upon Him to give His life for sinners? But that He did as obedience. What, to bear the law’s curse for another? All His life was obedience, but far beyond law; He laid down His life so, not according to law. And here it is obedience as a principle contrasted with disobedience, and no thought of law. There was a disobedient man and an obedient one --Adam and Christ. The law came in by the by. He learned obedience by the things which He suffered. Did the law make a righteous man suffer? Christ’s obedience was perfect and absolute. To reduce it to fulfilling the law is horrible, though He fulfilled the highest requirement of the law. The law was suited to the first man, Christ’s obedience to the glory of God, into which He is entered because He finished the work His Father gave Him to do. So in Phil. 2, He was obedient unto death (mechri thanatou). It is the character and extreme possible limit of a principle of obedience -- He was obedient even to death. Think of saying, He fulfilled the precepts of the law even to death! What precept commanded a person to die? No; His obedience was the principle of perfect submission to His Father’s will, whatever the cost might be. 126

IT IS NOT "A RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH IS VALID BEFORE GOD"

The reformers started out incorrectly on the subject of the righteousness of

God. In connection with calling attention to the mistake of Luther and Calvin, J. N. Darby wrote:

It is God's, not man's. It is -- has its character, quality, and source -- from God, not from man. It is what it is that is spoken of, not how it is. It is a righteousness after this fashion, not man's. It comes from God for man, not from man for God. Hence it has the character and qualities of its source, whoever may be given to profit by it.

So wrath of God from heaven: it is not human wrath or justice on earth ending there in its nature and quality, nor even divine wrath exercised in an earthly way by earthly instruments. It is divine, from heaven.

It is not "the" righteousness of God, a fact, an existing thing, which is spoken of, but "righteousness of God"-this quality of righteousness. But hence it must first be found in God Himself; or it would not have that essential quality. Hence we are after God as to the new man created in righteousness and true holiness.

"The righteousness which is valid before God" (which is the sense put by Luther and Calvin on the expression) is utterly astray, because legal righteousness, where it existed, would be valid before God. If accomplished, it would be accepted. Man would live in doing it; but then it would be not God's righteousness, but man's: whereas the whole point on which the apostle insists in this expression is, that it is God's, and not man's . . .

It is righteousness before God which the epistle treats of {not "inherent Righteousness"}. 127

BORNE WITNESS TO BY THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS

This again shows that the righteousness of God was not manifested in the OT times. It is viewed in the OT as something that was to come. Bearing witness to, is hardly the same thing as "But now . . . manifested." The contrast is quite clear. Think of the great day of atonement and how it pointed forward to the work of Christ. We see both propitiation and substitution foreshadowed there, and God going on with the people for another year. This pointed to something, but was not a manifestation of the righteousness of God. See Psa. 22:31; Isa. 46:13; 51:5, 6, 8; 56:1.

The Actings of God Are
in Accordance with His Righteousness

IMPUTING RIGHTEOUSNESS

In covenant theology there has been much writing about imputed righteousness, but in an erroneous way. The phrase is used to designate a transfer of righteousness of Christ's righteous law-keeping to the believer -- and that is

supposed to be the Christian's righteousness. Thus the phrase "imputed righteousness" is loaded with much freight from covenantism. While the phrase 'imputed righteousness' is not found in Scripture, in Romans we find God imputing righteousness to the believer. What it does not mean is the transference of a quantum of righteousness outside the believer that is transferred, or credited, to the believer.

What is meant by God imputing righteousness is that God accounts a man righteous before Himself. This is what Romans treats of. Do not bring 2 Cor 5:21 into the treatment of righteousness in Romans, and particularly so into Rom. 1 - 5:11. Rom. 5:1 - 5:11 is about sins and guilt, not sin, which 2 Cor. 5:21 addresses. The failure to distinguish what Scripture teaches about sin (the root) and sins (the fruit) is the source of much confusion and jumbling together things that differ. It is true that Rom. 5:12 - 8:39 deals with sin, standing and state, but the righteousness of God is not unfolded there, though noted in Rom. 10:3.

An analogy to what is meant by God imputing righteousness to a believer, and thus accounting him righteous, was given by JND regarding circumcision:

An analogous passage (Rom. 2:26) gives the same sense -- the uncircumcision is counted for circumcision. That is, the man is accounted circumcised when he is not. Thus, though a person is reckoned to be in a state which he is not de facto in, a quantum of righteousness, ready outside himself, reckoned to him, is not the meaning of imputed righteousness. It means the state in God's sight of the person so accounted righteous. Righteousness imputed to a man is the same as the man's being accounted righteous. 128

It is necessary to understand this matter. The teaching in Romans is about how a man is righteous before God, and that righteousness is imputed to a person; so he is accounted righteous before God, as JND taught:

. . . the writer's mistake here arises from his not understanding what imputed righteousness means. It does not mean a quantum of formal righteousness outside us, imputed to us, but our being accounted righteous. Righteousness being imputed to a man simply means the man being accounted righteous. 129

. . . {that} the term "imputed righteousness" is not found in scripture, a concordance will prove.

Imputing righteousness, or righteousness being imputed, is found; the question is what it means. Does it mean a given quantum of righteousness transferred over to a man's account; or holding a man to be righteous - reckoning or accounting him such? I affirm that in scripture it always means the latter. Thus in Rom. 4:11 it is abstract -- "that righteousness might be

128. Collected Writings 7:277.
129. Collected Writings 10:41. See also 7:275.
imputed to them also;” that is, that they might be held or accounted righteous though not of the circumcision. There is no question at all of a quantum of righteousness subsisting and then put to their account; but that righteousness itself should be reckoned to them. And this is the more clear, because the sentence on which all the apostle’s reasoning on the point and his whole use of the phrase rests is, “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness”; “faith was reckoned to him for righteousness,” i.e., he was accounted righteous before God because of his faith. The meaning of the phrase is, Abraham was held for righteous on this ground. That is clearly the meaning of the passage; but this passage is the governing passage -- that from which the use of the phrase is drawn in every instance.

A sober mind, taught of God, subject to the word of God, has only to read the passages in which imputing righteousness is spoken of in scripture to see at once the force of the expression. 130  ♦

A man’s being righteous is his standing in the sight of God, not a quantum of righteousness transferred to his credit. 131  ♦

130. Collected Writings 10:58.
131. Collected Writings 23:254. Here is another helpful extract from JND, to which I have added the bold emphases:

No attribute of God is imputed; but a man who is a sinner is accounted righteous according to that attribute, according to all its perfection and all its exigencies, because of Christ and His work. If only a man who was truly righteous was accounted righteous, there would be no ground for imputed righteousness at all. Imputed righteousness has all its value and meaning in this: that a man who cannot pretend to be righteous in himself is so accounted for another’s sake. It is God’s justifying the ungodly. I repeat, the work of God in us is needed that we may have a part in divine righteousness; but Dr. C.’s statements are a denial of the whole gospel, and nonsense to boot. For a man who is truly righteous does not want imputed righteousness; and if he is accounted so for another’s sake, it is because he is not truly so in himself in God’s sight. It is a denial of the gospel; for the essence of this is, that God justifies the ungodly. No one who knew what scripture means by imputed righteousness could for a moment speak of imputing the righteousness of God; not only, as I have said, because imputing an attribute is a contradiction in terms, but because it is denying the proper sense of imputing righteousness. Clamor and abuse are no argument.

I affirm that scripture never speaks of imputed righteousness as of a sum of righteousness first existing in itself and then imputed. The truth is, it never speaks of imputed righteousness at all, but of imputing righteousness; and the difference is very great indeed. Imputed righteousness may carry with it in the mind the sense of a substantive quantity of righteousness first existing and then imputed; imputing righteousness cannot. It is an act of the mind accounting the person something at the moment the act of the mind takes place. If it is God’s mind, it is perfect, and does not change, no doubt; but when I say God imputed his faith to Abraham for righteousness, it is plain that He held Abraham to be righteous in His sight on account of faith; that is, imputing righteousness means, in scripture, to hold a person to be a righteous man, to reckon or account him such.

(continued…)
We must pursue this important matter just a little more. JND called attention to the eleven passages which speak of God imputing righteousness:

So, blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sin is covered: Blessed is the man to whom the Lord does not impute sin. It is not merely that He does not impute the sin done, but he does not view him as in sin, but as in righteousness; for innocence there is no question of. Hence it is not dikaioma when imputed righteousness is spoken of, but dikaiosune -- not an act or sum of things done, but a state. He is reckoned to be in the state of dikaiosune: dikaiosune is imputed to him . . .

There are eleven passages in scripture which speak of imputing righteousness or for righteousness; in nine of them faith is imputed for righteousness; so that here it does not mean the value of the thing done which is imputed, or our faith would be the merit. They are Rom. 4:3, 5, 9, 10, 22-24; Gal. 3:6; and James 2:23. The others, where it is said righteousness is imputed, are Rom. 4:6, 11. In Rom. 4:6, it is, God imputes righteousness without works, saying, Blessed is the man whose iniquity is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Here, clearly no positive external thing is imputed or put to another's account, but a man is reckoned to have dikaiosune. Verse 11 leads us to exactly the same result. The Gentile believers were to be reckoned righteous, because faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness when he was uncircumcised. 132

Towards All, and Upon All Those Who Believe

. . . righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ towards all, and upon all 133 those who believe: for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come

131. (...continued)

Theologians may torture themselves, and abuse those who state it, and quote clouds of doctors like themselves. They advance nothing. When scripture says Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness, it means Abraham was accounted righteous on account of his faith. Hence imputing God's righteousness could not be employed or thought of by me, because I deny all such previous sum of righteousness made out and then imputed to be the meaning of righteousness being imputed. Imputing righteousness (for, I repeat, imputed righteousness, as a compound term, is unscriptural) is the estimate of the man's relative state to God. The man is righteous in the sight of Him who judges (Collected Writings 10:55, 56). See also 7:276, 302, 379, 380; 10:41, 108-110, 138, 139, 145, 166; 31:344.

132. Collected Writings 7:276, 277.

short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:22, 23).

GOD ACTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS

It will be seen in all that follows (Rom. 3:22-26) that it is maintained that God has acted consistently with His righteousness. It is very important for understanding the Scriptures that follow, that we see that the actings of God are what is shown to be consistent with the righteousness of God. In Rom. 3:22, 23, we see that He acts towards (eis) unbelievers and acts upon (epi) believers. Keep in mind that the subject in Romans, regarding righteousness, involves God accounting a person righteous, and He does so consistent with His righteousness, the righteousness of God. There is also the important truth in Rom. 3:22, 23 that there is an aspect of this towards the unbeliever -- let me say, towards the world. We must keep in mind the mercy-seat of v. 25. Recall that in Lev. 16, the blood of the goat that spoke of propitiation was on and before the mercy-seat. This is not substitution for sins, as depicted by the scape-goat. It relates to what we are told in 1 John 2:2, that there was propitiation for the world. Obviously, the righteousness of God is involved in this entire matter. The fact is, there is something towards the world in the work of Christ, but it is not efficient upon unbelievers -- it is not made good in their souls. The acting of God in accordance with the righteousness of God is made effective "upon all those who believe."

RIGHTEOUSNESS OF God BY FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST

"Faith of Jesus Christ" does not refer to some imagined faith that Christ had. It refers to faith that lays hold of His person and work on the cross. This statement is also exclusive: it excludes law.

The righteousness of God is upon the believer "by faith of Jesus Christ." That righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ is towards unbelievers, but if he has no faith, then it is not upon him.

ROM. 3:22: TOWARDS ALL, AND UPON THOSE WHO BELIEVE

Towards All. In the statement, "towards all, and upon those that believe," we have a difference between propitiation and substitution, in that order; the difference too between purchase and redemption; the difference between the two goats of Lev. 16. The gospel itself is preached to all, but only effective for those who believe. Concerning the aspect of the work of Christ that is propitiation, we are told that Christ died for all:

... having judged this: that one died for all, then all have died; and he died for all ... (2 Cor. 5:14).

134. Why does the Scofieldian age-ism system say that the testing of man continues when God has declared that all are dead? That all are dead is a statement of the conclusion of the testing. God is not now testing dead men. Before the cross man was not treated by God as dead, but as (continued...)
... [the] man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, the testimony [to be rendered] in its own times (1 Tim. 2:6).

This is parallel to the righteousness of God towards all. It answers to propitiation, not substitution. Propitiation is typified in the goat of Jehovah's lot in Lev. 16, not the goat for the people's lot (substitution).

**Upon Those Who Believe.** However, the righteousness of God . . . upon those who believe refers to substitution, the people's lot, the transference of sins:

. . . who bore our sins in his own body on the tree (1 Pet. 1:24).

. . . Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many (Heb. 9:28).

Of course the Scripture does not state that Christ bore the sins of all. He is the propitiation for the world (1 John 2:2), but the substitute for some: 135

134. (...continued)
alive in Adamic responsibility to see if he was recoverable from the fall.

135. In the blood which is put upon the mercy-seat, it is not a question of those who are saved or of election, but of the majesty of God, which demands this satisfaction for sin. I can address all, and declare to them that this satisfaction has been made, and that God the Father has perfectly accepted it. But I cannot say to all that Christ bore their sins, because the word does not say it anywhere. If He had borne their sins, they would certainly be justified, and consequently saved by the life of Christ, and glorified.

Thus in Rom. 5:18, the gift has come "towards" -- not "upon" -- literally it reads, "So then as by one offence, towards all men to condemnation" (it is the direction towards which a thing would go if left to itself, not its coming upon), "so by one righteousness towards all men for justification of life." This is why he says "all." But in v. 19, "For as indeed by the disobedience of the one man the many have been constituted sinners; so also by the obedience of the one the many will be constituted righteous"; here it is the effect, not the tendency, therefore he says "many." The thing is not limited to the one who accomplished it, but extends in its efficacy to those who are interested in it; the many are constituted sinners or righteous in virtue of these two works. So it is said, Rom. 3:22,

[The] righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ towards all, and upon all those who believe.

