



3 3433 07955980 7

20

Great
a
Cloud
of
Wisdom

The
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860

634 *Ecology & Parasitology*
Journal of Parasitology

1911.

ZFHF

Southwest

The

First Millennial

Faith.

8/21/97

THE
FIRST MILLENNIAL
FAITH.

THE CHURCH FAITH
IN ITS
FIRST ONE THOUSAND YEARS.

BY AUTHOR OF
NOT ON CALVARY.


New York
SAALFIELD & FITCH
12 BIBLE HOUSE.

London
EDEN, REMINGTON & CO.,
15 KING STREET—COVENT GARDEN.

1893.

COPYRIGHTED, 1893,
By SAALFIELD & FITCH.

Press of Styles & Cash,
New York.



PREFACE.

“*Not on Calvary*”* was written with the earnest desire that it might help to a better understanding of the goodness of God. The considerate treatment it received from the religious as well as from the secular press, and its wide circulation, are assurances that its views have been welcome to many; yet the theories of the author were apparently new, because they were—practically—so old, for he substantially advocated the doctrine concerning the Atonement that was almost universally held in the Christian church, during the first thousand years of its existence.

It was intended to combat the “satisfaction

* “*Not on Calvary*”: English edition, Eden, Remington & Co., 15 King Street, Covent Garden, London.

theory"—the theory that God's justice could be satisfied only by the sacrifice of His Son ; it was a plea—founded only on the words and history of our Lord—for the life-long sacrifice of the Son of God as the means of our redemption ; using the word redemption in its literal sense of "buying back" from the slavery that followed as a consequence of the grand but misused power that God had, in the beginning, given to Satan ; and

"*The First Millennial Faith*" is a concensus of historical evidence to support this—to show that the satisfaction theory originated with the monk Anselm, at the close of the first one thousand years of the Christian church.

The Reformation did away with many of the corruptions that originated in the dark period of Christian history ; but this satisfaction theory still lives, and is popularly taught to the unsettling of the faith of many. To such, this book is a further plea for the life-long sacrifice of the

Son of God as the means of our redemption ; a declaration of the unqualified love of God for His creatures, and attributes sin, suffering, and death to the malicious workings of the fallen archangel, the enemy of God and man.

Listen, then, to the voice of the Church speaking in her earlier and purer days.

The compiler has availed himself of the careful studies of Professor John W. Draper, LL.D.,—whose “Intellectual Development of Europe” is largely quoted from—and he acknowledges his obligations to the Rev. William Du Hamel, for his faithful researches into the teachings of the early Christian writers.



INTRODUCTION.

If, in the impartial presentation of evidence to prove what were the ethical, the intellectual, and the theological conditions of the period that produced the monk Anselm and his theory of the necessity of the Christ sacrifice to appease the justice of God, it became necessary to reproduce some of the dark pages of ecclesiastical history, it is with profound regret that in no other way could the condition of that period be fully understood ; and only when the force of those conditions are fully comprehended can we make a just estimate of the First Scholastic and his dogma. Yet, essential as they are, the compiler of these pages would not present those sad records, did he not believe that the day is near when the Universal Church will no longer permit itself to be manacled to a dead and ignoble past, but will be free to restore again the “*The First Millennial Faith.*”

“ The Church was purer in her younger days,
’ Ere the world yet smiled upon her.”

“ Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see,
and ask for the old paths where is the good way, and
walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.”

The

First Millennial

Faith.

PART I.

The First Scholastic.

It would be a grave omission, in attempting to write the history of any great movement, if we did not carefully depict the moral and intellectual conditions of the period that gave it birth. True as it is of any phase of merely intellectual development, it becomes a paramount necessity, when a moral and religious philosophy is presented, that we should accurately describe the influences of the century in which it originated. Only in this light can we give to such a philosophy a just and proper consideration.

The eleventh century found the Church of

Christ sunken to the level of an ambitious despotism, unable to cope with the surrounding moral degradation that everywhere abounded. The countries of Europe presented to the student of history a vast scene of rapine and plunder, usurpation and anarchy. Into this conflict and carnage there entered with lofty assertions the pretended vicar of Christ—a usurped office already disgraced by infamy and lust. No pages of court history reveal more revolting scenes than we find in the history of those pontiffs that affected to exalt themselves above the majesty of kings.

After a shocking but nevertheless truthful account of the disgraceful condition of the Papal court in the tenth century, Dr. Draper writes:

Volume I.,
Chapter XII.,
Page 381. “John XIII. was strangled in prison; Boniface VII. imprisoned Benedict VII., and killed him by starvation; John XIV. was secretly put to death in the dungeons of the Castle of St. Angelo, and the corpse of Boniface was dragged by the popu-

lace through the streets. In Rome the sentiment of reverence for the supreme pontiff, nay even of respect, had become extinct. Throughout Europe the clergy were so shocked at the state of things that, in their indignation, they began to look with favor on the intention of the Emperor Otho to take from the Italians the privilege of appointing the successor of St. Peter, and to limit it to his own family. But his kinsman, Gregory V., whom he placed on the pontifical throne, was soon compelled by the Romans to fly: his excommunications and religious thunders were turned by them into derision; they were too well acquainted with the true nature of those terrors; they were living behind the scenes.

“A terrible punishment awaited the anti-pope, John XVI. Otho returned into Italy, seized him, put out his eyes, cut off his nose and tongue, and sent him through the streets mounted on an ass, with his face toward the tail, and with a wine-bladder on his head.

“It seemed impossible that things could be worse ; yet Rome had still to see Benedict IX., A.D. 1033, a boy of less than twelve years, raised to the Apostolic throne. Of this pontiff, one of his successors, Victor III., declared that his life was shameful ; so foul, so execrable, that he shuddered to describe it. He ruled like a captain of banditti rather than as a prelate. At last the people, unable any longer to bear his lasciviousness, homicides and abominations, rose against him. In despair of maintaining his position, he put up the Papacy at auction. It was bought by a presbyter named John, who became Gregory VI., A.D. 1045.

“More than a thousand years had elapsed since the birth of our Saviour, and such was the condition of Rome. Well may the historian shut the annals of those times in disgust ; well may the heart of the Christian sink within him at such a catalogue of hideous crimes. Well may he ask : ‘Were these the representatives of God upon earth—these, who have truly

reached that goal beyond which the last effort of human wickedness cannot pass? ”

Urban II., a French Pope, instituted the first of the Crusades; thereby adding much to the power of the Papacy. But this so-called Holy War is sullied by such a record as the following :

Draper,
Volume II.,
Chapter I.,
Page 23. “But in the capture by the Crusaders, the brains of young children were dashed against the wall; infants were thrown over the battlements; every woman that could be seized was violated; men were roasted by fires; some were ripped open to see if they had swallowed gold; the Jews were driven into their synagogue and there burnt; a massacre of nearly 70,000 persons took place, and the Pope’s legate was seen partaking in the triumph.”

Had we need of further evidence of the condition of Ecclesiasticism in the century that produced Anselm, we might recall that then was first established the dogma of Transub-

stantiation. The refusal to accept this dogma constituted the offence for which, in the reign of Queen Mary alone, hundreds of Protestants were burned at the stake.

True, this dogma was suggested at the Seventh General Council, held at Nice in 787; but it met with no welcome; and though revived in 831 by Paschaise Radbert, an obscure monk, the Church received it with mingled horror and ridicule. Berenger of Tours met it with pungent sarcasm, and Raban Maur, Archbishop of Mentz—counted by some among the Fathers—denounced it as “an error and a novelty.”

It remained for the period that gave birth to Anselm's satisfaction theory, to sanction by Papal authority, Leo IX., this blood-stained dogma of the Material Presence.

