

issue here, we cannot help noting how the imagination must be drawn upon to show a correspondence between the sufferings of Israel in captivity and the vivid picture given in the 53rd of Isaiah, or how in any important sense the sufferings of the remnant really produced a penitence on the part of sinning Israel leading to a reformation in their religious life. Many things must be accepted as historical on insufficient evidence to make this theory workable.

But our chief interest here is in Dr. Workman's use of the word "expiation", which is continually treated in a sense entirely different from that found in our Standards of Doctrine. On page 205 he says: "Here he (the prophet) teaches plainly that this sin was expiated through the voluntary endurance by the loyal Israelites of the chastisement which was necessary, not to render God propitious, nor to influence Him to forgive their disloyal brethren, but to make them realize their guilt and feel their need of forgiveness." The permissible inference from this is—If I suffer patiently the ills resulting from my neighbor's wrong-doing and it leads to his becoming penitent, I "expiate" his sin. Expiation is thus simply the suffering on the part of the good of the consequences of the sins of the bad. Thus, for instance, the wrong-doings induced by the liquor-traffic are expiated by the suffering it brings to the sober. The sober here may be described as the Servant of Jehovah bearing the guilt offering of the drunkard. There is no relation in all this to the satisfying of the demands of justice. God needs no satisfaction to enable him to forgive. On this basis Dr. Workman interprets the numerous quotations from Isaiah in the New Testament as instances merely of accommodated application.

We have mentioned already that he rejects as unreliable the narrative in John's Gospel of the Baptist declaring as to Jesus "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and holds that the idea of a suffering Messiah had no place until the second Century. No wonder then that his interpretation of the atonement would differ from that of the orthodox churches. Dr. Workman's view as stated by himself is: "I believe Christ's atoning work consists in the life He lived, the teaching He gave, and the death He died in loving obedience to the will of His Father to affect the reconciliation of man to God." Such a definition would consistently fit into Unitarian soteriology, but could not be accepted in any orthodox church. Under such a definition, Buddha or Confucius could be regarded as atoning saviours of men, if their lives and teachings and death but led men to penitence.

We have referred already to Dr. Workman's denial of the Virgin Birth of Christ, and we note the statement he quotes from Beet that "The Virgin Birth is no essential part of Christians apologetic." Combine these views with others of Dr. Workman and what is the result? Jesus is a man, born of ordinary human parentage, living a noble life, working no miracles, but dying a heroic death. Even with such a picture before the mind of the apostles it seems to us