It is one thing to put the blood on the mercy-seat, this was God's lot; another to confess the sins of the people on the head of the goat Azazel. On account of the one, God can act in the testimony of love towards all. His righteousness being satisfied; on account of the other, He owes it to Christ never to find those sins again: they have been borne into a land not inhabited. Now this is not true of the sins of the wicked: therefore it cannot be said that it is not on account of the fruits of Adam's sin that men are condemned, for it is said, "For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience." And "If ye believe not that I am he ye shall die in your sins." Thus I quite believe that Christ died for all, but I cannot say that He bore, as a substitute, the sins of all. The word, it seems to me, is very clear on this point in its doctrines, in the consequences that it draws from them, and in its types. So that I take αὐτίλυπρον ὑπὲρ πάντων in the simplest and widest sense. Satisfaction has been presented to God for men, but here (1 Tim. 2:6) it is evident these words refer to the desire to make of Jesus, at least of the Messiah, a mediator of the Jewish nation. No, says the apostle, He is so for all. God Ὁ ἔλεεί (not (continued...)}
The thing we do not find in Scripture is substitution for all. On the great day of atonement, there were two things in the sin-offering of the people -- the Lord's lot and the people's lot. The Lord's lot was killed, because it met the whole character of God; God was completely glorified in Christ, and the gospel goes out to the whole world. Then with the people's lot, the sins of the people were confessed on its head; that is the scapegoat; in that I find Christ for His people, and in the other atonement, Godward. That, of course, was for those whose sins he confessed. In Rom. 3 we hear of the "righteousness of God unto all, and upon them all that believe." It goes out toward all, and is upon believers. Many a one will say that Christ bore the sins of the world; but if so, how can God ever impute them? He could not, nor does Scripture ever say so. Then the Calvinist only takes the blood upon the mercy-seat; really he denies the propitiation. We have the satisfaction to God's glory, and then the gospel goes out and says, "We beseech you to be reconciled to God: come in." When they come I can say, I have something else to tell you; Christ bore all your sins, and it is impossible God can ever impute them or any one of them. An evangelist would not be right in saying, "Christ bore all your sins." If he makes it personal, God of course knows His own elect from all eternity, but we can only know them as they are shown out in life.  

The Textual Criticism of "And Upon All" Those that Believe. W. Kelly has repeatedly denounced the textual criticism which omits these words. This omission is of great doctrinal importance, so a part of one of his criticisms follows, where he has also commented on the doctrinal bearing of the words:

No doubt four or five of the oldest uncials with two cursives and some ancient versions and fathers leave the words out; and they are followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort. But the Homoeoteleuton simply and satisfactorily accounts for the slip, aided as it may have been by the inability of many to see the double bearing of the truth enunciated. For how readily the mind swerves to Calvinistic views, or to Arminian; and how few accept the truth in its fulness, of which extreme partisans see but one part, unintelligently opposed to the other part! The main body of uncials, cursives, versions, and fathers declares for the text as rendered in the Authorized Version {KJV}. Even the mutilated form of some of the best Latin copies ("super omnes") bears

135. (...continued)

136. Collected Writings 26:337.

witness against that abbreviation which has found favor. And though the expositions of Greeks and Latins have little worth or point, they show the fact; for it is no question of Jews and Gentiles, but of God's righteousness manifested unto all, going out toward all indiscriminately, and taking effect actually on all those that believe. To overlook the difference of the prepositions is unworthy, and yet more so to confound "all" with "all that believe." The old writers who state but misapprehend the difference were certainly not the men to foist in a clause which, giving both comprehensiveness and precision, falls in as strikingly with this epistle in particular as with all scripture generally. God's righteousness could not but be for all; but in fact none but believers profited by it through faith in Christ. Its direction was towards all, not merely all believers, but all mankind; its application was upon all that believe. To take away the former is to deprive it of breadth; to blot out the latter is to deny its depth and strength. "Unto," not "upon," all that believe is far short of divine truth.

W. R. Newell's Problem. W. R. Newell saw a false implication in the words, "and upon all" who believe:

I have found Mr. Darby's explanations of "God's righteousness" more clear and illuminating than those of any other. It is therefore unfortunate, as it seems to me, that he adds to verse 22 the confusing phrase, "and upon all." I ask, what is "upon all"? If, as Mr. Darby holds, the act of justification is a forensic one, a declaration about a sinner who believes, accounting him righteous (although he is not intrinsically so), then why add that this righteousness is "upon" him? For the human mind is unable to conceive of a meaning for such a phrase other than something that a man does not possess being placed upon his person. But this is the exact meaning that Mr. Darby so constantly and justly wars against!

The very thing Mr. Darby so assiduously avoids, that is, the bestowal on a person of a quality, (or of, as he says, "a quantum of righteousness"), he opens the way to, in retaining the phrase "and upon all." Bishop Motile, for example, remarks: "As to 'unto all and upon all,' the Greek phrases respectively indicate destination and bestowal. The sacred pardon was prepared for all believers, and as actually laid upon them as a 'robe of righteousness.'" We would expect such a comment as this from a churchman, or any one of the Reformation theologians, but it is the very thing that Paul does not say; and it darkens all counsel concerning justification.

1. Here is a comment from W. Kelly regarding what he thinks of the Revised Version's (of 1881) rendering of the verse, which WRN thinks superior:

. . . "the righteousness of God unto all them that believe." Such is the form in which it is given in the Revised Version. What is the consequence? That they give us an unscriptural platitude. They unwittingly take from Scripture its edge and fulness . . . They have mixed up two forms of the truth, so that one cannot get at either. The hotch-potch of both destroys the exact sense of each.

The change means that there is not a word "unto all" sinners as such, whilst all believers receive a mere offer of the gospel. "The righteousness of God is unto all believers," if they like to accept it. Thus is effaced the effect of the gospel upon all that believe, while the mercy to unbelievers vanishes away, because His righteousness is only "unto all them that believe." If the words omitted be read, the double truth is given in perfection.  

The stunning thing about WRN's complaint regarding JND, coupled with his own support of a false reading of the text, is that he really did not explain the end of the verse as he prefers it translated. Here it is:

God's righteousness, moreover, through faith concerning Jesus Christ unto all them that believe.

Be sure to understand WK's pointing out that what this false translation really means is:

"The righteousness of God is unto all believers," if they like to accept it.

2. W. R. Newell said:

For the human mind is unable to conceive of a meaning for such a phrase other than something that a man does not possess being placed upon his person.

It would have been better if he had confined his remark to his own mind's inability to conceive the truth about this. For him, "and upon all" cannot be "accounting him righteous" (which is a phrase WRN approves). His mind could not conceive that. But in truth, "And upon all" indicates the positive effect of the righteousness of God upon the believer. The believer is accounted righteous. Apparently JND, WK, and many others find no difficulty about that. JND wrote:

Moreover it was upon all . . . those that believe; they stood in that righteousness.

Next comes the question, How and why is the man accounted righteous? It is God's righteousness, by faith in Jesus Christ, towards all, Jew or Gentile, and upon all them that believe.

It is "unto all," as much for the Gentiles as Jews, "and upon all that believe"; though presented to all, it is by imputation (made real by grace, and not by accomplishment) on them only that believe.

No one who knew what scripture means by imputed righteousness could for a moment speak of imputing the righteousness of God; not only, as I have

---
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said, because imputing an attribute is a contradiction in terms, but because it is denying the proper sense of imputing righteousness.  

Clearly, then, JND understood the words “and upon all” to indicate that the believer was accounted righteous -- and not as having some quantum of righteousness transferred to the believer, or that the righteousness of God, or whatever, was put upon him as a hat is put on someone’s head.

DOES NOT MEAN IMPUTING THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD

Note well that last quotation from JND. I repeat a part of it to emphasize an important matter:

No one who knew what scripture means by imputed righteousness could for a moment speak of imputing the righteousness of God.

We note that the subject here in Romans is not the matter of 2 Cor. 5:21: made the righteousness of God in Him. Let us not jumble everything together. In the place in Romans we are considering, note that sins, guilt, the blood, the righteousness of God, and the justification of those who are of the faith of Jesus are before us. Keeping in mind, then, that Romans, through ch. 5:11, deals with sins, let us note this from the pen of A. C. Ord:

This passage gives us the relation between the blood of Christ and the righteousness of God, displayed toward us, in justifying us according to its efficacy, declared in its being put upon the mercy-seat or propitiatory; an act which represents its full value according to the righteousness of God, whose throne is the mercy-seat. But 2 Cor. 5:21 goes further than this, for there we find its {i.e., the righteousness of God's} relation to the death of Christ as bearing sin {not sins}; and that we are “made the righteousness of God in Christ.” . . .

It is quite clear that OT saints were not “in Christ,” and so could not have been made the righteousness of God in Christ (Cp. 2 Cor. 5:21). But the subject here in Romans is not that of being made the righteousness of God in Christ, but of being accounted righteous. And that makes room for OT saints to have been accounted righteous by God, though, of course, that was not a revealed basis of standing before Him. And this is confirmed by what we read of Abraham in Rom. 4:3:

And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness. Abraham was held by God to be righteous in virtue of faith. See the lengthy footnote by JND to this Scripture. Abraham was reckoned, or accounted, righteous by God. It follows, of course, that this is true of all OT saints. And so we read of them as the just. The spirits of just men made perfect (Heb. 12:23) refers to OT saints. Moreover, the OT saints have part in “the

145. Collected Writings 10:55.
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resurrection of the *just,*” which is the first resurrection.

So Rom. 3:22 refers to the actings of God’s righteousness, that which acts toward unbelievers, and that which acts upon believers. What is involved with God’s acting on believers in accordance with His righteousness is partially given in Romans. There is more that what we have in Romans.

W. R. Newell found JND on the subject of God’s righteousness more clear and *illuminating* than that of any other, he wrote; and WRN would repair JND where he was wrong— and does that not mean, then, that the *most* illuminating treatment of all must be that of WRN? Fact is, he has *darkened* the subject. I mean no disparagement of the personal piety of any man when I say that there are numerous attempts at improving on J. N. Darby by those holding what is to me a pseudo-dispensationalism, the effect of adhering to it resulting in ignoring of truth, darkening of truth, and retrogression, all the while claiming improvement.

**THE NIV AND ROM. 3:21, 22**

W. Kelly spoke of the Revised Version of 1881 mutilating the text. Hear the NIV:

> But now a righteousness from God, apart from law, has been made known, to which the law and the Prophets testify. This righteousness from God comes through faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe (Rom. 3:21, 22, NIV).

This perversion concerning the righteousness of God by the NIV is systematic in Romans. In Rom. 1:17 we read: “a righteousness from God is revealed.” In Rom. 10:3, the perversion reads: “the righteousness that comes from God.” Is it not apparent that there is an immense difference between “a righteousness from God,” and the NIV’s “the righteousness that comes from God,” and what we have seen the passages really teach? What is involved in this false translation is the introduction of a quantum of righteousness being credited. It opens the door for the covenant theology notion of the believer being credited with a righteousness that come from Christ’s righteous law-keeping, rather than God’s accounting a person righteous. This much WRN rightly saw. On v. 22, the strictures, both as to the text and the false meaning of the resultant translation apply. “To all them that believe,” is as, WK noted, towards believers, if they want it. And so the truth of God is frittered away in favor of theological figments!

**ROM. 5:18: TOWARDS ALL**

If substitution were for the whole world, it would save the whole world. 147

Rom. 5:18 is properly understood as having to do with propitiation, not

---
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substitution. The bearing of this distinction on understanding this passage was pointed out by J. N. Darby:

Rom. 3:22: "The righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe"; not unto and upon all them that believe, but the righteousness of God is unto all, and upon all them that believe; "δικαιοσύνη Θεοί εἰς πάντας, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας." The Jews had been convinced of sin; the Gentiles had been convinced of sin; they had no righteousness in which to stand with God. Whether Jew or Gentile, they had no hope in themselves; but the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ was not towards Jew or Gentile, but towards all, "εἰς πάντας." Moreover it was upon all (ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστεύοντας) those that believe; they stood in that righteousness.

We have another most important instance in verse 18 of chapter 5. "Therefore as by one offence towards (εἰς) all men, to (εἰς) condemnation." This was the aspect of the result of the offence (intercepted, as regards them that believe, by the death of Christ); "so by one righteousness towards (εἰς) all men, to (εἰς) justification of life"; if, as in the English translation, it had been "upon," for which the scriptures use ἐπὶ, all would have been justified. We know it is not so, nor does the scripture say so. The aspect of the act is as wide as the aspect of the act of the first Adam; the effect is quite another and a distinct question. We have, in the former passage, seen it to be pronounced upon them that believe. These remarks make, I believe, quite clear what the English translation renders very difficult to comprehend. The word translated (Rom. 5:18) "upon all" is the same as "unto all" in Rom. 3:22, not as "upon all" them that believe. It shows that the free gift was unto (that is, towards) all in its aspect; but that its effect, and the acceptance of people under it, is quite a distinct question. The accuracy and perfectness of scripture is additionally illustrated. Εἰς seems to exhibit the natural consequence, the effect of anything looked at in itself: it may or may not involve the coming to the result; taken in itself it has the effect, for the tendency of anything is that which per se, or left to itself, it would produce or arrive at. The word may be seen in many passages of Rom. 6 so used. 148

Then what is the explanation of Rom. 5:19?