This state of affairs in the ecclesiastical world reflected a condition even worse in the social life of the people. The peasants were little

more than serfs, and the feudal lords were the worst of despots. A vile fetichism of factitious relics, that were working pretended miracles in all directions, constituted the individual piety. Even the ordinary religious life was no better. Ecclesiastical preferments, bishoprics, benefices, etc., were generally bought and sold. Simony, in short, was openly justified. In Normandy Dean Church, the clergy were as a whole "rude, ignorant and self-indulgent to a degree that was monstrous and intolerable." In the midst of all this there arose a Norman monastery, by far superior to any religious institution of that perverse age, the House of Bec. It was founded by a hermit soldier, Herlwin by name, and was first made famous by Lanfranc, who afterwards, in the reign of William the Conqueror, was the spiritual father of England. To this monastery, for the purpose of study, there came a youth of varied life and diverse fortunes.

He was born at Aosta in Piedmont, in 1033.

His home life, owing to the brutality of his father, was not happy. But his mother, a devout and godly woman, made a deep impression upon his passive nature.

Monastic life attracted him from the first; but in consequence of his father's refusal to permit him to enter upon it, he strayed off into a worldly life in which there was much of licentiousness. After his mother's death he left home and wandered through Burgundy and France. Lanfranc attracted him to Bec, and shortly afterward he assumed the monastic vows (1060), devoting himself to the study of that abstruse philosophical theology that made him the father of scholasticism. The superiority of his mind soon made itself felt, and he succeeded Lanfranc as Prior of Bec in 1063, when the latter was promoted to the Abbacy of Caen. On the death of Herlwin (1078) he became Abbot. For fifteen years he remained in this position, becoming widely renowned for austerity and intellectual acumen. Here he

wrote the Monologion and Prologion—apologies for the Christian religion.

Bec flourished and acquired property even in England, so the Abbot Anselm must go thither to attend to the interests of his monastery. The intercourse with that country, then begun, ended with his being almost compelled to accept the Archbishopric of Canterbury from the hands of that villainous prince, rough-handed William Rufus, then very ill and doubtful of his recovery. With that king and his successor (Henry) Anselm waged an almost continual contest, which ended, in Henry's reign, by the formal acknowledgment of the Papal power in England. During this time he was more than once an exile from the land. It was while sojourning at the village of Schlavina, that he wrote his "Cur Deus Homo" (Why God Became Man), with which we are chiefly concerned; for therein he originated his judicial theory of the Atonement.

Anselm may with justice be called the flower

of mediæval monasticism. His character was the purest: with bravery and heroic devotion he sought to serve God through the Pope, whom he sincerely believed to be His representative. His greatest apologist, however, tells us that he was a “monk of monks, a dogmatist of the dogmatists, powerful and severe in mind, stern in individual life,” yet he did not escape the evil influences of his age, though in some respects far superior to it. He died on the 21st of April, 1109. His infirmity and fatal illness were the results of a tortuous ascetism. It is but natural that one who believed that God delights in such self-torture, would also agree to that intellectual and legal doctrine of the Atonement that he originated.

Dean Hook concludes his life of Anselm by the statement (in substance) that they will praise him most effectively who see in his life both the evil and the good. We may praise him then for his heroism, his virtue, and his sincerity; but we must not forget that it was

Church's
Life of
Anselm,
Page 96.

he who first forced free England to submit to the galling yoke of Papal usurpation, and saddled upon the theological world a harsh and repugnant conception of a bloody, cruel, and avenging God, who could find judicial satisfaction in the shedding of the innocent blood of His Son. The intellectual efforts of St. Anselm and the other schoolmen amounted to little more than quibbling. There were no great doctrinal controversies at the time, and their hair-splitting discussions chiefly in a circle, were in reality only a by-play with intellectual weapons. Milman says that "of those Latin Chris-
tianity,
Vol. IX.,
Page 118. vast monuments of theology which amaze and appal the mind, the sole remnant is that barren amazement."

Draper,
Vol. II.,
Page 13. "We have just cause to expect little of permanent value from this source, since history, criticism and science were almost unknown. Latin was the language of scholars, while Greek was hardly studied, a fact especially unfortunate since the early Greek Fathers

were—without an exception—the best theologians.”

Of Anselm in connection with this scholasticism, Hardwick justly regards him as the purest and most able type of it in the West : “He occupied the place of St. Augustine in relation to the Middle Ages. The basis of his principles was also Augustinian ; but the form and color which they took from the alliance now cemented between them and Aristotelean dialectics, gave to Anselm a peculiar mission, and compared with his great master, a one-sided character.”

But in the analysis of his character and of his doctrine, let us not forget the lesson that a comprehensive study of the history of Christianity teaches ; for however much we may admire the purity of motive of the “Puritans” of any age, the men who have heroically come out from the low moral conditions into which the Christianity of their age had fallen, let us not fail to recognize the always attendant conditions. For on

the higher plane to which they rose, the atmosphere was as cold as it was pure, and in every instance they advocated theories that presented a hard and unlovely representation of God's character; theories that later generations—with no less purity, but with a truer appreciation of God's love—rejected. Lauding the noble heroism and self-denial, let us recognize the universal tendency of such reformers, to attribute to God the same stern condemnation of the sinner that they exhibited in their own lives—lives that were made incapable of charitable judgment, through asceticism.



PART II.

The Witness of the Fathers.

Of what importance or value are the works of those who have been called the Fathers of the church? Their writings were not inspired; yet because of this there are many who, while they look upon certain modern writers as little short of infallible, utterly despise an appeal to the primitive authorities. Do these authors supersede the teachings of the Bible? Certainly not.

Yet zealous Christian authors, often disciples of the Apostles, or of those who have walked with Jesus in the flesh—in many cases themselves martyrs and confessors—are worthy of attention; and, whereas they wrote before the days of later controversy, may fairly be regarded as unbiased witnesses, and become almost com-

plementary to the inspired Word. They were human, however, and in some things disagreed among themselves; but they were diligent students of Holy Writ; indeed, to such an extent that the New Testament, if lost, could almost be restored through the quotations they made from it. Moreover, it is upon their authority that we accept certain writings as canonical and inspired: and while much that they have written seems on the borderland of mysticism; was largely influenced by that Eastern mode of thought that delights in an involved method of reasoning and in subtle distinctions, still they were too closely held by the faith as they had received it to permit themselves to advocate such error as was reserved for Anselm—so far removed from the period of our Lord's immediate witnesses—to promulgate.

Yet no one who analyzes their mode of thought can for a moment doubt that, if any authority had been given them to advocate the satisfaction theory, the early Christian

writers would have been irresistibly attracted by its subtle mysticism.

Let us observe how positive was their assertion of the constant active malignity of Satan. How constant, too, their reference to the antagonism of Satan to our Lord while on earth.

Let us then value their testimony, and regard as of especial value the literary productions of the heroic Christians of the first three hundred years of the church's life, while persecution made it hold fast to the faith delivered to it, and before it had been secularized by the sanction of worldly power.

How thoroughly contrary was the theory of the ascetic Anselm to the teachings of the Fathers, we shall now attempt to establish.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS, A.D. 60-160.

—Let us now essay a definition of that term :

Smith's Dic-
tionary of
Christian
Biography,
Vol. I., p. 147.

“Confined to those who are known—
or may reasonably be presumed—to

have associated with and derived their teaching directly from some Apostle."

ST. CLEMENT OF ROME, who lived at the close of the first century, was one of the first Bishops of Rome, if not the first. He is supposed by many to be the Clement named by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Phillippians (iv. 3). He was the writer of a letter to the Corinthian church, and addressed them as the authoritative representative of the Roman brethren. His letter is devoted almost wholly to church dissensions at Corinth; and there is hardly any reference in it to doctrinal matters. He speaks incidentally of death having come into the world through unrighteous and ungodly jealousy on the part of Satan, and of "the blood of Christ as being precious unto the Father and as winning the grace of repentance for the whole world." Speaking of the Father and Maker of the whole world, he says: "Let us note how free He is from anger toward all His

St. Clement,
1st Epistle,
Sec. 19.

creatures." Again, he calls "Jesus Christ the High Priest of our offerings, the guardian and helper of our weakness." In all then, that concerns the Atonement, St. Clement's writings in no way convey the idea of a mediatorial sacrifice in the person of our Lord.