In v. 18 we have the universality of the bearing of the act of Adam and of the blessed Lord; in v. 19 the positive efficiency or effect on those who were actually connected with these two heads. "Many" is "the many" -- the mass of persons actually connected with each of these heads. The sin of Adam did not confine itself, in its effect, to him. By the disobedience of one, the many connected with him were constituted sinners. By the obedience of Christ, the many connected with Him were constituted righteous. This is not responsibility and imputation (there every one is dealt with according to his own works, to which judgment and propitiation apply), but a state into which the many were brought by the head to which they belonged, in contrast with personal responsibility. One man's -- Adam's -- disobedience involved those connected

with him in the condition of being sinners; the obedience of One -- Christ -- constituted those associated with Him righteous, putting them in that state and condition before God. It is in contrast with individual responsibility, though each individual connected with the head is placed in the state consequent on what characterized his conduct. The “many,” in their condition, were such before God in consequence of the conduct that characterized the head. It was not what met the actual conduct of the individuals, but a state of the individuals, which was the result of the characteristic action of the one who stood as the representative and head of his race before God. It was a state dependent on the conduct of the head. This is the great point here. The Lord and Adam, by their act and conduct, bring those connected with them into a certain condition. 149

By one righteousness the free gift came towards all, not in the sense of application, the meaning in each case is to or towards all (Greek eis), not upon all (Greek epi). As the one offence did not rest in its effect on Adam only, but run over to all, so the effect of the one work of righteousness did not end in Christ, but passed on toward all, “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.” Verse 19. When it is a matter of application, it is the “many,” not “all,” that is, the many respectively connected with each head, therefore I can go to all to preach the gospel to every creature, saying to the sinner, the blood is on the mercy-seat; but to the believer I can say, You are righteous, “so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” 150 ♦

FOR THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE

God has everyone in view. No one, not even the Jew, has any advantage now. All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. 151

THE GLORY OF GOD

It has been pointed out that this (Rom. 3:23) does not refer to God’s essential glory -- because all creatures fall short of that. It means that no person is fit to stand in His presence, in the glory of His presence; all are unsuited to it. Yes, the glory of God is involved in this matter of the righteousness of God. It has been noticed that righteousness can meet the claims of righteousness but only a cloud can meet a cloud! -- referring to the cloud of the incense that rose from the hot coals from the altar, rose in the tabernacle to cover the mercy-seat (Lev. 16). Oh, my soul, a cloud met a cloud -- glory met glory! The Shekinah was there between the cherubim of glory. There was the glory-cloud of the presence of Jehovah between the cherubim. And there rose up a cloud that spoke of the unspeakable glory of the person of the Son of God giving Himself upon the cross -- imparting the glory and value of His person to the work being
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The incense was compounded of ingredients that speak of His glories - and a sentence of death hung over all who would attempt to compound its like. It rose up before the Shekinah from off the hot coals and glory met glory. The cross brought out that which met the glory of God. There arose, as it were, from the cross, nothing but what glorified God. And the blood was brought in to be put on and before the mercy-seat. It typified the blood of the One who glorified God on the cross. And so Scripture presents propitiation as commensurate with His person. Scripture language is: “He is the propitiation” (1 John 2:2). It is Himself that is the propitiation. It is the sacrifice of Himself that is the propitiation; and as we shall shortly see, He is also the mercy-seat.

All sinned but Christ, and not only did He not fall short of the glory of God, He brought infinite glory to God. It is instructive to observe that there is now the gospel of the glory of God:

...the glad tidings of the glory of the blessed God, with which I have been entrusted (1 Tim. 1:11).

“Glorious gospel” is a translation which lowers what is meant. The same is true in another passage:

...in whom the God of this world has blinded the thoughts of the unbelieving, so that the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is [the] image of God, should not shine forth [for them] (2 Cor. 4:4).

What about the gospel of the glory? What is almost always preached is man’s need, not God’s glory.

When therefore he was gone out Jesus says, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. If God be glorified in him, God shall glorify him in himself, and shall glorify him immediately (John 13:31).

There are two glories of Christ spoken of here. Note that in John 17:4 the Lord Jesus that the He had glorified God on the earth and finished the work given to do. Of course, He spoke anticipatively, as having accomplished the work. His whole course had glorified God on the earth, but there was something special to occur in glorifying God; and that was that on the cross he glorified God. But note that the Son of man was glorified on the cross: “Now is the Son of man glorified.” The incense rose up from the hot coals of the altar. The cloud of the incense covered the mercy-seat (Lev. 16). It was glory meeting glory. It was the glory of Christ rising up as the cloud, one glory meeting the other.

152. When the soldier pierced the Lord’s side there came out blood and water. Then the veil was rent, from the top down. The work was done and its effect felt immediately before God, who, in virtue of that precious blood, rent the veil. Years ago I remarked to A.C. Brown that I noticed in W. Kelly’s book on Mark, that he said that the blood rent the veil. He squinted his eyes slightly, stared at me for a moment, and then with great feeling, said: “Of course it did!” Praise God!
Not only was God glorified in the cross, but Him who so glorified God must be glorified in Himself, and it must be done immediately – not wait for the millennial kingdom, but enter glory then.

And not only did the Lord Jesus enter as man into the scene of glory in heaven, and acquire glories that He will share with us, but there is that mind-prostrating statement in John 17:5:

and now glorify me, thou Father, along with thyself, with the glory which I had along with thee before the world was.

This is more than entry into heaven itself. It is to enter *as man*, as to presence and place, into the *Godhead glory* that the Father and Son had before the world was! Oh, indeed, the relationship of Father and Son was from eternity to eternity, and here it is seen. There is the eternal glory of the relationship of Father and Son in Godhead glory; and now, having glorified God on the earth, and having finished the work He was given to do, as man He entered that very glory! That, of course, is a glory He cannot share with us -- but we will behold it (cp. 2 Cor. 4:6; Acts 7:55).

**Christ the Mercy-seat**

... being justified by his grace through the redemption which [is] in Christ Jesus; whom God has set forth a mercy-seat, through faith in his blood (Rom. 3:24, 25).

In the tabernacle, the mercy-seat was where the glory of God rested. The blood of the first goat, typifying propitiation, was presented before the Shekinah. The Shekinah now rests on Christ. *God must be approached in accordance with His righteousness.* What righteousness? -- the righteousness of God Himself! There is a mercy-seat that is presented to man. What is that mercy-seat? It is Christ! By what does he approach? -- “through faith in his blood”! God has now set forth Christ as a mercy seat and it is through Christ that God is approached -- “through faith in His blood,” the very blood presented in the sanctuary. When

“The very spear that pierced Thy side,
Drew forth the blood to save,"

the infinite, unspeakable value of that blood was *immediately* in the sanctuary before God, and consequently the veil was rent from the top to the bottom.

It is in the power of that blood that we are justified with respect to our guilt and our sins (Rom. 5:9).

Of course, it is by grace we are saved, through faith; and that faith itself is the gift of God (Eph. 2:8). You would be utterly wrong to think that the words “it is God’s gift” means that grace is the gift. The view in Eph. 2 is that
the sinner is *dead* in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1),\(^{153}\) hence *quickening* (being made alive) is applied and faith is imparted. Eph. 2 is so obviously the divine operations that it is only the perversity of our natural hearts that would pretend that we are not totally lost by nature and pretend that we somehow conjured up faith, instead of it being implanted within us by God. All of this is because of God’s grace acting on our behalf. Faith is the divinely communicated instrumentality of appropriation -- “through faith in His blood.” We are justified by God’s grace through an instrumentality -- “through the redemption which [is] in Christ Jesus.” Redemption goes further than the ransom of 1 Tim. 2:6. The “ransom for all” spoken of there is connected with propitiation, as is Christ’s death for all (2 Cor. 5:14). Redemption means setting the believer free and has to do with substitution.

Here is a helpful quotation on the subject of Christ as the mercy-seat, or propitiatory:

And what was the result of Christ’s coming? That God was shown to have been righteous throughout Old Testament times, as, indeed, He is now, in blessing every soul who receives the gospel. “Whom [Christ Jesus] God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare (1) his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God to declare (2) I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus (Rom. 3:25, 26). God’s righteousness is, therefore, said to be declared in regard to His remission (or, strictly, the praeter-mission {Rom. 3:26b}, that is, forgiveness based on that which was coming) of the sins of Old Testament believers, and also in regard to His present act of justifying the believer in Jesus.

Now, observe that this public declaration of God’s righteousness is connected with Christ as the propitiatory. It is in this character that Christ displayed God’s righteousness: “Whom God set forth a propitiatory ... to declare His righteousness.” For it is a remarkable fact that a different word is used by Paul from that used in John’s Epistle. This fact can be verified by anyone having the slightest acquaintance with the Greek tongue, and is noted in most versions. In John’s Epistle, Christ is said to be the Ἰλασμός, but in the Epistle to the Romans He is called the Ἰλαστήριον. We have one other instance only in the New Testament of the use of the latter word, which establishes its meaning beyond just question. The apostle, when enumerating the furniture of the holy of holies in the ancient tabernacle, spoke of the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat (Ἰλαστήριον, Heb. 9:5). From the two passages, therefore, there can be no doubt that Christ is the Antitype of the mercy-seat, or propitiatory, as He is also the Ἰλασμός or propitiatory sacrifice (1 John 2:2; 4:10), whose blood was sprinkled upon and before the mercy-seat (Lev. 16:14).

It will be remembered that Moses was to make the mercy-seat of pure

---

153. The view of the sinner in Romans is that he is alive in sins.
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gold, and to place it upon the ark of testimony. "There I will meet with thee," said Jehovah, "and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat" (Ex. 25:17-22). Fine gold was emblematical of the intrinsic righteousness of God, as brass was of His judicial righteousness. Hence, when the blood of the victim, on the great day of atonement, was sprinkled upon the golden mercy-seat, the act clearly signified, in type, that the claims of Jehovah's righteous nature were glorified thereby. And the seven-fold sprinkling before the propitiatory indicated that a foundation was thus laid for communion with Jehovah, as He had said to Moses.

In the epistle to the Romans (to which we have been referring) we find the mercy-seat, the blood, and the righteousness of God, all associated together. For Christ Jesus is shown as the propitiatory through faith in His blood to declare God's righteousness. This declaration He has made. As the exceeding riches of God's grace will be declared in coming ages (Eph. 2:7), so God's righteousness has been already declared "at this time." Moreover, it was done here below. For this Epistle deals with the position of the believer in this world, not in the heavenlies as is done in the Ephesians. So the moral history of the world is summarized to prove it guilty before God; and where the fruits of man's unrighteousness abounded, there -- not in heaven -- God's righteousness in justifying the ungodly was demonstrated. In Old Testament times, as may be seen in the book of Job, the possible relation of unrighteous man to a holy God was unknown; but now Christ has declared it to be consonant with God's righteousness by becoming a propitiatory. In His own blessed Person lifted upon the cross, He formed the blessed answer to all the righteous demands of God.

Is there a difficulty in that Christ is the sacrifice, and, moreover, the mercy-seat where the blood of the sacrifice was sprinkled? It is no greater difficulty than in Christ being both the Shepherd of the sheep and the Door through which He leads them (John 10). It was unbelief that could not understand how Christ could be both David's Son and David's Lord. Such paradoxes do not stagger faith. All the difficulties vanish when we remember He was "God manifest in flesh." An ancient writer (Theodoret) has put it: "The Lord Christ is God, and the Mercy-seat, and the High Priest, and the Lamb, and in His blood He has worked out our salvation." Christ is indeed all. His Person is one, and His work is one. Herein was the great distinction between the Antitype and the types. They were many and varied and terrestrial; and they were, by reason of their very nature, in all points exceeded by the Antitype, as the heavens are higher than the earth.

To insist on the necessities of the type in the Antitype is to speak derogatorily of the Person of the Son. In the type you must have a person to take the blood of the sacrifice from the altar to the mercy-seat; but in Christ the sacrifice and mercy-seat coincided, and hence there was no necessity for such transference of His blood, as in the type. And, on the word of Christ Himself, the work was finished when He bowed His head, and dismissed His spirit (John 19:30).

Moreover, the fact of the closure of the work was attested by the veil of the temple being supernaturally rent from the top to the bottom (Mark 15:38). The veil signified of old that the way into the holiest of all, for communion with
Chapter 10: The Showing Forth of the Righteousness of God

God from above the mercy-seat, was not then made manifest (Heb. 9:8); but when rent thus it proclaimed that a new and living way into the holiest had been dedicated; so that by the blood of Jesus we may enter with boldness. But the veil was emphatically a figure of Christ's flesh (Heb. 10:19, 20), and plainly points that the work whereby the restrictions of the most holy place were removed was accomplished in His flesh on the cross, and not in heaven after death. For Christ's death (the rent veil) declared the way open, which implies that the work on which this could be righteously done had then been accomplished, and, moreover, accepted by Him for whom it was accomplished. 155

In the tabernacle, the mercy-seat was hidden. Not so with the antitype, for Christ has been set forth by God.

**Showing Forth His Righteousness**

What God's righteousness requires He has provided in the work of Christ. The work of Christ has satisfied God with respect to His righteousness. By the cross, the righteousness of God dealt with the guilt of the old man, the first man - dealt with his sins in a manner that glorified Himself and allows Him to act consistently with His own glory and righteousness. It is righteous and owing to Christ that God act as He does in view of the work of Christ on the cross.

**REGARDING SINS OF OT SAINTS**

Here we look at the translation of Rom. 3:25 by W. Kelly:

> whom God set forth as a propitiatory through faith in His blood, for a declaration of his righteousness on account of the praeter-mission of the sins that had been before, in the forbearance of God . . .

One of the reasons that God has set forth Christ as the mercy-seat, the propitiatory, is for the declaration of His righteousness with respect to the sins of the saints in OT times. He showed forbearance with them in view of the cross - looking toward the coming work of Christ that would glorify Him and manifest His righteousness. So the work of Christ includes provision for the OT saints. God has settled the matter of those sins and there can be no charge of unrighteousness against God. The cross has vindicated God against any such charge, showing Him righteous in all His ways.

**IN THE PRESENT TIME**

The first reason that God set forth Christ as a mercy-seat, we saw, was to show Him righteous with respect to praeter-mission of the sins of the OT saints. Now
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we come to another reason for setting forth Christ as the mercy-seat:

for [the] showing forth of His righteousness in the present time, so that he should be just, and justify him that is of the faith of Jesus (Rom. 3:26).

W. Kelly translated it:

with a view to the declaration of his righteousness in the present time, in order to his being just and justifying him that [is] of faith in Jesus.

The God-glorifying work of our Lord Jesus is the righteous foundation upon which God can act in justifying those whose faith is in the One who wrought that work. God is just in justifying such.

But the righteousness of God also required that He set Christ in glory above. It was due Him.

Conclusion

Rom. 3 concludes with the statement:

Do we then make void law by faith? Far be the thought: [no,] but we establish law (Rom. 3:31).

The claims of the law are upheld by faith in Christ. How so? The Word teaches that Christ rendered a satisfaction to God. The claims of the law are thus upheld and honored – and faith in the work that accomplished this thus establishes the law. It is not done by trying to keep the law but by acknowledging the work of Christ. Thus, law is maintained in all its force -- and the blood has met all its claims.

We will keep in mind that there was much more involved in the work on the cross than upholding the claims of the law; but here in our text, the point made is about the law in relation to the work, based upon which, the righteousness of God is manifested.
Chapter 11

Made the Righteousness of God in Him

Christ Was Made Sin

SIN AND SINS

There is a difference between sin, referring to the evil nature within, and sins, which are the fruits produced by that evil nature. 1 Pet. 2:24 speaks of sins, the fruits, and Christ has borne the sins of believers. Sins are forgiven (Eph. 1:7). However, a nature is not forgiven. We do not read that the believer has the forgiveness of sin. But the nature is judged. Christ was made sin for us on the cross and thus God removed sin from before Himself regarding the believer as viewed in Christ.

In Romans, there is a main division of subject matter which occurs between Rom. 5:11 and 12. Before v. 12, the subject is our guilt and our sins. We read that Christ was delivered for our offences (Rom. 4:25). Beginning at Rom. 5:12 the subject is our sin, our evil nature, the flesh, and our state before God. Of course, by the cross God has dealt with both the fruit (sins) and the root (sin). In the first part of Romans we read that Christ died for us (Rom. 5:6-8); in the next part we read that we have died with Christ (Rom. 6:8). Christ has died to sin (Rom. 6:10) and so then have we died to sin also (Rom. 6:2) as having died with Him. Thus, we are justified from sin (Rom. 6:7). You cannot charge a dead man with sin. He is dead. Thus is the believer viewed in Christ Jesus. On the other hand, we are viewed as alive from among the dead (Rom. 6:13) and “alive to God in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 6:11). Thus is the believer viewed in Christ. So we are not viewed by God as in the flesh, i.e., in the Adamic standing of the first man. It is not only sins forgiven, but more: a new standing before God. The life of being alive to God in Christ Jesus stands in justification (Rom. 5:18). No charge can be brought against that life.

What we have in 2 Cor. 5:21 refers to sin. This connects with the second major division in Romans, ch. 5:12 through ch. 8. And here Rom. 8:3 helps us:

... God having sent his own Son, in likeness of flesh of sin, and for sin, has
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condemned sin in the flesh . . .

"Likeness of flesh of sin" does not mean, of course, that any sin was in Him, as 2 Cor. 5:21 assures us, for "he knew no sin," referring to sin as what is in man. He appeared a man among men is the thought. The Son was sent for sin; He was sent to deal with it, and did so on the cross. He was "made sin" for us in such a way that God could remove sin from before Himself. As W. Kelly said:

. . . I understand thereby, that God charged Him with all its consequences as far as this could be done by imputation to the Holy One, who suffered for sin as really, yea, far more perfectly, than if it had been His own. Christ went down as truly and unsparingly under the direct judgment of sin, as if He had been Himself guilty. He was so completely charged with sin that God not only dealt with Him in death but in judgment. For nothing more distinctly marks judgment than God forsaking one.

Regarding the offerings in Lev. 1-5, Christ being made sin answers to the sin-offering (Lev. 4); while the trespass-offering (Lev. 5) speaks of Christ bearing our sins.

Christ was made sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. It was not a life-long being made sin. No. It was in the three hours of darkness on the cross. The righteousness we are made does not come from the law in any way, as J. N. Darby well pointed out:

What I deny is the doctrine that, while the death of Christ cleanses us from sin, His keeping the law is our positive righteousness, and that His keeping the law is imputed to us as ourselves under it, and that law-keeping is positive righteousness. I believe that Christ perfectly glorified God by obedience even unto death, and that that is to our profit in such sort that, while His death has canceled all our sins who believe, we are accepted according to His present acceptance in God's sight according to the value of that work, being held to be risen with Him, that our position before God is not legal righteousness, or measured by Christ's keeping the law, but His present acceptance, as risen, in the whole value of the work, and we accounted righteous according to the

---

156. "The notion that He of whom it is said, "knew no sin," is God as such, and that He was made sin in incarnation, which is Dr. B.'s (Horatius Bonar) interpretation, is too monstrous and too offensive as well as absurd to need reply. God has made God, who as God did not know sin, to become sin by being a man: can any Christian taught of God receive such a thought? God does know sin perfectly: to apply it to His not knowing it in conscience is blasphemy; to affirm it of One who was in the likeness of sinful flesh is of vital importance. "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" In Him is no sin. Is God's making God become sin (vicariously of course, I admit) any better? The Lord declares He comes to do God's will and that His law is in His heart. It was the Lamb, the spotless Lamb, the victim that was made sin" (Collected Writings 23:239).

157. The Bible Treasury 12:12.

value of that. 159

SIN IS LAWLESSNESS

It is well to be clear about what is meant by sin contrasted with sins. That "sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4) is an utterly false translation. The law came by Moses (John 1), and sin was in the world before Moses, as is clear from the fact that sin was introduced by one man, Adam (Rom. 5:12). Adam had a law, but not the law. It is convenient, however, for covenant theology to invent the teaching that Adam had the law, necessitated in order to be compatible with the notion that sin is the transgression of the law. The reader should understand this: that if Adam had not the law, and if 'sin is the transgression of the law,' then Adam could not have sinned. Therefore it has been invented that Adam had the law. 160

So sin was in the world before Moses (Rom. 5:12), before the law, and thus sin cannot be the transgression of the law – since sin was there before the law which was given by Moses (John 1:17).

I pointed this out to some KJV advocates who virtually treat the KJV as inspired, and who claim to be dispensationalists, the result being only to be lectured, or sent a paper to fill out so that at the conclusion I might see that I was a "dunce" (reminding me of what has often been pointed out in Thy Precepts, that the guilty often reverse matters) -- but no answer, no facing up to this glaring, patent contradiction. It is an outrage that anyone claiming to be a dispensationalist will hang on to this falsification of the translation that has resulted from covenant theology. But it would breach the agenda of covenant theology to admit it and the seriousness of it, as it would breach the agenda of 'dispensationalists' who treat the KJV as virtually as inspired as the autographs.

That champion of error, the NIV, only appears to give with the right hand -- but certainly takes away with the left. Listen to it:

Everyone who sins breaks the law; in fact, sin is lawlessness.

This is absurd. It is the same old law-mindedness in theology, worded a little differently. Those before the law of Moses was introduced sinned, but had no law to break. Moreover, the Gentiles never were under the law, yet they sinned.

W. Kelly translates:

Everyone that doeth sin also doeth lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness.

159. Collected Writings 14:250.
160. The reader should look at Elements of Dispensational Truth, vol. 1, second edition, chapter 3.4, "Romans 5:12-21: The Christian Under a New Head," and the chart on p. 93, which diagrams these points and many others that bear on this matter.
I will cite but one small comment from him:

One hardly knows a verse in the New Testament more perverted if one may so call it, or more productive of widespread misapprehension. 161

Let us see the translation by A. Marshall:

Everyone doing sin also lawlessness does, and sin is lawlessness. 162

And here are some of J. N. Darby’s forceful strictures:

The other {false translation} is, “Sin is the transgression of the law.” This is really, I must say, a wicked subjection of the word to theology; The word (anomia) is never used for “transgression of the law” anywhere else in the English translation of the holy scriptures; another expression is, parabasis nomou. I call it “wicked,” because by it a human system denies what the word of God carefully insists on. Not only so, but it is the word rightly translated elsewhere “without law.” Sin is not transgression of the law; to say so, universal as it may be, is a wicked anti-scriptural perversion. Sin is the evil nature which produces lust, the enmity of the heart against God. It is written, “Sin by the commandment became exceeding sinful,” which could not be if sin was not there before the commandment. Again, the contrary is expressly stated. “Until the law sin was in the world.” There is no transgression without sin. Further, it is said, “They that have sinned without law,” the same word as an adverb (anomos), in contrast to sinning under the law. That is, the word of God puts it in direct contradiction to what this false translation does.

These gentlemen believe men are born in sin. I do not blame them for this, surely; but are men born in transgression of the law? It is false theological perversion, and nothing else; and it is time that false theology gave way to the word of God: for this affects the whole nature and character of Christianity. Patience has its just place; but, after all, souls are more precious than false theology. 163

Men are born in sin, not born in the transgression of the law. “Sin” has to do with the nature in us; transgressions refer to acts committed -- i.e., transgressions are a class of sins committed. Moreover, when Christ was “made sin,” He was not made the transgression of the law. It is most true that He bore our sins in His own body on the tree, but that is not what 2 Cor. 5:21 describes. This passage is dealing with our nature, the root within us from which sinning springs. And this root within was in the world before the law was given by Moses. And men acted in accordance with that root within them


without the law. They acted in self-will, without reference to the will of God. Rom. 1:19ff bears directly on this issue and the law is not brought up in this passage. All before Moses were without the law, and when it was given it was given to Israel, not the Gentiles, who never were under the law.  

164. J. N. Darby addressed this issue repeatedly. Here is a sample:

But it is said, we confound all laws together. I take it as the word of God does. That law is not the way of righteousness or sanctification, nor of obedience. Paul does not even say the law. Law came in by the by (νόμος παρεισήλθε), that system and way of dealing on God’s part. He carefully distinguishes men under law, and men not under law -- without it; he alludes to Adam as under a law, Israel also; whereas people between them are on a different ground: so all Gentiles, having no law (νόμον); so Christians. I know that great pains are taken to undo his words, and shew they must have had some law, though the apostle declares they have none, and perish without it, instead of being judged by the one which was given. I know that it is urged they were a law to themselves where they had none, because they had a conscience; but this is only to prove that actual righteousness by conscience is better than the having a law and breaking it; that working good was better than having a law, if it was broken. Scripture contrasts being under law and being without law, and does not know these speculations on it. What it calls law as absolutely as words can make it, it declares the Gentiles to be without (μη ἐχοντες νόμον), having no law at all. It does say every one has a conscience which tells him of right and wrong. They are without law -- χωρὶς νόμου. They are inexcusable, from natural proofs of God, and as giving up God when they knew Him. But they are not proved guilty by any law they were under; but it is declared, having sinned without law (ἀνόμως), they will perish without law -- while others have sinned under law, and will be judged by it. The sense in which scripture says they were without law and had none, in that sense I believe and say it. Nothing can be more absolute. The reasonings of men as to it are all inventions not found in scripture. What scripture calls law, Gentiles and Christians are not under. I know passages are quoted to show that they must be, in spite of what scripture says. I shall refer to these. Ignorance of Greek can hardly excuse the use of some of them, where positive scriptures are so plain.

Sin, we are told, is the transgression of the law. Now, no one knowing Greek could cite this theological, but fatally unscriptural, translation. It is simply, Sin is lawlessness, ἀνόμια, not παρέβασις νόμου. Another passage quoted is, “under the law to Christ”; but neither here is the law spoken of at all; it is, not as lawless in respect of God, but rightly subject to Christ -- ἐννομος Χριστῷ. It is in contrast with having to say to the law. But there is another passage which is reckoned on to prove that all men are under law, Rom. 3:19. It is astonishing how anyone could so little see the force of the apostle’s argument. I am aware that Dr. O’Brien refers to this; but I am only so much the more astonished. The apostle had proved Jews and Greeks all under sin, and then turns back to the many advantages the Jews had. He was not derogating from them. Well, he says, you have the oracles of God. Let us hear them. Are we better than Gentiles? You are as much under sin as the Gentiles. Read your own books, from which he then cites passages, and, relying on the claim of the Jews that the law belonged to them, that the law spoke to those who were under it, applies these denunciations to the Jews who were; thus stopping their mouths by their own oracles, which they claimed as belonging exclusively to them. There you are then, says Paul. You say the scriptures apply to you, and that is what they say;
SIN WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE UNIVERSE

Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world (John 1:29).

But now once in the consummation of the ages he has been manifested for [the] putting away of sin by his sacrifice (Heb. 9:26).

Christ has not taken away the sins of the world -- a very absurd notion -- and the subject is not about sins. Keep in mind that the subject matter in these Scriptures is sin, not sins. Heb. 9:26 is broader than John 1:29. Heb. 9:26 states:

1. The purpose for the manifestation of Christ -- the putting away of sin;
2. The means -- Christ’s sacrifice; and,
3. When the work was done -- in the consummation of the ages.

There is still another age coming, called in Scripture “the age to come.” That refers to the kingdom age, the millennium. This shows that the phrase, “consummation of the ages,” does not refer to the time-ending of all ages; it refers to certain ages, namely the ages of the probation of the first man. When the testing of man was to end, Christ appeared as the final test; and He was rejected and nailed to the cross. However, this was used in the ways of God to accomplish His purpose. Included in His purpose is the removal of sin such that the new heavens and the new earth (Rev. 21) will be entirely clear of sin.