ST. IGNATIUS (A.D. 70-107) was the second Bishop of Antioch. The story of his life, as known to us, begins and ends with the events connected with his martyrdom. He wrote six epistles to as many churches, while on his way to a brutal death at Rome; being selected for martyrdom as the representative of the church at Antioch. His other letter was written to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. In his epistle to the Ephesians (Sec. 16) he declares that Christ was crucified for the sake of the faith of God. (Sec. 19): "And hidden from the Prince of this world were the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing, and likewise also the death of the Lord;"—as if he, Satan, had been kept in

ignorance and knew not that he was putting to death the Son of God.

In the account of his martyrdom (Sec. 2) Ignatius is said to have called Christ "Him who crucified my sin with him (Satan) who was the inventor of it, and who has condemned and cast down all the deceit and malice of the devil under the feet of those who carry Him (our Lord) in their heart.

ST. POLYCARP (A.D. 70-156), Bishop of Smyrna. He was noted for his long and consistent life ; but even more for his glorious heroism unto death for Christ's sake. He leaves us only one epistle, in which he says of Christ that "He endured to face even death for our sins, whom God raised, having loosed the pangs of Hades."

ST. BARNABAS, (A.D. 120). He speaks of Christ as the scapegoat, and that He was
General Epistle, Sec. 7. accursed of the people, not of God.*

* See page 84.

He makes Christ appear unto God for the people, as the outstretched arms of Moses made Israel victorious; and also makes the brazen serpent and the sacrifice of Isaac, types of his own crucifixion.

(Sec. 4): "But He was made manifest, in order that at the time they might be perfected in their sins, and we might receive the covenant through Him who inherited it, even the Lord Jesus, who was prepared beforehand hereunto; that appearing in person He might redeem out of darkness our hearts, which had already been paid over unto death and delivered up to the iniquity of error, and thus establish the covenant in us through the Word." Again, "We perceive then whence we were ransomed." (Sec. 15.) In interpreting a prophecy he finds that certain things had been promised: "When His Son shall come and shall abolish the time (of control) of the Lawless One."

THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS (about A.D. 140). This writing was for a long time received as one of the canonical books. In Mandate the Ninth, he writes : " For God is not as men who bear a grudge, but Himself is without malice and hath compassion on His creatures." In a parable our forgiveness is said to have been obtained by the labors and teachings of the Son of God. " And the Son placed the angels in charge of them, to watch over them ; and the Son Himself cleansed their sins by laboring much and enduring many toils ; for no one can dig without toil and labor. Having Himself then cleansed the sins of His people, He showed them the paths of life, giving them the law which He received from His Father."

Fifth
Parable,
Sec. 6.

The last writing of this period is the Epistle to Diognetus, though it is not possible to learn its exact date or to identify its author. It is

important, since it shows that there was no demand for judicial satisfaction.

Epistle to Diognetus,
Secs. 8 and 9. “For God the Master and Creator of the universe, Who made all things and arranged them in order, was found to be not only friendly to men, but also long-suffering.

“And such, indeed, He was always and is and will be, kindly and good and dispassionate and true, and He alone is Good. And having conceived a great and unutterable scheme, He communicated it to His Son alone. For so long as He kept and guarded His wise design as a mystery, He seemed to neglect us and to be careless about us.

“But when He revealed it through His beloved Son, and manifested the purpose which He had prepared from the beginning, He gave us all these gifts at once ; participation in His benefits, and sight and understanding (of mysteries), which none of us ever would have expected.

“Having thus planned everything already

in His mind with His Son, He permitted us during the former time to be borne along by disorderly impulses as we desired ; led astray by pleasures and lusts, not at all because He took delight in our sins, but because He bore with us ; not because He approved of the past season of iniquity, but because He was creating the present season of righteousness ; that, being convinced in the past by our own deeds as unworthy of life, we might now be made deserving by the goodness of God ; and, having made clear our inability to enter into the kingdom of God of ourselves, might be enabled by the ability of God.

“ And when our iniquity had been fully accomplished, and it had been made perfectly manifest that punishment and death were expected as its recompense, and the season came which God had ordained, when henceforth He should manifest His goodness and power (the exceeding great kindness and love of God), He hated us not, neither rejected us nor bore us

malice, but was long-suffering and patient, and in pity for us took upon Himself our sins, and Himself *parted with His Son as a ransom for us*, the holy for the lawless, the guileless for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal.

ANTE-NICENE FATHERS.

A.D. 100 TO GENERAL COUNCIL OF NICCÆA, 325.

JUSTIN THE MARTYR (A.D. 114-165).—He was an educated layman of the early church, who proved one of the ablest apologists of the period, and did much to attract philosophers and learned men to the church. Of him one of the ancients (Methodius) says: “A man who was not far separated from the Apostles either in age or in excellence.”

In his Second Apology we read (Chap. V.): “God, when He had made the whole world,

committed the care of men and of all things under Heaven to angels, whom He appointed over them. But the angels transgressed this appointment." (Chap. VIII.) : "The devils have always effected that all those who anyhow live a reasonable and earnest life and shun vice be hated."

(Chap. XI.) : "We should not be put to death, nor would wicked men and devils be more powerful than we, were not death a debt due by every man that is born." In his discussions with the Jew Trypho (Dialogues), without attempting to construct any theory, he incidentally refutes the mediæval doctrine. Referring to the Jewish sacrifices, he says : "He neither takes sacrifices from you nor commanded them at first to be offered because they are needful to Him, but because of your sins ;" evidently meaning that a pure form of sacrifice was demanded of them, to prevent their readiness to adopt heathen sacrifices.

(Chap. XLI., 1) : "And the offering of fine

flour, sirs, I said, which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist; the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering which He endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from iniquity; in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world with all things therein for the sake of man; and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and *for utterly overthrowing principalities and powers by Him who suffered according to His will.*"

(Chap. XCIII.): "More than this, you suppose that He (Christ) was crucified as hostile to you and cursed by God; which supposition is the product of your most irrational mind."

(Chap. XCIV): "He produced the mystery by which He declared that He would break the power of the serpent which occasioned the transgression of Adam, and would bring to them that believe on Him (who was forshadowed) by

this sign, *i. e.*, Him who was to be crucified, salvation from the fangs of the serpent.

“Just as God commanded the sign to be made by the brazen serpent, and yet he is blameless; even so, though a curse lies in the law against persons who are crucified, yet no curse lies on the Christ of God, by whom all that have committed things worthy of a curse are saved.”

He does not understand St. Paul to mean (Gal. III. 13.) that Christ was cursed of God; for he writes (Chap. XCVI.): “For the statement in the law, ‘Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,’ confirms our hope which depends on the crucified Christ; not because He who has been crucified is cursed by God, but because God foretold that which would be done by you, all and by those like to you, who do not know that this is He who existed before all; who is the eternal priest of God, and King, and Christ.” In other words, Christ was accursed by the Jews, and not cursed by God as being a sin-bearer on the cross.

In another place he translates the prophecy of Isaiah from the Septuagint : “The discipline, (paideia—not chastisement) of our peace was upon Him.”

Speaking of the temptation he writes (Chap. CXXV.) : “Accordingly the name Israel signifies this : A man who overcomes power ; for Isra is a man overcoming and El is power. And that Christ would act so when He became man, was foretold by the mystery of Jacob’s wrestling with Him who appeared to him, in that He ministered to the will of the Father, yet nevertheless is God, in that He is the first begotten of all creatures. For when He became man, as I previously remarked, the devil came to Him, *i. e.*, that power which is called the serpent and Satan—tempting Him and striving to effect His downfall, by asking Him to worship him. But He destroyed and overthrew the devil, having proved him to be wicked, in that he asked to be worshipped as God, contrary to the Scripture : who is an apostate from the will

of God. For He answers Satan : ' It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.' Then overcome and convicted, the devil departed at that time."