It is not said that the putting away of sin has occurred. It still remains to be done, but the basis for doing it has been accomplished. The Lamb of God has accomplished the work by which this will be done.

Heb. 9:28 shows that when Christ appears, He will not take up the question of sin -- “without sin for salvation.” Those that so look for Him will have the benefit of His work on the cross.

These Scriptures do not mean that there will be no eternal punishment. Hell is not considered to be part of the new heavens and new earth. In the new

164. (...continued)

and then every mouth is stopped. That the Gentile was a sinner was admitted; they were not Jews by nature. But their own oracles brought in the Jews too; and every mouth was stopped. How any one could think that the statement that the law spoke to those who were under it, meant that it spoke to all, when the subject is the Jews alone possessing it and its advantages, would be hard to think, but for the prejudices of a system. I do not go on to insist on what follows, that the righteousness of God is manifested (χωρίς νόμου) absolutely apart from law, because I have done it elsewhere (Collected Writings 10:98, 99).

165. The reader should look at Elements of Dispensational Truth, vol. 1, second edition, chapter 3.9, and the charts on pp. 91 and 112 regarding the subject of the testing of the first man and its termination in the rejection of Christ. The Scofield system leaves this out. No wonder, for there really is no testing of the first man now and the Scofield scheme continues testing after the cross.
Chapter 11: Made the Righteousness of God in Him

We Made the Righteousness of God in Him

MADE NOW

It is a fact that the one who is in Christ is made the righteousness of God in Him -- now. It is not in glory that we shall be made this, because it is already true for the believer now. W. Kelly addressed this point, and while the remarks he wrote in answer to a question do not name the person he had in mind who is being rebutted, it is clear to me it was F. E. Raven:

The object of the enemy is plain: now as ever anything new or old to enfeeble the blessed fruit of Christ's work. Nobody doubts that righteousness was proved in setting the rejected Christ in glory (John 16). But here we are taught that, as God made Christ sin for us, so we become His righteousness in Christ. It is simply and solely our present standing in Christ. Nor does anybody question the future glorification of the saints but this hope is wholly outside the passage, which refers exclusively, as its full scope, to what we Christians become (or were made) now in Christ -- even God's righteousness. This is what many saints fail to believe. And the objection to apply in an absolute way to the believer, in his mixed condition down here, statements in scripture which refer to what he is in Christ, shows that it is pure unbelief, which is so blindly put forward as "advanced truth," to ensnare, unsettle, and overthrow the unwary. For the truth, which is to deliver from the weakness, and doubts, and all other evil to which the mixed condition is naturally subject, must be received and applied absolutely if taught of God: the faith is made void, and what is worse and goes along with it, the work of Christ and the grace of God alike. If I am not to believe in the most absolute way what the Holy Ghost declares I, a Christian, am already made in Christ, not only is all claim of advanced truth vain, but the gospel in any full sense is systematically denied. And the more evidently is it of Satan, because those who adopt such destructive reveries flatter themselves that they are going on to higher things, instead of virtually, though unwittingly, abandoning that distinctive truth, even as to the foundations of the faith, which used to characterize those waiting for God's Son from heaven. A sober and duly instructed Christian cannot doubt, unless under the strong bias of personal or party feeling, that the teaching is retrograde, false, and incompatible with the gospel.

He also called attention to this, regarding the word become:

166. The infernal beings noted in Phil. 2:10 will never be annihilated.
168. The Bible Treasury 19:240.
None of the early editors seems to have suspected the reading of the present (γινετος), which besides has not one good known MS in its favor. If true, it would mean a process going on, contrary to all sound doctrine taught elsewhere. The best witnesses, if not all, have the aorist, which imports an accomplished fact. 169

And a quotation from J. N. Darby is quite relevant in view of this:

"We wait [it is true] for the hope of righteousness by faith"; not for “righteousness by faith,” because we have that, or rather in Him are that; but we wait for the hope that belongs to it; and we know what that is, for it is that which {Christ} 170 has now in glory. And we are to be “changed into the same image from glory to glory.” Christ is our righteousness, and we have it, or rather we are it; “we are made the righteousness of God in him.” But we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness. The Spirit was sent down to witness that Christ is glorified; and hence He becomes an object to us in the glory. 171

MADE WHY?

The righteousness of God is involved with making the believer the righteousness of God in Christ. That is, the righteousness of God would be compromised if He did not do so, as J. N. Darby pointed out:

Now He glorified God by His work, accomplished for those who believe in Him. The Holy Ghost then descends on those who already believed in Him (John 7:39; Luke 24:49; Acts 1 and 2), and announces through their means this glorious salvation; announces to all men that the blood is on the mercy-seat, and invites them to draw near. But, besides that, He gives, as dwelling in the believer, the assurance that all his sins have been borne by Christ (1 Pet. 2:24), and are blotted out for ever (Rev. 1:5; Heb. 1:3, and other passages); that he, the believer, is made the righteousness of God in Christ; 2 Cor. 5:21. For the righteousness of God must accept and glorify the believer: otherwise the work of Christ has been done in vain, and God's righteousness is not put in exercise with respect to it; God does not recognize the value of this work, does not render to Christ that which He in every way deserved, which is absolutely impossible. Next, the Holy Ghost is in the believer, the seal for the day of redemption (Eph. 4:30), that is to say, for his entering actually into the glory of Christ; then He gives to the one in whom He dwells the consciousness that he is with Christ, in Christ, and Christ in him (John 14:16-20); that he is the child of God, and His heir, joint-heir with Christ (Rom. 8:16, 17; Gal. 4:5-9); finally, He takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to him, while leading him through the wilderness by the path that leads to the glory; Rom. 8:14. 172

169. The Bible Treasury 19:377n. See also his Notes on 2 Corinthians, in loco.
170. {The word “Christ” is in the older Morrish edition. No doubt it was mistakenly omitted in the newer edition.}
171. Collected Writings 30:60.
THE EFFECT NOW

The fact that we are made the righteousness of God in Christ has a bearing on what we read in 1 John 2:1:

We have, there, a standing witness of righteousness and of propitiation. This is because Christ is there, and He is both. Then, in 1 John 2:1, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father," etc. Christ is our righteousness, and so all is settled; if it were not, we should have sins imputed to us, but we stand in Him as our righteousness before God, and He is there according to the value of His propitiation; then, if we fail, He takes up our cause there, and grace comes to deal with our hearts and spirits, to restore us, without our righteousness ever being touched. It is because our righteousness never can be touched that we can go on. This is not our highest place, which we have as members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones; in one word, as being "in Christ"; but it is the highest character of His grace now to help us when we are in weakness, and in infirmity. If God commended His love towards us, it is when we were sinners, and as we learn this, we joy in God; He loved us when there was nothing in us to love. The grand testimony to absolute divine love is that God loved sinners. Well, it is the same way as to the graciousness of God. The grace of Christ is not, after all, our highest place; but it is the highest place of Christ. It makes us little and Christ great. To be put into Christ makes us great. 173

The reader should read the article, "Divine Righteousness," in Collected Writings, vol. 10.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 2 COR. 5:21 AND ROMANS

We have observed previously that it is a mistake to import 2 Cor. 5:21 into the treatment of the righteousness of God in Romans. This is again emphasized here in the words of A. H. Rule:

Here it is not the believer accepted according to Christ’s work, as in Rom.6, nor yet Christ, the righteousness of the believer before God; but it is the believer becoming the righteousness of God in Him. It is what he becomes in Christ. It is in Christ, not apart from Him. Christ is the perfect expression of God’s character. Christ on the throne is the expression of God’s righteousness there. So the Holy Spirit convicts the world of righteousness because He had gone to the Father (John 16). It was righteous in God to set Him on the throne, and He is there as the expression of that righteousness. But the believer through grace is in Him, and looked at as a part of Himself, so that he also becomes the expression of God’s righteousness in Him. “As He is, so are we in this world.” What marvelous grace! Made the righteousness of God in Him! This is of God. God made Christ the expression of what we are. He made Him to be sin on the cross. What are we but a mass of sin? And God made Christ the expression of this, in order that in Christ He might make us the expression of Himself in His character of righteousness. How manifest this will be when we are in the glory!

173. Notes and Jottings, p. 244
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Christ is the pattern of what we will be then. "When He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." ‘What a glorious position now belongs to the believer in the righteousness of God in virtue of Christ’s work! Surely it calls for praise and adoration from these poor hearts of ours. 174

NOT CHRIST’S RIGHTEOUS LAW-KEEPING

W. Kelly observed:

There prevails a notion (unknown to the Bible) that Christ was making out our righteousness when He was here below. Now the life of Christ was, I do not question, necessary to vindicate God and His holy law, as well as to manifest Himself and His love; but the righteousness that we are made in Christ is another thought altogether -- not the law fulfilled by Him, but the justifying righteousness of God founded on Christ’s death, displayed in His resurrection, and crowned by His glory in heaven. It is not Christ simply doing our duty for us, but God forgiving my trespasses, judging my sin, yea, finding such satisfaction in Christ’s blood that now He cannot do too much for us; it becomes, if I may so say, a positive debt to Christ, because of what Christ has suffered. It is not seen that the law is the strength of sin, not of righteousness. Had Christ only kept the law, neither your soul nor mine could have been saved, much less blessed, as we are. Whoever kept the law, it would have been the righteousness of the law, and not God’s righteousness which has not the smallest connection with obeying the law. It is never so treated in the word of God. Because Christ obeyed unto death, God has brought in a new kind of righteousness -- not ours, but His own in our favour. Christ has been made a curse upon the tree; God has made Him sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. Were the common doctrine on this subject true, we might expect it to be said, He obeyed the law for us, that we might have legal righteousness imputed or transferred to us. Whereas the truth is in all points contrasted with such ideas. Surely Christ’s obeying the law was not God’s making Him sin. So, in the passage that is so often used, “by His obedience many are made righteous.” How is His obedience here connected with the law? The apostle does introduce the law in the next verse, as a new and additional thing, coming in by the way. 175

Christ Made unto Us Righteousness

But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who has been made to us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and holiness, and redemption (1 Cor. 1:30).

Above we considered something of what the Christian is made -- in Christ. Here, we read of what Christ is made -- to the Christian.

THESE THINGS NOT IMPUTED

JND very tersly put down the idea of dragging imputation into this:

175. Lectures on the Epistle of Paul, the Apostle, to The Ephesians, London: Race, p. 104, n.d.
“Imputed” cannot be applied to all these words. If to any, it is not the subject of this text. People talk of “imputed sanctification”; how about imputed redemption? What does that mean? I hope we shall get more than imputed redemption on going into glory! It is the kind and measure and standard of these things, and that is Christ, and He made them of God to us. 176

GOD IS THE SOURCE

Of Him Are Ye in Christ Jesus. We are of God. It is of God we are in Christ Jesus. It is the result of sovereign grace, consistent with the righteousness of God. What we are before God, what we are of Him, is the result of His acting in accordance with His righteousness, acting upon us, as we saw when considering Rom. 3:21-26. “Of Him,” then, denotes the source of the blessing; and the blessing is “are ye in Christ Jesus.” Being in Christ Jesus, and what we are in Christ Jesus,” results from God Himself. Thus is man put down and God is everything.

Christ Jesus Has Been Made . . . From God. Not only do the words “of Him” direct our thoughts to God and His divine activity; so do these words that Christ has been made something, from God. All this comes from the heart of God. It is His good pleasure, and His good pleasure expresses itself through, and in, Christ.

So we have that which is of God, and that which is from God.

FOUR THINGS Christ HAS BEEN MADE TO US

Next we are told what Christ is made for us. Speaking generally, the Christian’s place before God is the place Christ has before God. His place is our place. He Himself is the measure of our place.

Concerning Wisdom. 1 Cor. 1 shows us the foolishness of man’s wisdom. It works against himself. Indeed, we read: “Christ God’s power and God’s wisdom” (1 Cor. 1:24). Man’s wisdom leads him to the pit, from which none escape. How different it is concerning the wisdom of God.

Not wisdom in the mind being acted upon and so I am wise about God, but “of him,” that is of God, “are ye in Christ Jesus.” I am of God, and I have my wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption of God, all in Christ. I am of God in Christ, and have all there of God in Christ. It comes from Him; it is not my thinking about Him. And so man is totally set aside, flesh is put down. The world by wisdom was not to know God, but I am in Christ as a new being, a new creature, created again; and I have wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption all in Christ. These verses are a remarkably complete statement of what a Christian is, with full redemption itself at the end, body and all. 177

176. Collected Writings 31:177. See also 32:340.
177. Collected Writings 26:207.
Christ is divine “wisdom” for us: God has made foolish the wisdom of this world, but “we speak wisdom among them that are perfect.” He has “abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will.” (See Eph. 1:8-10.) The divine revelation of all God's thoughts and intentions is in Christ; “the wisdom of God in a mystery,” which word means what only the initiated understand: as in Freemasonry, I do not know anything about it because I am not initiated. 178

In 1 Cor., chapter after chapter, the flesh in one form or another, is put down. In 1 Cor. 1, the wisdom of the flesh is shown in its true character; and in ch. 2 we see Paul excluding man's wisdom from His ministry, for he spoke God's wisdom in a mystery. Only God's wisdom will do for us.

Concerning Righteousness.