Again, an important passage is found in Chap. CXXXIV.: "Jacob served Laban for speckled and many-spotted sheep ; and Christ served even to the slavery of the Cross, for the various and many-formed races of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the Cross."

ST. IRENÆUS (A.D. 120-202)—A valiant soldier of the faith. He was a pupil of Polycarp ; and after becoming a presbyter he was sent to labor with a fellow-student, Pothinus, then Bishop of Lyons (Gaul). Afterward he was sent to Rome to condemn certain heresies, but found, on reaching the Imperial City, that the Bishop of Rome and an old friend have embraced respectively the Montanist and Valentinian

heresies. Saddened in heart, he returned to Lyons only to find that a martyr's death had claimed the holy Pothinus, and naturally he was called upon to succeed him (A.D. 177). Faithfully he labored to evangelize southern Gaul, and sent missionaries to what we now call France. He did more than this; for with his pen he effectively contended against the enemies of the faith, and in doing so expressed himself in plainer words than any of his predecessors.

His teaching was almost universally accepted, for nearly a thousand years, as being next to inspired. A recent American editor declares that "his work 'Against Heresies' is one of the most precious remains of early Christian antiquity." It is devoted, on the one hand, to an account of those multiform Gnostic heresies which prevailed in the latter half of the second century; and, on the other hand, to an exposition and defense of the Christian faith. We quote (Book III., Chap. XVIII., 6): "He

(Christ) fought and conquered, for He was a Man contending for the Fathers,* and through obedience doing away with disobedience completely ; for He bound the strong man and set free the weak, and endowed His own handiwork with salvation by destroying sin. For He is a most holy and merciful Lord and loves the human race.

(7.) “Therefore, as I have already said, He caused man (through His divine incarnation) to cleave to and to become one with God. For unless man had overcome the enemy of man, the enemy would not have been legitimately vanquished. And again, unless it had been God who had already given salvation, we could never have possessed it securely. And unless man had been joined to God he could never have become a partaker of incorruptibility. For it was incumbent upon the mediator between God and man, by His relationship to both, to bring forth friendship and concord ;

* Meaning the Jewish Patriarchs.

and to present man to God, while He revealed God to man. For in what way could we be partakers of the adoption of sons, unless we had received from Him through the Son that fellowship which refers to Himself, unless His Word, having been made flesh, had entered into communion with us? Wherefore, also, He passed through every state of life, restoring communion with God to all."

(Book V. Chap. 1.): "The mighty Word and very Man who, redeeming us by His own blood in a manner consonant to reason, gave Himself as a ransom for those who had been led into captivity. And since the apostasy tyrannized over us unjustly, and though we were by nature the property of the omnipotent God, alienated us contrary to nature, rendering us its own disciples, the Word of God, powerful in all things and not defective with regard to His own justice, did righteously turn against that apostasy, and buy back from it His own property; not by violent means—as the apostasy had ob-

tained dominion over us at the beginning, when it insatiably snatched away what was not its own—but by means of persuasion as became a God of counsel, who does not use violent means to obtain what He desires ; so that neither should justice be infringed upon, nor the ancient handiwork of God go to destruction. Since the Lord thus has redeemed us through His own blood, giving His soul for our souls, and His flesh for our flesh, and has also poured out the Spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God and man, imparting, indeed, God to men by means of the spirit, and on the other hand, attaching man to God by His own incarnation ; and bestowing on us, at His coming, immortality durably and truly by means of communion with God.

“The advent, therefore, of Him whom these men represent as coming to the things of others, was not righteous nor did He truly redeem us by His own blood, if he did not really become man, restoring to His own handiwork

what was said (of it) in the beginning—that man was made after the image and likeness of God ; and not snatching away by stratagem the property of another, but taking possession of His own in a righteous and gracious manner. As far as concerned the apostasy, indeed, He redeems us righteously from it by His own blood ; but as regards us who have been redeemed (He does this), graciously. For we have given nothing to Him previously nor does He desire anything from us, as if He stood in need of it ; but we do stand in need of fellowship with Him. And for this reason it was that He graciously poured Himself out, that He might gather us into the bosom of the Father.”

Again, he emphatically declares, (Book V. Chap. XXI.): “For indeed the enemy would not have been fairly vanquished unless it had been a man born of a woman who conquered him. For it was by means of a woman that he got the advantage over man at first, setting himself up as a man’s opponent. And there-

fore does the Lord profess Himself to be the Son of Man; comprising in Himself that original man out of whom the woman was fashioned (*Ex quo ea quae secundum mulierem est plasmatio facta est*); in order that, as our species went down to death through a vanquished man, so we may ascend to life again through a victorious one; and as through a man death received the palm (of victory) against us, so again by a man we may receive the palm against death."

Sec. 2 of the same chapter is most important since it gives the account of the temptation which we quote at length: "Now the Lord would not have recapitulated in Himself that ancient and primary enmity against the serpent—fulfilling the promise of the Creator (Demiurgi), and performing His command—if He had come from another Father. But as he is one and the same who formed us at the beginning, and sent His Son at the end, the Lord did perform His command by being made of a woman, by both destroying our adversary and

perfecting man after the image and likeness of God; and for this reason He did not draw the means of confounding him from any other source than from the words of the law; and made use of the Father's commandment as a help toward the destruction and confusion of the apostate angel. Fasting forty days, like Moses and Elias, he afterward hungered; first, in order that we may perceive that He was a real and substantial man—for it belongs to a man to suffer hunger when fasting; and secondly, that His opponent might have an opportunity of attacking Him.

“For as at the beginning it was by means of food that the enemy persuaded man, although not suffering hunger, to transgress God's commandments; so in the end, he did not succeed in persuading Him that was an hungered to take that food which proceeded from God. For when tempting Him, he said: ‘If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.’ But the Lord repulsed him by the commandment of the law, saying, ‘it is written, man

doth not live by bread alone.' As to those words (of His enemy), 'If Thou be the Son of God,' the Lord made no remark; but thus acknowledging His human nature, He baffled His adversary and exhausted the force of his first attack by means of His Father's word. The corruption of man, therefore, that occurred in paradise by both of our first parents eating, was done away with by the Lord's want of food in this world.

"But he, being thus vanquished by the law, endeavored again to make an assault by himself, quoting a commandment of the law. For bringing Him to the highest pinnacle of the temple, he said to Him: 'If Thou art the Son of God, cast Thyself down. For it is written that God shall give His angels charge concerning Thee, and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest perchance Thou dash Thy foot against a stone'; thus concealing a falsehood under the guise of Scripture, as is done by all the heretics. For that was indeed written, namely:

‘That He hath given His angels charge concerning Him,’ but ‘cast Thyself down from hence’ no Scripture said in reference to Him : this kind of persuasion the devil produced from himself. The Lord therefore confuted him out of the law when He said : ‘It is written again, ‘Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God’ ; pointing out by the word contained in the law that which is the duty of man, that he should not tempt God ; and in regard to Himself—since He appeared in human form—declaring that He would not tempt the Lord His God.

“The pride of reason, therefore, which was in the serpent, was put to nought by the humility found in the man (Christ), and now twice was the devil conquered from Scripture when he was detected as advising things contrary to God’s commandment, and was shown to be the enemy of God, by the expression of his thoughts. He then having been thus signally defeated, and then, as it were, concentrating his forces,

drawing up in order all his available power for falsehood in the third place, 'showed Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them'; saying, as Luke relates, 'All these will I give Thee, for they are delivered to me.' The Lord then, exposing him in his true character, says: 'Depart, Satan; for it is written thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.' He both revealed Satan by this name, and showed at the same time who He Himself was. For the Hebrew word 'Satan' signifies an apostate. And thus vanquishing him for the third time, He spurned him from Him finally, as being conquered out of the law; and *there was done away with that infringement of God's commandment that had occurred in Adam*, by means of the precept of the law which the Son of man observed, who did not transgress the commandment of God."