True it is that Christ is our life, and that we have received a nature which in itself is sinless, and that, looked at as born of God, we cannot sin because we are born of God. It is a life holy in itself, as born of Him. But, besides that, we have the flesh, though we are not in it; and the practical result in respect of our responsibility as to the deeds done in the body does not, even if we have this new life, meet the just demands of God, if we should pretend to present them as doing so. That is, righteousness is not made out by our being born again. We need, and have, a perfect righteousness apart from our life, though in Him who is our life. Christ is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. No soul can or ought to have solid settled peace in any other way. The whole perfection of Christ is that in which, without any diminution of its value, we are accepted. The delight of God in His obedience is that in which we are received. What we have done as children of Adam, He took on the cross in grace, and entirely put away. And what He did is our acceptance with God. It is needed for us, for otherwise we have no righteousness. It is a joy to us, because we enter, as immediate objects of it, into the delight which God has in His own Son. 179

Some have thought that, as Christ is made these things to us, the passage speaks of imputation. It does not, however. Imputed wisdom, or imputed redemption, has no sense; other passages do shew that imputation is true in the case of righteousness. But here the thought is not found; it is, that Christ gives the true character and reality of these things on the part of God . . .

Then we get “righteousness” -- the righteousness of God revealed on the principle of faith, so that we have no part in its accomplishment at all. Supposing you kept the law to a tittle, this would be man's righteousness, not God's. God's righteousness is revealed in His setting Christ at His right hand, as in John 16 the Spirit convinces the world “of righteousness, because I go to my Father.” Christ having perfectly glorified God, it was due to Him on the

179. Collected Writings 7:281.
part of God, to set Him in the glory, as He says: "He will straightway glorify
him" (John 13:31, 32). "Sit thou at my right hand." There was righteousness!
but it was done for us; and, because this work of redemption was done for us,
we get the result of it all. God is "just, and the justifier of him who believeth
in Jesus"; not "just and yet the justifier," but just in justifying.

And it is a different kind of righteousness in which we stand. Man's
righteousness is the measure of the judgment; but the righteousness of God is
the measure of my place before Him. What a poor sinner needs is that his sins
should be met; and, thank God, they are met. But Christ has done more; He has
glorified God. Where has God's love been manifested? In the cross. Supposing
He had cut off Adam and Eve, there would have been no love in it, though just.
If He had passed over all sins simply, we should have called it love; it is what
man calls mercy; but then it were no matter about righteousness. But, in Christ
dying on the cross, I get all that is in God perfectly glorified; and therefore He
puts the Man who did it into the divine glory.

He is "made unto us righteousness." It is of faith that it might be by grace.
A man may believe me when I tell him I have paid his debt, but his belief does
not add one farthing to the payment. All the good comes to us, but all the glory
comes to Him, and He is worthy of it. 180

Concerning Holiness.

I will here add a word as to sanctification. Scripture speaks of it, as both
absolute and progressive. Where it is connected with justification however, in
spite of "the orthodox," it precedes it in scripture. In its ordinary natural sense,
it is absolute, and once for all. A vessel sanctified to God is set apart to Him
simply and absolutely, and so is a person. We are saints by God's calling. But
as a man is a compound being, and the flesh is there as well as the new nature,
there may be, and ought to be, practical progress in practically reducing it to
subjection, and in the new man's growing up to Him who is the Head, in all
things. We are "sanctified in God the Father," "sanctified by the word," that
is, set apart to God: so we are "washed, we are sanctified, we are justified,
where it precedes justification. So when it is said we are "sanctified unto
obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" -- we are sanctified unto
the blood of sprinkling That it is not by the law is carefully brought out when
it is said; Christ is "of God made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and
sanctification, and redemption." There, it may be said, it follows righteousness.
I do not think it refers to application, but states what we are to hold as
sanctification; but I make no resistance, as I think there is an intended order,
though not a state described. The Spirit of God seems to me to be speaking of
the first necessity as before God, righteousness; and then the actual result, as
viewing the end of being actually before Him; and hence sanctification, the
setting apart of the whole man according to what is in Christ Himself, is
brought out afterwards; and then final delivery from our whole mortal state into
glory, which is what I understand here by redemption.

In 1 Thess. 5:23, we get what may justly be called progressive

sanctification -- "May the God of peace sanctify you wholly." Again, Heb. 12:14, "Follow after holiness." (See too 2 Cor. 3:18.) These fully justify speaking of progress in holiness, or practical setting apart of the heart and mind to God by its being filled with Christ, provided that the first truth be held of a primary setting apart, which is absolute and once for all, and that in the way of a new life, being born of God -- of water, and of the Spirit. If this be not held, sanctification becomes a mere gradual fitting of man as such for God, leaving out a new life, and denies that in that he is washed ($\alpha$e$l\upsilon o$) he needs not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.  

Concerning Righteousness and Sanctification.

It is true that Christ has been given to us, made of God sanctification, and it is true that no human efforts can add to sanctification; but though on one side the life given by God is holy -- Christ is our life -- it is not the whole truth that we are accounted holy in Him. It is evident that the writer loves holiness, but the word speaks of following holiness (Heb. 12:14): it says, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly." The sanctification that I have in Christ is as perfect as the wisdom and righteousness. But the righteousness is always perfect as my righteousness; I possess it, and so I am the righteousness of God in Him. Could I say I am holiness, or I possess perfect holiness? God sees me in Christ perfectly righteous; He sees me, we can say, perfectly sanctified -- granted -- but, as to righteousness, there is no other righteousness before God but Christ. If I could have any other righteousness, I would not wish to have it; but I do desire holiness; I follow after holiness: could I follow after righteousness? God chastens us that we may be partakers of His holiness; this could not be said of His righteousness. There is, thus, a difference between sanctification and righteousness, although we have both in Christ. We are, as to our persons, sanctified in Christ, since we have the new life; but our state of soul may be bad or good, and we ought to follow holiness. If this be done before knowing the perfect righteousness of God, before being justified and knowing it, we are not really seeking sanctification, but justification, hoping that if we were more holy God would accept us. There is no true holiness until we have peace; after we get peace, holiness for its own sake is the desire of the soul. We must certainly first of all go to Christ, that is not the question, but what we are to do when we have gone to Him, and have found peace. That we have received an entirely new life, which ought to be developed, and the activities of the heart in prayer, in the use of the means given by God, are things often forgotten when sanctification is spoken of.  

Concerning Redemption.

Then there is "redemption." He is "made unto us redemption," which is the full accomplishment, in full deliverance, of all God's plans and counsels as to us; all these are in Christ.  

181. Collected Writings 10:77, 78.  
183. Collected Writings 32:341.
Chapter 12

The Abandonment on the Cross and Communion with the Father

The Bosom of the Father

From time to time questions arise concerning the abandonment of Christ on the cross and how this bears upon the Son's communion with the Father. The question bears upon the relationship of the Persons of the Godhead. Now, there are several things that we must bear in mind concerning the light Scripture sheds on this.

The first point to bear in mind is that God never ceases to be God. The intra-Trinitarian relationship does not change. From everlasting to everlasting, He is God. The relationship of Father, Son and Holy Spirit has always been, and always will be; and uninterruptedly so. The abandonment on the cross did not change it. The abandonment did not mean that one divine Person in the Godhead abandoned another divine person in the Godhead so as to break up the Trinity. In John 1:18 we read:

No one has seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, \textit{he} hath declared \[him].

"In the bosom" tells the place where the only-begotten Son dwells. It is His eternal, never-interrupted dwelling place. It never has, and never will, change. It was never interrupted; no, not even during the three hours of darkness at calvary. The "bosom of the Father" is, of course, a figure of speech; but, oh, what fullness of meaning this conveys to us concerning that inexpressible relationship. Love never had a beginning. Love always existed in the Godhead in reciprocity. That is where love comes from. And the Son has divine competency to reveal that love that is in the Father's bosom. But though the Son came here in flesh, He never left that bosom. He came from that bosom to make known what is in that bosom which He never left. And He is full of grace and truth, and of His \textit{fullness} have we all received (John 1:14, 16). Think of the only-begotten Son filling that infinite bosom with the plentitude of His own fullness, with the glory and value of His own Person. And this did not cease to be true during the three hours of darkness on the cross.

Here are some helpful comments:
Here we get Christ (John 1:18) as the only-begotten Son. It is not, He was in the bosom of the Father, as though He had left it, but, “is in the bosom of the Father.” There He is even when upon earth, and even upon the Cross it was true. He was always in the nearness of intimacy indicated by the expression “is in the bosom of the Father.” On the cross He was, of course, not enjoying this relationship, but bearing wrath. The expression, “from the bosom of the Father,” is rather inexact, for the Son never left the bosom of the Father. The passage, “Son of man which is in heaven” connects the manhood with the divinity; the Son was in heaven, and that Son was a man upon the earth, therefore might it be said, “Son of man in heaven.”

On the cross, Christ was under wrath, and therefore -- although He was then doing something on account of which the Father would in a very especial sense love Him -- yet then He could not be enjoying the relationship between Him and His Father. In one sense, the Father never loved the Son so much as when He was upon the cross. This was what was in the Father’s mind, not what was in Chris’s, who could not be enjoying His relationship and drinking the cup of wrath at the same time. He gave Himself up to drink this cup. On the cross He was entirely occupied in bearing the wrath: it required a divine person to apprehend infinitely what the wrath of God was. I apprehend that at that time Christ was fully occupied with what He was bearing -- infinite pain -- which He infinitely realized. God was to be glorified on account of sin, and only such a One as He could do it. Still it is a very deep mystery, and it becomes us to be very careful in speaking about it. We find, however, that the time Christ was upon the cross was most distinctly clouded. There is a period before the three hours of darkness and a period afterwards, when Christ on the cross uses the term “Father.” He does not use it during the three hours of darkness: during this time He appears to be entirely occupied with God -- bearing wrath; everything is shut out but what was passing between Him and God. It is exceedingly terrible, this three hours of darkness. It is this terrible character of bearing wrath which makes it so dreadful to think, that {it is alleged} in His life Christ was bearing wrath. Christ sympathizes with the judgment He was bearing, that was right. See Psa. 22. Christ really bore this wrath {in the three hours of darkness} before His death, and when it was all done He gave up His life. After the bitter cry -- My God, why hast thou forsaken me? -- we see Him calmly giving up His spirit to His Father. The depth of death, looked at as the wages of sin, had been gone through during the hours of darkness. We see first, all man’s wickedness in His crucifixion fully brought out; then the darkness -- darkness and wrath -- God forsaking Him. Afterwards, having borne this wrath, He comes out and occupies Himself in fulfilling the rest of the scripture which had to be fulfilled in His death. The expression, “It is finished,” shows it, that just then He was departing because everything was done. 185 It was a most blessed time for Him, for the

184. {Things bracketed thus have been added by the editor.}
185. {A number of things are stated anticipatively in John’s gospel, a notable one appearing in John 17:4. In keeping with this, we take “It is finished” to be anticipative also. He must necessarily say that before the death and blood-shedding -- but the work included the death and (continued...)}
bitterness of death was past -- He was going to Paradise. He must actually die in order that the blood and water might come out for us. We never could enter into what Christ entered into upon the cross, therefore it was that He went through it for us. We have no revelation of what He passed through during the three hours of darkness: we could not understand it, it was between Him and God alone.

In John's Gospel we never get Jesus dying, as it were, but simply going out of the world to His Father. In John we get a divine person acting for us; in the other gospels, a man suffering for us. 186

**Glory Meeting Glory**

Let us ever keep before us the great fact that every word, way and work of the Lord Jesus had a divine spring. This is so because of the union in Him of the human and divine -- two natures, one Person. His death was a human death, but it was not a death accomplished in independence of deity. The accomplishment of that death had a divine spring, which imparted to that death all the value of His Person. So was it with the atoning sufferings and the abandonment. It was as man He bore this, but not as man apart from deity. The value of His infinite Person imparted infinite value to the sufferings and abandonment. The stream of blood and water from His side has all the value of His death in it; and the death has in it all the value of His atoning sufferings and abandonment during the three hours of darkness. It is all one great whole having the infinite value of His Person. This is typified in Lev. 16, where the cloud of incense rose up from the incense upon the coals of fire from the altar before Jehovah -- and that cloud of the incense covered the mercy-seat which was upon the testimony (Lev. 16:12, 13). There was another cloud present upon that occasion: “for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat” (Lev. 16:2). This is the Shekinah of glory bespeaking all the glory of God. What could possibly meet that glory? One has well said that righteousness can meet the claims of righteousness, but only a cloud could meet a cloud! And here two clouds met. One cloud was brought before the other. The cloud brought into the sanctuary rose up from the incense upon the burning coals. It signifies the glory of our Beloved coming up from the burning coals of Calvary before the God of glory. The rising up of His glory, so to speak, before the Shekinah of glory, and what answers to the blood sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat, all took place on the cross. The evil notion that the blood was taken to heaven to make propitiation there, among other things separates the cloud of the incense from the blood. The work entailed the three hours of suffering, the voluntary death, and the bloodshedding (accompanied by the water of cleansing). The blood has all the value of this work comprehended in its value -- which necessarily contains the value and

185. (...continued)

blood-shedding.}

glory of His Person. The blood rent the veil, so to speak. The rending of the veil, consequent upon the finishing of that work of infinite value to God, was the response of the Shekinah of glory, for God was infinitely glorified. Glory had met glory. “I have glorified thee on the earth, I have completed the work which thou gavest me that I should do it” (John 17:5). The abandonment, then, experienced as man, had a divine spring in it and had all the value and glory of His Person.

**Addressing God During the Three Hours of Darkness**

The other point that guides in this matter is that it was only during the three hours of darkness that Christ addressed God as “God.” During His life before the cross He always addressed Him as “Father” and, note well, He also did so during the first three hours on the cross. Moreover, having come through the three hours of darkness, He again addressed Him as “Father.” Thus we have guidance by His using Father or God, and by the three hours of darkness:

- It marks off the three hours in a special way. It is only during those three hours of darkness that He cried, “My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?” These are the hours of the atoning sufferings, sufferings that had all the value of who He was. Infinite in value and glory, this He imparted to the work wrought on calvary; because, every human word, work, and way of the Lord Jesus had a divine spring in it, and to these was imparted all of the value and glory of who He is -- because He is God and man united in one Person.