(Chap. XVII., Sec. 3): "By this action the prophet pointed out that the sure word of God, which he (man) had negligently lost by means

of a tree, and were not in the way of finding again, we should receive anew by the dispensation of a tree, viz., the Cross of Christ."

(Chap. XXII., Sec. 1): "By means of the statement of the law He put our adversary to utter confusion."

(Chap. XXIV., Sec. 4): "The devil being one among those angels who are placed over the Spirit of the air, as the Apostle Paul has declared in his Epistle to the Ephesians, becoming envious of man, was rendered an apostate from the divine law, for envy is a thing foreign to God. And as his apostasy was exposed by man (our Lord incarnate), and man became the means of searching out his thoughts (*et examinatio sententiæ ejus, homo factus est*), he has set himself to this with greater and greater determination in opposition to man, envying his life and wishing to involve him in his apostate power. The Word of God, however, the Maker of all things, conquering him by means of human nature, and showing him to be an apos-

tate, has, on the contrary, put him under the power of man."

(Book III., Chap. XXIII., Sec. 1): "For if man, who had been created by God that he might live, after losing his life through being injured by the serpent that had corrupted him, should not any more return to life, but should be utterly and forever abandoned to death, God would (in that case) have been conquered; and the wickedness of the serpent would have prevailed over the will of God."

(Book IV., Chap. XXXIII., Sec. 44): "How, too, could He have subdued him—who was stronger than men, and who had not only overcome man, but also retained him under His power—and conquered him who had conquered, unless He had been greater than man, who had thus been vanquished?"

Neander's
Church History,
Vol. II., p. 385.

In conclusion we quote from the words of Neander; who, speaking of the teachings of St. Irenæus, says: "Of a satisfaction paid by the sufferings of Christ to

the Divine Justice, not the slightest mention is as yet to be found."

ST. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (A. D. 153-217):—He was an educated Athenian who, accepting Christ, became a teacher, and was the forerunner of that great Alexandrian School, of which Origen may more properly be called the founder. He does not add much to what has already been quoted, but the following paragraphs bear upon our subject.

Exhortation
to the Heathen,
Chap. X. "Assuming the character of man
and fashioning Himself in the
flesh, He enacted the drama of human salva-
tion ; for He was a true champion and a fellow
champion with the creature."

(Chap. XI). "The first man when he was in Paradise, sported free because he was the child of God ; but when he succumbed to pleasure, (for the serpent allegorically signifies pleasure) he was as a child seduced by lusts, and grew old

in disobedience ; and by disobeying his Father, dishonored God. Such was the influence of pleasure. Man, that had been free, by reason of simplicity, was found fettered to sins. The Lord then wished to release him from his bonds, and clothing Himself with flesh—O divine mystery !—vanquished the serpent and enslaved the tyrant, death ; and most marvelous of all ; man that had been deceived by pleasure and bound fast by corruption, had his hands unloosed and was set free. O mystic wonder ! The Lord was laid low and man rose up, and he that fell from Paradise received, as the reward of obedience, something greater than Paradise ; namely, Heaven itself.”

Again in the same chapter we read : “ He (Christ) hath changed sunset into sunrise ; and through the cross brought death to life ; and having wrenched man from destruction, He hath raised him to the skies ; transplanting mortality into immortality, and translating earth to Heaven.”

TERTULLIAN (A.D. 135-217);—He was presbyter of the Church in Carthage, and a Latin writer whose logic had been called fervid and cogent. His legal mind knew nothing of the Anselmic “satisfaction” theory, yet he was the first to use that term, but he used it in reference to the acts of the repentant sinner. He does not refer it to the work of Christ. Like Justin Martyr, he plainly refutes Luther’s theory (that Christ was accursed of God) built on the strength of Galatians III., 13. He quotes Deuteronomy to show that those who hang on the tree are said to be cursed only on account of their sins. Let us look at his “Answer to the Jews,” (Chap. X.): “God did not maledictively adjudge Christ to this passion but drew a distinction, that whoever, in any sin, had incurred the judgment of death and died suspended on a tree, he should be ‘cursed by God,’ because his own sins were the cause of his suspension on the tree.

“On the other hand, Christ, who spake not

guile from His mouth, and who exhibited all righteousness and humility, not only was not exposed to that kind of death for His own deserts, but was so exposed in order that what was predicted by the prophets—as destined to come upon Him through your means—might be fulfilled.”

ST. HIPPOLYTUS (A.D. 170-236.)—We quote as follows from his writings.

Against
Beron and Helix,
Fragment II.

“For with this purpose did the God of all things become man: viz., in order that by suffering in the flesh, which is susceptible to suffering, He might redeem our whole race, which was sold to death; and that by working wondrous things by His divinity, which is unsusceptible of suffering, through the medium of the flesh, He might restore into that incorruptible and blessed life from which it fell away by yielding to the devil.”

ST. CYPRIAN (A.D. 200-258);—He speaks of our Lord's redemption in the following manner (Epistle LIX., Sec. 1): "Christ is to be contemplated in our captive brethren; and He is to be redeemed from the peril of captivity who redeemed us from the peril of death; so that He who took us out of the jaws of the devil, may now Himself be rescued and redeemed (in the persons of the captive Christians) from the hands of the barbarians by a sum of money, who redeemed us by His Cross and blood."

Treatise on
Public Shows,
Sec. 10. "He will see that devil, who had triumphed over the whole world, lying prostrate under the feet of Christ."

GREGORY THAUMATURGIS (A.D. 205-265);—

Confession
of Faith,
Sec. 6. He bears this testimony: "The capital element of our salvation is the incarnation of the Word."

Explication of
Twelve Topics. "As sin entered into the world by
flesh, and death came to reign by
sin over all men, the sin in the flesh might also
be condemned through the self-same flesh in
the likeness thereof; and that that overseer of
sin, the tempter, might be overcome."

ORIGEN (A. D. 185-253).—This great and
learned Father—the head of the Alexandrian
school—left a permanent impression upon the
church. His writings are so voluminous, and
there is so much concerning our subject, that
we quote from others a summary of his teach-
ing—and add a few quotations.

Smith's Christian
Biography,
Vol. IV., p. 137. "Origen thus insists on the effi-
cacy of Christ's work for the
consummation (*i.e.*, restoration) of humanity
and of the individual, as a victory over every
power of evil. Though he does not attempt
to explain how the sacrifice of Christ was effica-
cious, he frequently presents it as a ransom

given to redeem man from Satan, to whom sin had made man a debtor. Christ, in His own person, freely paid the debt by bearing the utmost punishment of sin; and so set man free, giving His soul as a ransom for him."

Oxenham,
Doctrine of the
Atonement,
page 135.

"Origen regards the redeeming work of Christ as a whole, under five aspects. It includes His teaching, as the revelation of absolute truth: His works, as cleansing the temple, and especially His miracles, to which a symbolical meaning is attached: His life as the great Example: His sufferings and death, to which is ascribed a threefold efficacy; in our redemption from the power of Satan, our reconciliation with God, and the purification of our corrupted nature. And lastly, His continued priesthood in Heaven, which is constantly and emphatically dwelt upon; and whereby He, who on earth poured out His material blood for us, is said to offer the vital virtue of His body as a kind of spiritual sacrifice."

Now let us turn to His own words.

Origen
De Principalis,
Book II., Chap. V. “For they (heretics) think that
it (Justice) is just to send evils
upon the wicked and benefits upon the good ;
i. e., so that—according to their view—the just
God does not appear to love the bad, but to be
animated by a kind of hatred against them.”

(Book III., Chap. II.): “Let us now look
also to the New Testament, where Satan ap-
proaches the Saviour and tempts Him: wherein
also it is stated that evil spirits and unclean
demons, which had taken possession of very
many, were expelled by the Saviour from the
bodies of the sufferers, who are said also to
be made free by Him: and the Apostle Paul
teaches us that we ought not to give place to
the devil; but ‘put on,’ he says, ‘the armour
of God, that ye may be able to resist the wiles
of the devil;’ pointing out that the Saints have
to wrestle (Eph. VI., 13, etc.). Nay, he says
that the Saviour even *was crucified by the princes
of this world*, who shall come to naught.”

(Contra Celsus, I., 13): He argues that it was necessary for Jesus "to have died to ensure the destruction of a mighty evil spirit, the ruler of evil spirits, who had held in subjection the spirits of all men upon the earth."

(VII-17): "And there is nothing absurd in a man having died, and in His death being not only an example of death endured for the sake of piety, but also the first blow in the conflict which is to overthrow the power of that evil spirit, the devil, who had obtained dominion over the whole world."

Homily on the
Cross and Passion,
Sec. 1.

METHODIUS, (260-312):—He was Bishop of Tyre, and tells us: "It was for this mainly that the cross was brought in, being erected as a trophy against iniquity and a deterrent from it; that henceforth man might be no longer subject to wrath, after that he had made up for the defeat which, by his disobedience, he had received; and had lawfully

conquered* the infernal powers, and by the gift of God had been set free from every debt.

“Since, therefore, the first-born word of God thus fortified the manhood—in which He tabernacled—with the armor of righteousness, He overcame, by the figure of the Cross, as has been stated, the powers that enslaved us, and showed forth man—who had been oppressed by corruption, as by a tyrant power—to be free with unfettered hands.”

With this we conclude the Ante-Nicene period. We have found that only two writers set forth any definite theory of the Atonement. The others only incidentally manifest their views, and the views generally accepted in their day. The word “satisfaction” is seldom used, and then not in the Anselmic sense; but as applied to the penitent and not to Christ: and certainly the only plainly taught doctrine of the Atonement is the ransom theory—held so strongly by Irenaeus and Origen.

* Evidently, through the power of God incarnate.

THE LATER FATHERS.

A.D. 325-1000.

As our purpose has been to present the primitive faith, we are not so much concerned with the writings of this second period: but a few quotations will help to show that the ransom theory was still generally held by the church, and continued to be held by it until after Anselm's time; Peter Lombard being the last exponent of it.

On Nature and Grace,
Chap. XXIV. ST. AURELIUS AUGUSTINE (A.D. 354-430), the greatest of the later Fathers of the church, bears this testimony. "His being born also was of the ability of His mercy, not the demand of His nature; so, likewise, did He undergo death of His own power; this is our price which He paid to redeem us from death." The Pelagians denied this, and asserted that human nature needs no such

ransom, in order to be translated from the power of darkness, and of him who has the power of death, into the kingdom of Christ the Lord. And yet when the Lord drew near His passion, He said; 'Behold the prince of this world cometh and shall find nothing in me,' and therefore no sin, of course, on account of which he might exercise dominion over Him, so as to destroy Him. 'But,' adds He, 'that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence' (John, XIV., 31): as much as to say, 'I am going to die, not through necessity of sin (imputed to me for man's sake), but in the voluntariness of obedience.'

St. Augustine, "Wherefore not without reason are
Epistle 130, many made righteous by the obe-
XIV., 26. dience of one."

Enchiridon, "That the devil might be subdued
Chap. CVIII. by the same nature which it was his
boast to have deceived."

Psalm CXXX. "The pouring forth of innocent

blood blotted out all the sins of the guilty; so that a great price paid down redeemed all captives from the hand of the enemy who captured them."

Not one of the Fathers ever imagined, let it be distinctly understood, that the Incarnation or the Cross effected a change in the mind of God towards us, or implied a division of will between the Father and the Son. The sacrifice of Calvary, however explained, they looked upon as part of an eternal purpose, not a device to avert the wrath of the Father; but the utterance of his unfailing love. As for example :

St. Augustine, "What means this, 'reconciled by
De Trinitate,
XIII., 2. the death of His Son'? Is it that
when the Father was angry with us He looked
on the death of His Son for us and was appeased? Had the Son, then, been so completely appeased already that He even vouchsafed to die for us? But was the Father still so incensed that He would not be appeased unless the Son died for us? And what is it that the

same teacher of the Gentiles says elsewhere : ‘What, then, shall we say to these things? If God be for us, who is against us? He who spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how has He not with Him given us all things?’ Would the Father, unless He had been already appeased, deliver up His Son for us, not sparing Him?

“Do not these statements seem to contradict each other? In the former the Son dies for us, and the Father is reconciled to us by His death; but in the latter the Father, as though He first loved us Himself, does not spare His Son for our sakes, Himself delivers Him up to death for us. But I see that the Father loved us before also; not only before the Son died for us, but before He created the world; as the Apostle himself testifies, saying, ‘As He has chosen us in Him before the creation of the world.’ Nor was the Son delivered up for us, as it were, unwillingly when the Father spared Him not; since it is said of Him also; ‘Who loved me and

gave Himself for me.' The Father, therefore, and the Son and the Spirit of Both, work all things at the same time equally and harmoniously."

De Incarnation,
Sec. 25. ST. ATHANASIUS, the great doctor and polemic writer, thus asserts: "The Lord came to cast down the devil, and clear the air and prepare the way for us to Heaven.

"By His death has salvation come to all, and all creation been ransomed."

De Demonstratione
Evangelica, X., 1. EUSEBIUS, the church historian, writes: "He took the curse upon Him, being made a curse* for us; for what else is this than a ransom for our souls?"

De Virginibus, III. ST. AMBROSE writes: "The adversary rated us at a low price as slaves, but

* The context shows Eusebius does not mean cursed of God.

the Lord ransomed us for a great price; as being made after His image and likeness."

Other writers do not hesitate to declare that Satan was deceived and outwitted. Of these :

GREGORY OF NYSSA declares that the Incarnation is a device of the wisdom of divine love, since it seemed to render accessible to the devil the essentially inaccessible to temptation.

GREGORY THE GREAT describes Christ's flesh as the bait held before the Leviathan, by the divine stratagem of the Incarnation, in order that he might try to swallow the hook of Christ's divinity, and thus come to be caught and pierced as a fish on a hook.

It was the net to catch the bird in, according to Isadore of Seville.

System of
Christian Doctrine,
Vol. IV., Sec. 115.

Thus we are compelled to deny
Dorner's statement, that the satisfaction theory was "not foisted into theology

by Anselm :” and we maintain exactly to the contrary.

History of Philosophy,
Volume I.,
Sec. 93, Page 386.

We agree with Uberweg, who asserts that Anselm was the first who went beyond “the theory of ransom paid the devil—a theory which, until his time, had been widely accepted, and which as held by several Fathers of the Church (Origen and other Greeks, Ambrosius, Leo the Great and others) had extended to the avowal that God had outwitted the devil.”

In the later times, however, there were other theories maintained besides that of the Ransom ; and Christ is even called by some a sacrifice to God ; but even by them His whole life is regarded as the only limit of that sacrifice.

Some maintain (Gregory of Nyssa and Leo) that Satan came to admire Christ, and to desire Him as a victim, and thought to secure Him, and to frustrate His designs of Redemption and Reconciliation, by killing Him ; but in so doing

he lost all. Some repudiate any particular theory—as Gregory Nazianzus—who, in rejecting the ransom to Satan, declares that Christ's death could not have been as a ransom to God, for we were not held captive by "Him"; and next, for what reason should the blood of His only begotten Son, please the Father, who would not receive Isaac when being offered up by his father, but changed the victim, and gave a ram instead of the human sacrifice?"