- During these three hours Christ was abandoned as the sin-bearer. After the three hours He again addressed the Father, into Whose hands He commended His spirit.

The question is, then, what is meant by the cry of being forsaken? What does it mean that He was forsaken?

We never find such a thought in scripture as the Father’s wrath being on the Son of His love. The great force to me of Psa. 22 is this: that the Son of man did not forsake, or forget to vindicate God’s Elohim’s glory, just when God, on account of His taking upon Him our judgment -- made sin for us -- forsook Him. The scene was in no sense one of enjoying anything, as far as the Lord Jesus was concerned, but not to forsake God, when God for our sakes had to forsake Him, proved that He was God and that the everlasting springs were in Himself. He knew who He was, and knew that none but Himself, as Man, could go through what He had undertaken to pass through. He was still the only-begotten which is in the bosom of the Father.” Therefore it could not be said that “the face of the Father, as the Father, was hidden from His own Son.”

---

187. See *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 7:201.
188. {Boldface emphasis is added throughout by the editor.}
189. G. V. Wigram in *Words of Faith*, 1883, p. 73.
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Now I believe that there never was a time when the Father's complacency in the Son was so great as at that solemn moment; but that is not the communion of complacency. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" is not the enjoyment of communion. 190 ♦

Never was the unfathomable love for God and man so proved in Him as when thus bearing our judgment at God's hand on the cross; but for that very reason it could not be a time of Christ's enjoying the communion of His love and delight as ever before and since. This was the necessary change then. 191 ♦

. . . surely never so the object of God's love as when drinking the cup, for He could say, "therefore doth my Father love me," a word that belongs only to a divine Person, but in His own soul tasting all its bitterness undiminished by any consolation, or it would not have been absolute and complete, yet showing His perfectness as to the state of His own heart in the words "my God." 192 ♦

He lived in the perfect relationship in which he was, and says, "my Father"; but on the cross, when drinking the cup of wrath, he says, "my God." That was His perfectness; it was not the expression of his full relationship, but it was the expression of infinite suffering of infinite claim. 193 ♦

. . . He walks in this path of obedience to obey to the end, finding that He could not be heard until the cup, of which He had a holy fear, had been drunk; that cup that He was going to drink, in being abandoned of God in His soul, then heard, doubtless, and glorified, but after having experienced to the end what it was not to be heard. 194 ♦

I believe Jesus's soul passed into peace {at the end of the three hours of darkness}, that He might give up His own Spirit {sic, i.e., spirit, His human spirit} -- which no one took from Him -- to God His Father. He delivered it up, as is stated in John 19:30; He commended it into His Father's hands (Luke 23:46). His soul, while living, had gone morally through all the full depth of the -- to us -- unfathomable suffering of the atoning work, and gave up His spirit Himself to God His Father. 195

The Cry of the Son of Man

Yes, God was there, not the approver of what was good only, but the Judge of all evil laid upon that blessed head. It was God forsaking the faithful obedient Servant; yet it was His God: this would -- could -- never be given up; for, on the contrary, He even then firmly holds to it, "My God, my God"; yet He has to add

190. Collected Writings of J. N. Darby 7:202 note.
195. Collected Writings of J. N. Darby 15:75n. {The Lord Jesus died as an act of his own will (John 10:18). He gave up His life voluntarily.}
now, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" It was the Son of the Father, but as Son of man necessarily that He so cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Then, and then only, did God desert His unswerving Servant, the man Christ Jesus. Nevertheless we bow before the mystery of mysteries in His person -- God manifested in flesh. Had He not been man, of what avail for us? Had He not been God, all must have failed to give to His suffering for sins the infinite worth of Himself. This is atonement. And atonement has two parts in character and range. It is expiation before God; it is also substitution for our sins (Lev. 16:7-10; Jehovah’s lot and the people’s lot), though the latter part be not so much the subject of the psalmist here {Psa. 22}, and I do not therefore dwell on it now. The ground, the most important part, of the atonement, though all be of the deepest moment, is Jehovah’s lot.

Here then we have God in His majesty and righteous judgment of evil -- God in the display of His moral being dealing with sin, where alone it could be dealt with to bring out blessing and glory, in the person of His own Son; One who could when forsaken of God, reach the lowest, but morally highest, point of glorifying God, made sin for us on the cross. It was the very perfection of His bearing sin that He should not be heard. There was the sharpest pain and anguish and bitterness of rejection; and did He not feel it? Did the glory of His person render Him incapable of suffering? The idea denies His humanity. Rather was His deity that which made Him endure and feel it most, and as none other could. "I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. But be not thou far from me, 0 Jehovah: 0 my strength, haste thee help me. Deliver my soul from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog" (Psa. 22:14-20).

Nevertheless the Lord Christ perfectly vindicates God who forsook Him there and then. Others had cried, and there was not one who had not been delivered; but it was His not to be. For the suffering must go to the uttermost, and sin be righteously atoned for, and this too not by power but by suffering.

But what is this that breaks on our ears, when the last drop in the cup is drained? "Thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns. I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee," says the Savior. He says, now He is risen from the dead, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren." He had declared it: such was His ministry here below, but now on an entirely new ground. Death and death alone disposed of sin; death, but His death alone, could dispose of sin, so that the sinner could bow to God's righteousness about it, and be brought without sin into the presence of God. And this is what God Himself declares. 196

196. The Bible Treasury, New Series 8:114.
Appendix 1: Propitiation Not Made in Heaven

Propitiation not Made in Heaven

There are variants of the idea that Christ took the blood to heaven. The evil form of this is that he had to take the blood to heaven to make propitiation there. Here, we will consider these ideas.

Q. Lev. 16 etc. Does the Hebrew distinguish “atonement” and “propitiation”? Are there two different words? What distinction does the chapter present? It is known that ἴλασμος in the NT is translated "propitiation," and in the Septuagint answers to "atonement."

A. The Hebrew word Kaphar (for the question) means to atone, or make atonement. So it is regularly; and Deut. 32:43, Isa. 47:11, Ezek. 16:63, Ezek. 43:20, Ezek. 45:15, 17, 20, are the same in substance, though the effect in some cases is meant, as pacified, purged, forgiven, merciful, etc. "Propitiate" would be just as good a rendering as "atone"; and no other word regularly expresses either but the one. There is however a real distinction definitely drawn in the chapter, not between atonement and propitiation, but between propitiation and substitution typified in Jehovah's lot and the scapegoat. The error which has so often been exposed in these pages is limiting propitiation exclusively to the use made of the blood by Aaron in the sanctuary. That theory necessarily involves the frightful error of denying that the offering of the slain victim is any part of the propitiation for our sins. What a slight on Christ's sufferings! For this monstrous theory is that propitiation was made "in heaven, and after death," thus nullifying for ever that great work of God by Christ's blood and death on the cross, and making it altogether dependent on another work "after death and in heaven," instead of the type met before God in heaven by what Christ suffered on earth. "You hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh (not when He was out of His body) through death" (not after death and in heaven). Assuredly to be "reconciled" is grounded on propitiation, and presupposes it; but the truth is that Christ fully reconciled us in the body of His flesh through death. The ghostly work after death and in heaven is a ghastly fable, and calls for abhorrence.

Christ's Entrance Into Heaven

Q. Is it true that Heb. 4:4, Heb. 9:11, 12 speak of Christ's entrance into heaven when He died, not on His ascension? R.T.

A. It is pure assumption, in order to scrape an appearance of evidence for the strange and unsound doctrine of propitiation made by Christ, not through the blood of His cross, but by His subsequent action as a separate spirit in heaven, by an unintelligent misuse of the types. Hence the pretense that Heb. 4:14 and Heb. 9:11, 12 refer to His entrance on death as priest! whereas other passages in the Epistle speak of His entrance on ascension as Man! Whosoever is bold enough to draw such a line is on every principle of truth bound to prove his assertion. Those who deny it, as almost if not all believers hitherto, stand on the common character thus far of Heb. 1:3, 6:20, 8:1, 9:24, 10:12, with the two texts in question. No one denies the Lord’s presence in Paradise immediately after death; no sober Christian has ever confounded this with His entrance after ascension on priestly function. Indeed one of the two texts maintains beyond cavil Christ’s entrance once for all into the sanctuary, having obtained eternal redemption. This is the sole entrance which the Epistle contemplates or allows: if any one disputes this, let him try to give an adequate proof. Dean Alford’s argument for simultaneity here is at issue with the doctrine of the Epistle. Indeed, ingenious as he was, he is unreliable often for orthodoxy. And as to Greek, think of a scholar coupling ἀποκριθείς εἰπε and similar cases with εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ... αἱ. λ. εὐράμενος! The rendering of the A. and R. Vv., Green, Davidson, etc., is alone tenable: so the Vulgate, etc. 198

C. E. Stuart’s Teaching That Christ Made Propitiation in Heaven in the Disembodied State

Regarding C. E. Stuart’s teaching, W. Kelly spoke of it as “The fundamental error which Mr. S. has embraced,” 199 “his evil view,” 200 “Mr. S.’s heterodoxy,” 201 and spoke of “... readers who are not leavened will see ...” 202 In his The Strange Doctrine of Propitiation, he pointed out that several in fellowship with him were put away when they were discovered to hold the doctrine. In that paper he wrote:

198. The Bible Treasury, New Series 2:256. See also The Bible Treasury 16:190.
199. Ibid. 16:190.
200. Ibid., p. 191.
201. Ibid. T. Weston, in Some Remarks on Mr. J. C. B.’s Letter, with a Few Facts, p. 2 (1900), wrote:
. . . he openly associated himself in service with a well-known propagator of false doctrine as to Christ’s propitiation. Not that he adopted the new teaching himself, but he defended it on the O.B. plea that only party spirit would call such error heterodoxy! If error as to the fundamental doctrine of Christ’s work upon the cross be not heterodoxy, what is? . . . With perfect truth did Mr. K. describe such unprincipled conduct as perfidious treason against Christ.
202. Ibid.
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No person known to hold it has been, or would be, tolerated in fellowship.

**Walter Scott Denied Propitiation**

**Was Completed on the Cross**

**THE BLOOD RENT THE VEIL**

The value of Christ’s shed blood was felt at the throne of God immediately upon its being shed. It was the finished work which was the basis for the rending of the veil, in the middle, from the top to the bottom. The blood of Christ rent the veil, so to speak.

And our consciences are purged by the blood which rent the veil and opened the way into the holy of holies, God in all His moral being and majesty being for ever glorified thereby. It is because Christ is in the holiest, and we by faith know Him while there, the Holy Ghost is sent down not only that we may enjoy the blessed fruit of Christ’s work, but that we may enter freely, boldly, in spirit where He is. 203

Atonement was finished on the cross. God was glorified and rent the veil, in token that the shed blood had opened a way into His presence. 204

Then God did dwell in the thick darkness, the way into the holiest was not made manifest, the veil was upon God’s presence, which is now rent and done away in Christ, and therefore on Christ’s death they that come to God are entirely in a new position. They must meet Him in personal responsibility, and that met by the blood of sprinkling, in the shedding of which the veil was rent; so that grace and holiness necessarily go together. 205

It is most important to keep together the sufferings in the three hours of darkness, the death, the shedding of the blood, and the rending of the veil. The rending of the veil did not depend on a supposed presentation of the blood in heaven. Moreover, the rending of the veil indicates that there was no necessity of carrying the blood to heaven. Its full effect for God was present to Him the moment the blood, accompanied by the water, was shed.

**WALTER SCOTT’S TEACHING THAT Christ MADE PROPITIATION IN HEAVEN IN THE DISEMBODIED STATE**

In *The Bible Treasury* 18:60, 61, W. Scott, who printed a paper called *Help and Instruction*, is criticized by W. Kelly thus:

> ... contains the following statements:

205. *Notes and Comments* 5:270.
Now we are not to understand by this that God needed to be propitiated by the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to reconcile Him to us. We, not God, needed the reconciliation, &c. (p. 38).

To speak then of propitiating God by sacrifice would be to belie the teaching of revelation, and to deny what He is Whom we know as our God. Such a thought would do for a heathen, but not for Christians, &c. (p. 39).

But if He needs not to be propitiated, &c. (Ib.);
To be propitiated on their behalf He never needed (Ib.);
Propitiation, therefore, had to be made, though God needed not to be propitiated (Ib and 40).

... But I affirm that the author {Walter Scott} has abandoned the truth of God on propitiation in a way which the simplest believer in the most unenlightened sect, if orthodox, would denounce as false and evil ... It is not merely (as in 1886) a fable supplanting the truth; it is since then an open contradiction of a most essential element of propitiation as revealed in all the scriptures of God, though presumably the last error {W. S.'s} flowed from the first {C. E. S.'s}. For if propitiation be only in heaven after death, there can be in it no abandonment of God, no suffering of Christ. Both errors make shipwreck of the faith; but the former is the parent of the latter, and necessarily involves it. 206

WK's strictures regarding the fundamentally evil teaching of C. E. Stuart applies also to W. Scott. I do not know all the places where he taught this evil doctrine, but here are several.

A booklet by Walter Scott entitled "Doctrinal Summaries," currently in circulation from an Open Brethren publisher, has been called to my attention by a reader of Thy Precepts who had written to a retailer of it, and received an unsatisfactory reply. This booklet contains C. E. Stuart's fundamentally evil doctrine that Christ made propitiation in heaven in the disembodied state -- not on the cross. This notion is based, as you may observe in the following quotation, on the sequence of events that took place on the day of atonement (Lev. 16). Reasons for rejecting these conclusions have already been given in this series in the article on The Day of Atonement, by W. Kelly. We will not here refute this teaching but rather call attention to it that you may be warned. W. Scott wrote:

Now propitiation, it will be observed, was effected by *blood-sprinkling*, that is, the presentation of the blood God-ward, not simply by *blood-shedding*. *Shed* at the altar; *sprinkled* on and before the mercy seat. The latter was the work of the priest, the former generally that of the offerer beside the altar.