We must maintain that the prevailing theory, in the mind and teaching of the first Millennial Church, was the ransom theory; and the general consensus is well expressed by the last author from whom we quote; Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, who lived even after the days of Anselm. He regarded the Cross as the muscipula or mouse-trap, baited with Christ's blood, by which the Evil One was caught. (Sent., III., 19.)

In conclusion, we quote his words: "He was made, therefore, mortal man; that by death He might conquer the devil. For unless He were

man who overcame the devil, man would seem to be violently—not justly—delivered from him to whom he had voluntarily subjected himself. But if man overcame him, he clearly lost all right over man; and for man to conquer, God must be in him to make him free from sin. For if he were mere man or an incarnate angel, he might easily sin, as we know both natures have by themselves, fallen. Therefore the Son of God assumed a passible* humanity, in which He tasted death for us, and by which He opened Heaven to us, and redeemed us from the service of the devil, that is from sin (for the devil's service is sin) and from punishment.

“Christ came into the strong man's house, that is into our hearts, where the devil ruled; and so by Christ's Blood, who pays (for) that He had not taken, we are redeemed from sin, and thereby from the devil. For he did not hold us except by the bonds of our sins; those were the captive's chains.”

*Capable of suffering.

PART III.

Concluding Testimony.

This work—chiefly a compilation—is presented with the profound conviction that the restoration of the first millennial faith concerning the Atonement, would be a step far in advance of the popular theology of our day.

Of the prevailing objections to the ransom theory, the principal point of contest is : that it is unscriptural—especially in its antagonism to the Pauline theology. It is not within the scope of this work to refute the charge exhaustively. To do so, would fill a volume much larger than this little brochure. It may not be amiss, however, for the writer to state that he accepts the Canonical Scriptures as the infallible and inspired Word of God ; and that he was led through an independent, but no less prayerful and conscientious study of the Gospels and

Epistles of the New Testament, to accept this theory as more reasonable than any theory previously advanced. But in support of the ransom theory this fact is significant: the Christian Saints, Martyrs and Confessors, upon whose authority we receive certain books as inspired, and who preserved for us those books in their integrity, believed absolutely in the inspiration and infallibility of the record therein contained; and yet it seemed natural to them to accept either the ransom theory, or no theory at all; and to regard the Incarnation, Temptation, Isolation, Suffering and Death of the Son of Man—His life as a whole—to constitute the complete sacrifice to redeem us from the Prince of this World. And to whom else could God have “delivered Him up for us all?”

May not a human interpretation, grasped with blind zeal, cover and obscure the true meaning of the sacred text? For example; the Christian Fathers of a thousand years asserted that Isaiah’s prophecy ought to read, “the discipline,

(not chastisement) of our peace was laid upon Him;" and that St. Paul (Gal. III., 13) does not assert or mean that Christ was accursed or hated of God, but by the Jews. Yet all those who hold to the "satisfaction" theory, refuse to accept the interpretation which was ably maintained, in a devout and scholarly manner, by the pillars of the early Christian church.

But what of Jewish sacrifices and prophecies—were they meaningless? No: but could they not well prefigure a life-long sacrifice, and tell men of their sinfulness? A Roman Catholic writer who would be expected to deny this, distinctly asserts: "Heathen sacrifices could scarcely, if at all, be taken as prefigurements of the death of Christ. St. Augustine and others regard even the Jewish sacrificial worship more as a concession to temporary exigencies, and a safeguard against idolatry, than as having any special prophetic value."

Is Satan, then, to be regarded as another God;

and are we to receive the heathen conception of a conflict between two almost equal powers? No: but we must—to be scriptural—realize the malignity and personality of the devil; to whom our Lord conceded the right and title to the appellation; The Prince of this World.

We know of no better statement of Satan's connection with the world than that contained in the following:

Cutt's Devotional
Life of Our Lord,
page 185.

“ There are many Christian people who have very vague notions about the Satan of the Scriptures. Some think him a kind of unreal personification of a principle of evil which pervades the world. Some, who believe in Satan's real personality, think of him as if he were present to every man and tempting him always; *i.e.*, as ubiquitous and omniscient; making him a kind of evil deity. It is essential for the understanding of the whole religious history and condition of man, to have an accurate knowledge of this important subject.

“Satan was originally one of the angels of Heaven; probably an archangel; one of the chiefs of the heavenly hosts. Angels, like all creatures with a free will, are liable to set their will in opposition to God’s will; *i.e.*, to sin: and the Scriptures tell us that some of the angels, of whom Satan was chief, did actually sin.

“We know how fallen men and women seem to have a jealous hatred of the good, and to take a dreadful pleasure in bringing others down to their own moral level. The fallen angels exhibit the same dreadful malice. There was, perhaps, some special relation between Satan and mankind. It has been conjectured that God executes His ordinary providential government of the universe through His angels, and that the special care of this world and its newly created race had been committed to the archangel Satan; and that when he fell, instead of being its beneficent ruler, he became its tyrant—so far as his power permitted—in

accordance with God's wonderful ways, who is accustomed to let evil kings still rule nations, and evil fathers still rule their families; but who out of all this evil eventually will deduce a higher good, and justify His long-suffering, and vindicate His wisdom and goodness.

“Others have conjectured that the fall of the angels occurred before man was created, and that the creation of this new race had some relation to the angels' fall, and that this directed the special malice of Satan against our unhappy race, and made him the special enemy of mankind. This spiritual foe of mankind, then, is a fallen archangel. By falling into sin he did not cease to be an angel and become a being of another nature. He did not gain any new powers or any increase of his original powers; rather, we may be sure that his original powers suffered deterioration.

“We need not suppose, then, that Satan knew more of the divine scheme—by which man was to be recovered from the fall into which Satan

had seduced him—than the unfallen angels; and we seem to gather that this scheme of redemption was not made known beforehand to these; but that they watched it unfolded before their eyes with intensest interest: ‘which things the angels desire to look into.’ Perhaps Satan knew as much of it as the unfallen angels, and watched it with equal interest and sought to defeat it.

“The circumstance of the baptism may have directed Satan’s attention to Jesus. He, as well as the Baptist, had perhaps recognized the Messiahship; he too, perhaps, had heard the voice saying, ‘Thou art my beloved Son.’ He recognizes Him of whom it had been prophesied from the beginning; that ‘He should bruise the serpent’s head.’ He recognizes the great Champion of the human race, and he, the great Enemy, enters into spiritual conflict with Him. It is an awful moment in the world’s history. The Champion of the human race has entered the lists, and its great and hitherto triumphant

Tyrant comes forth to meet Him, and the Deceiver is overcome.”

We put forth the ransom theory, then, as more reasonable, consistent and authoritative than the satisfaction theory. That there are difficulties connected with any positive theory must be admitted. Many of the best thinkers have held that it was unwise to attempt to unravel the mystery.

The saintly Baxter, of the seventeenth century, plainly and emphatically repudiates the notions of Christ's vicarious obedience being imputed to us, and of our sins being imputed to Him; so that He took on Himself the person of the sinner, and endured as such the wrath of God and the torments of the damned.

Butler, the author of the “Analogy,” expressly disclaims any idea of speculating on the abstract necessity of the Atonement, or of attempting to explain the manner of its efficacy. He considers that Scripture has left this matter, of the satisfaction through Christ, mysterious;

left somewhat in it unrevealed ; and that accordingly all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, at least uncertain.

Archbishop Magee, in his valuable work on the Scriptural doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice, while insisting on the fact of the Atonement, disclaims speculations on the reason or manner of its efficacy ; viewing it as a means ordained by God, not as the cause of his forgiveness. The notion of the necessity of an infinite victim for an infinite sin, he indignantly repudiates.

Coleridge, the poet and philosopher, rejects the satisfaction theory in toto ; but declares that the Atonement “is a spiritual and transcendent mystery that passeth all understanding :” and declines to inquire into the “causative act” or “operative cause” of redemption.

The late Cardinal Newman thus preached : “Why Christ’s death was requisite for our salvation, and how it has obtained it, will ever be a mystery in this life.”

That such intellectual giants refuse to formulate a theory, would seem to justify this effort to effect the overthrow of that popular—yet repulsive and illogical—conception of a Father whose justice could be satisfied only by the sacrifice of His son.

Hence the compiler presents these evidences that the Christian church, during its first 1000 years, believed that Christ's sacrifice was lifelong; and that that life can only be truly understood when every portion of it is regarded as essential to the work of redemption from the slavery that followed as a consequence of Satan's misused power; and from which man could only be redeemed by the perfect obedience—even unto death—of the Son of God

 Temptations came—mental and physical—and He—human and divine—withstood all; and is now the champion of our race, and the vanquisher of the Prince of Darkness.

 Of our use of the word “redemption” let the

reader look to so great an authority as Archbishop Trench. He says :

Study of Words,
Lecture 7,
Page 37i. “Lose not yourselves in vague generalities, but fasten on the central point of these—viz : to redeem, Redeemer, redemption—that they imply a buying, and not this merely, but ‘a buying back ;’ and then connect with them, so explained, the whole circle of Scriptures which rest on this image ; which speaks of sin as a slavery, of sinners as bondsmen to Satan ; of Christ’s blood as a ransom ; of the Christian as one restored to his liberty.”


The death of Christ is of portentous moment. God forbid that we should lessen its significance ; it speaks of a wonderful love that so completed a life of sacrifice, that we and others may be drawn to Him who was thus lifted up. Let it urge us steadfastly to obey the voice of God, and to resist the influences of Satan ; be the loss ever so great, the temptations and perils ever so severe ; knowing that He who conquered Satan—the author of suffering and death—is our

Champion, and able to strengthen us so that we can reign with Him in glory. Let our prayers breath the spirit of the beautiful hymn that—echoing the spirit of the ancient Litanies—appeals for deliverance, Atonement and redemption; not by the Cross alone, but through the merits of the life-long and complete obedience of the Son of Man to the Will of the Father; the sacrifice of Himself as the ensample of a true, godly life.

- “ By thy birth and early years,
By thy human griefs and fears,
By thy fasting and distress
In the lonely wilderness,
By thy victory in the hour
Of the subtle tempter's power;
Jesus, look with pitying eye;
Hear our solemn litany.
- “ By thy conflict with despair,
By thine agony of prayer,
By thy purple robe of scorn,
By thy wounds, the crown of thorn,

By thy Cross, thy pangs and cries,
By thy perfect sacrifice;
Jesus, look with pitying eye;
Hear our solemn litany.

“ By thy deep expiring groan,
By the sealed sepulchral stone,
By thy triumph o'er the grave,
By thy power from death to save :
Mighty God, ascended Lord,
To thy throne in Heaven restored,
Prince and Saviour, hear our cry,
Hear our solemn litany.”



NOTE.

* (*See page 29.*) In considering this figure of St. Barnabas, let us remember that the sacrificial exposure of the scapegoat was a fitting type of our Lord's sacrificial exposure to Satan in the wilderness.

The blood that was shed, before the scapegoat was led away, was in purification of the priest: but the sin-bearer for the people was the goat, which was not merely taken out of sight, but was led so far into the wilderness that death from starvation or wild beasts was imminent. It would seem as if no more expressive type of the value of our Lord's exposure to Satan in the wilderness, as a ransom for the world, could be presented.

Then again, in St. Polycarp's reference to the type of "the sacrifice of Isaac," we cannot do exact justice to this figure, unless we recall that the divine demand was only for a *surrender, not a sacrifice*; and it is only a fair inference, that the demand for the blood sacrifice of our Lord was not from Him who stayed the sacrificial knife of Abraham.

NOT ON CALVARY.

A Layman's Plea for Mediation in the Temptation in the Wilderness. Pp. 46, 12mo; leatherette; 35 cents.

[*Christian Literature.*]

We have learned from the immense circulation and wide influence for good which Professor Drummond's little books have reached, not to despise a book because it is small. By some of the pamphlets issued of late years themes were so presented as to stir thought far more deeply than more pretentious treatises. The anonymous booklet before us is likely to take its place among these. Within its forty-six pages are suggested such modifications of the accepted Christology, Soteriology, and Anthropology as, carried out, would come little short of revolutionizing those departments of Systematic Theology. The principal thesis maintained is that redemption was secured "Not on Calvary," not by the crucifixion of our Lord, but by His complete subjection while in the flesh to the dominion of Satan. The crucifixion was only "the last exercise of malignant power by the . . . fallen one." The "mediation" of Christ is found "in the temptation in the wilderness," and in the constant submission to Satan's assaults and power while Jesus was on earth. The doctrine of atonement by blood sacrifice is definitely rejected.

The author does not go outside of the sayings of Christ for his scriptural basis, but he appeals constantly to reason and to our conception of the character of God.

A further conclusion drawn is that the origin of evil and of suffering is to be sought not in man, nor in God, but in Satan.

The author's aim is apologetic. He desires to answer the objection "How could the Divinity, if it is a unity, sacrifice a part of itself to itself, and was this sacrifice a sacrifice to itself as a whole or only to a part of itself? and if to a part, to what part?" Certainly the theory of the writer relieves the subject of grave difficulties. The exegesis of passages given is admissible, and not improbable.

The study is independent, and suggests that we have not heard the last word on the atonement. We should like to have a more exhaustive study of the subject from the same hand, and meanwhile heartily commend what we have here to the impartial judgment of the reader. The book will bear careful study and much thought.

NOT ON CALVARY.

[*New York Independent.*]

Those who have been deeply tangled in the web of life's mystery and suffering will be sure to read this little brochure with advantage.

[*New York Recorder.*]

When one finishes this little volume he cannot feel otherwise than that it is the most orthodox heresy that has been issued from the press for a long time.

[*New York Evangelist.*]

There can be no question that it does shed some light on questions which all Christians find deeply mysterious.

. . . It is a treatment of the question so reverent, so full of love to God, so profoundly impressed with the solemn importance of the subject, that it deserves a careful reading.

[*Buffalo Christian Advocate.*]

Although, in discussing the supreme subject of man's redemption, he strikes out in a line of thought so unique that its novelty startles us, yet his argument is based on such reverent belief in the word of God, that we are led to consider and reconsider the proof-texts produced, and the reasoning that leads the author to his conclusions. The booklet is worthy of careful reading.

[*Toledo Blade.*]

"Not on Calvary" is a little book intended to help those who have gone down into the dark valley of doubt. It is beautifully written, and will do great good to many.

THE PLAN OF THE AGES.

A remarkable book! A book for the times! It is emphatically A HELPING HAND FOR BIBLE STUDENTS. In these latter days, when Christians are so eagerly seeking the light of God's Word to interpret passing events and to forecast the dawning future, so pregnant with tremendous import to all mankind, this book comes as a soothing, satisfying draught from the fountain of all truth, knowledge and wisdom. Every earnest seeker after truth, every sincere student of the Bible, will do well to secure a copy of this remarkable book at once and enjoy the feast of fat things which it contains.

SAALFIELD & FITCH, Publishers, No. 12 Bible House,
New York City. Leatherette Binding, 350 pages, 50
cents.

THE
DRUMMOND YEAR BOOK.

FROM
HENRY DRUMMOND.

ARRANGED BY
ADA L. SUTTON.

Handsomely printed from large type, on fine calendered paper. Bound in half white vellum, beautiful design in gold.

PRICE, 75 CENTS.

SAALFIELD & FITCH, Publishers,
12 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