206. This is from an 1890; article, "The Denial of Propitiating God by Sacrifice" The article is missing in The Kelly Collection CD-ROM.
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Christ as High Priest in the upper sanctuary, 207 has made propitiation by His own blood (compare Lev. 16:14-17, the type, with Heb. 9:11,12, the antitype). 208 This He alone could do in His character and office as a merciful and faithful High Priest (Heb. 2:17, 209 where reconciliation should read “propitiation”). But He not only made it by His blood, but He is the propitiation, or blood-sprinkled mercy-seat. (1 John 2:2; 4:10; Rom. 3:25) . . . only in the heavenly Sanctuary, i.e., the immediate presence of God. He shed His blood as a Victim; by it He entered into the holiest as High Priest (Heb. 9:12). 210 Carefully distinguish between the blood shed and sprinkled. This latter effects propitiation.

In Selections from Fifty Years Written Ministry, London: Holness, 1913, he wrote this regarding the Lord saying “finished”:

The words do not primarily refer to the completion of atonement (p. 70).

Do you wonder why he said this? Consider this:

Christ as high priest, and in the Sanctuary above, has made propitiation by His own blood . . . (p. 172).

He bases this on the type in Lev. 16, and he also seemed anxious to point out this:

Atonement in all its parts had to be effected on that one day of 24 hours (p. 172).

So slavishly following the time sequence in the type, 211 he would have to conclude that Christ in the disembodied state took the blood to heaven between 3 PM and 6 PM on the day He died, in order to make propitiation in heaven. His appeal to Heb. 9:12 is baseless. That verse does not tell us that

207. “I have glorified thee on the earth, I have completed the work which thou gavest me that I should do it . . .” (John 17:4). Not only was it on the earth, but the rending of the veil signified that the work of propitiation was finished (on earth). What W. Scott says really means that propitiation was accomplished after the veil was rent, by Christ taking the blood to heaven and making propitiation there.

208. I suggest that the reader consult W. Kelly’s comments on Heb. 9:11, 12 in his book on Hebrews for the true meaning of this Scripture.

209. This is another distortion of Scripture. As W. Kelly remarked, “The propitiation of Christ is the basis of His priestly action on high” (Exposition of . . . Hebrews, in loco). Christ was not a priest on earth (He was of the tribe of Judah). His Melchizedec priesthood was not for offering blood, but was founded upon the work having been finished.

210. This evil teaching necessitates that Christ entered heaven two times; once in the disembodied state to sprinkle the blood, and the second time as resurrected man. Heb. 9:12, pressed into this unholy use, says, “. . . has entered in once for all into the [holy of] holies.” Scripture teaches but one entry.

211. Actually, on the Day of Atonement, as someone remarked, two bloods were brought into the holiest; that of the bullock (Lev. 16:14), and subsequently also that of the goat of Jehovah’s lot (Lev. 16:15). Yet we regard all this as speaking of one work. We do not reason from this that Christ presented blood twice, slavishly following the events in the type.
Christ entered with His blood; and moreover, the verse speaks of Christ’s ascension into heaven in manhood in resurrection. He has taught his evil doctrine in a number of books and used to break bread and preach among “Open-Brethren,” as he was doing at the time this book was published.

In his book, The Tabernacle, he wrote:

Christ as High Priest, and in the upper Sanctuary, has made propitiation by His own blood (compare Lev. 16:14-17 the type, with Heb. 9:11, 12 the antitype. 212

Sorry to say, this doctrine was given voice in A. C. Gaebelein’s magazine, Our Hope, vol. 20, p. 419 (Jan. 1914), where W. Scott’s article, “Concerning Propitiation” was included -- an article refuting the notion that Christ at present is making propitiation; and that gave an opportunity to Walter Scott, who wrote:

Propitiation was actually made in heaven itself, after Christ’s death, and by Himself as High Priest . . . Has Christ after death entered into the heavenly Sanctuary in His character as High Priest? He has. Then propitiation was made.

In Russell Elliot’s magazine, The Faith and the Flock 4:210, writing on 1 John 2:2, W. Scott said:

Propitiation was made by blood-shedding on the cross and blood-sprinkling on the throne (Lev. 16).

By “on the throne” is meant the throne of God in heaven, of course!

An obituary of Walter Scott appeared in the Open Brethren periodical, The Witness, vol. 63, p. 282 (Dec. 1933 – in which there was an article by him), which said:

WALTER SCOTT, the oldest well-known author and worker amongst us, passed to his Reward from Hull, on Nov. 2, at the ripe age of 95.

Among notice of his appreciated books is the above cited The Tabernacle.

If anyone come to you and bring not this doctrine, do not receive him into [the] house, and greet him not; for he who greets him partakes 213 in his wicked works (2 John 10, 11).

A little leaven leavens the whole lump (Gal. 5:9).

Walter Scott responded to W. Kelly in a dishonest way, not at all surprising since WS was supporting evil doctrine. Support of, and imbibing evil, seems almost always, if not always, to affect a person’s integrity. In May 1890, then, he wrote,:;

213. Partakes is koinoneo, which signifies that you would make common with the person.
Mr. Kelly’s attack is a wild and reckless one, and overshoots the mark entirely.

He attempted to defuse WK’s strictures by pointing out that the opening quotations in the Bible Treasury article, from WS’s Help and Instruction paper, pp. 38-40 (1888) — a copy of which lies before me as I write this — appeared in The Christian Friend, 1880, edited by Edward Dennett; and WS thus sought to parry WK’s strictures and make him appear ludicrous. Moreover, WS falsely enlisted the name of J. N. Darby as having found no fault with that 1880 article by CES entitled "Propitiation." Listen:

The article . . . contains no new development of doctrine, for it appeared originally — with the approval of the Editor — in “The Christian Friend” for 1880 . . . It is true that the late A. P. C. {Cecil?} wrote to Mr. Darby complaining of the article and which led to a correspondence between Mr. Darby and Mr. Stuart {the author of the article}. But the attention had been called to it, and after careful perusal Mr. D. found nothing incorrect in the article, and informed Mr. S. that he would not have written about the matter if it had not been for A. P. C.’s persistent urging. Both before and after the correspondence with Mr. D., the Editor, Mr. E. Dennett was thoroughly at one with Mr. Stuart as to the teaching in question.

It so happens we know that WS wrote falsehood concerning JND. I would not believe him about E. Dennett then, either. This is an exhibition of what evil teaching does to integrity. Now listen to JND, who wrote to E. Dennett on Feb. 18, 1881, about that very article written by CES:

My dear brother, I do not like the pages you sent to me, because they perplex the mind as to what it needs as fundamental truth . . . But the first two lines state boldly that God does not need to be propitiated, and the second line of page 246 throws all into confusion. 214

Further along in the letter he wrote, “The mistake is . . .” He most certainly, and rightly objected to the article by C. E. Stuart. But at this point in time it was not taught by CES that Christ made propitiation by blood in heaven in the disembodied state. But looking back, we can see the development of CES’s evil teaching here. The fact that in his 1890 article WK referred to those, as it turned out, 1880 views, as “a development, new to most,” might perhaps mean WK thought it was a development of CES’s 1886 views, but perhaps not; for WK also wrote:

Those words have alarmed souls who did not see the doctrine of propitiation in {CES’s paper} “Recent Utterances.”

In any event, Walter Scott, mired in evil teaching, used this as an occasion to pit WK against JND, about whom he, WS, spoke falsehood. All of this is

viciousness and untruthfulness. 215

Perhaps the 1888 *Help and Instruction* assembled by W. Scott, is what caused E. Dennett to publish in *The Christian Friend*, during 1888, a paper by himself, “Propitiation: What is it, and Where Made,” wherein he emphatically rejects the teaching that Christ entered heaven in the disembodied state to make propitiation there. 216 But that paper does not address the matter of God requiring propitiation. E. Dennett had taken care of that in *The Christian Friend* back in 1881, p. 112, where, in a “Note on Propitiation,” he wrote:

... He absolutely required the propitiation as the alone righteous ground on which He could righteous meet and justify the sinner...

When it is sometimes said that God did not need to be propitiated, it should be understood as meaning that He did not need to be moved or disposed to act in grace towards us...

ED has here, though himself sound, watered down the meaning of CES's words. But Walter Scott spoke *falsehood* in saying that:

Mr. E. Dennett was thoroughly at one with Mr. Stuart as to the teaching in question.

It is not a question of words, but of meaning and intent meant to be conveyed. 217

215. WS did not state where the papers and extracts he compiled came from, nor did he date them. Of course, one could claim, “I am letting the truth speak for itself,” pious-sounding clap-trap when evil is in question -- but in view of the great controversy that raged over CES's teaching, it looks to me more like a trap for the unwary; and see how he calumniated JND and tried to put WK in a certain light. Had the papers' sources been stated, and dated, he would not have been in the position where he thought he could get away with what he did in replying to WK's strictures.


217. There appeared in *Words of Faith*, 1882, an article in two parts, “Salvation and Atonement...,” by C. E. Stuart. This contains some statements which may not at all convey his teaching about propitiation being made above in the heavenly Sanctuary. But perhaps they did in the mind of the writer. In any event, the time soon came when he was charged in an integrity matter, from which he was exonerated by the Reading, England assembly -- though a division ensued. He soon came out with false teaching regarding the Christian's standing and next enunciated the doctrine of propitiation in heaven. Is there no moral connection among such things? Generally when persons fall into doctrinal evil, a loss in integrity accompanies it. And sometimes the evil doctrine is being developed secretly, but the loss in integrity has already showed itself. It reminds me of the case of B. W. Newton.
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The Scofield Reference Bible and the Presentation of the Blood in Heaven

The *Scofield Reference Bible* presents three possible solutions to a felt difficulty regarding the words to Mary, in John 20: “Touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father.” The difficulty results from the fact that in Matt. 28 he allowed them to hold his feet. The offensive explanation, apparently favored by C. I. Scofield is this:

That Jesus speaks to Mary as the High Priest fulfilling the day of atonement (Lev. 16). Having accomplished the sacrifice, He was on His way to present the sacred blood in heaven, and that, between meeting with Mary in the garden and the meeting of Mt. 28:9, He had so ascended and returned: a view in harmony with the types. 218

Were you aware that C. I. Scofield referred to Walter Scott, in the Introduction, as “the eminent Bible teacher,” among those to whom he gave credit for “suggestions of inestimable value”? You will notice, however, that the explanation quoted:

1. does not state that Christ went to heaven in the disembodied state;
2. does not state that Christ made propitiation there; and,
3. says it is a view in harmony with the types.

**Point 1.** Concerning point 1, what the quotation does mean is that Christ went to heaven in the resurrected state and presented “the sacred blood in heaven.” What for? The next chapter will take up the subject of Christ’s priesthood and I forbear comment on that matter here. This is a total fabrication that Christ so entered heaven in the resurrected state and flies right in the face of the express declaration of the Word of God that He entered once (Heb. 9:12); not twice, as this imagined entry requires.

**Point 2.** And while it is true that C. I. Scofield did not state that this was to effect propitiation in heaven, for what other reason did He make this trip to heaven, in the resurrected body, with the blood, to present it there? The note said that this is “a view in harmony with the types”; having said that “Jesus speaks to Mary as the High Priest fulfilling the day of atonement.” Note well the word “fulfilling.” There is but one meaning to this, though it is not expressly stated. It is implicit in this that He is viewed as going there to fulfil the type of presenting the blood at the mercy-seat in Lev. 16. Thus, in effect, the work was not completed on the cross. Propitiation was not made on the cross. It was, in this view, made when Christ, in the resurrected body, went into heaven to present the blood to make propitiation. In the type, the

---

presenation of the blood was made on the day of the sacrifice, not three days later, as, allegedly, Christ did.

**Point 3.** It is not a view in harmony with Lev. 16. Why, the statement is *ludicrous!* Aaron went into the holy of holies *more than once.* He brought in the incense with the blood of the bullock and came out again. Then, v. 16, he killed the goat and brought the blood within "as he did with the blood of the bullock." When He had come out after presenting the blood of the first goat (a second entrance into the sanctuary), then he dealt with the scape-goat, which speaks of substitution. Also he had to enter, at least the holy place, for another purpose. So why not have Christ entering two, if not three, times into heaven in connection with bringing blood there? -- and then claiming a work of substitution subsequent to the second presentation of blood? In keeping with the type of Lev. 16 indeed!

The minor difference, then, between this and Walter Scott/C. E. Stuart is that in one case Christ went into heaven in the disembodied state, and in the other case, He went into heaven in the resurrected state -- to make propitiation by blood *there* – and not on the cross. Saying "Having accomplished the sacrifice" does not alter this. It separates the propitiation from the cross, from the sufferings in atonement; and from substitution, if there even be such in this ludicrous and evil scheme. Was substitution effected on the cross while propitiation was effected in heaven (*backwards* from the time-order of dealing with the two goats in Lev. 16)? Or, was substitution also effected in heaven at the same time as propitiation? I speak of the true meaning of the scheme, its results and implications, not of the explanations and palliations of those who put forth such schemes. Away with all this. Propitiation and substitution were effected upon the cross; and as soon as the blood was shed, the infinite value was immediately before God – and He rent the veil.

The *New Scofield Reference Bible* lets this most offensive note stand.

Moreover, there came from the Lord's side blood and water. Why is the water left out of this doctrine? Why did not Christ carry the water to heaven? If you tell your child not to go into the mud puddle and he does it, two things occur. He is guilty of disobedience and he is dirty. You must deal with both. Sin does two things: it makes one guilty and it makes one dirty, morally dirty. The work of Christ provides for both. You must not separate the blood from the water.

*End.*
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