

It is not denied that the Scriptures abound with language, which seem to imply the penal substitution of Christ for his people. "He suffered the just for the unjust." He gave "his life a ransom for many. No unsophisticated reader of the Bible would think of putting any other construction on such language than that which Dr. Bushnell rejects. Why then must a non-natural meaning be discovered for such texts? The avowed reason is scarcely the real one.

No one can read this volume, without discovering that the real basis of this interpretation, is that the fact of the penal substitution of the innocent for the guilty, even where it is done by consent, and the party giving the consent has a right to do so, shocks Dr. Bushnell's feelings. This is not wonderful when he can represent it as implying that Christ became "a sinner for sinners." He announces it at the outset, as a self-evident truth, that for "Christ to become penally subject to our deserved penalties, is a kind of substitution which offends every strongest sentiment of our nature." P. 6. "That kind of penal suffering would satisfy nothing but the worst injustice." P. 11. This being settled, the Scriptures must be brought into harmony with it. The avowed reason for this mode of handling the Word of God, is so very shadowy that it could only satisfy one who was amply satisfied without it. The sole passage on which Dr. Bushnell relies to set aside the interpretation which, in all ages, has been put upon the vicarious language of scripture is Matt. 8. 17. In this text the miraculous cures wrought by our Lord are said to have been done, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias, the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." He tells us that he brings forward this passage, "because of the very great and decisive importance it has; for it is remarkable as being the one Scripture citation which gives the exact *usus loquendi* of all the vicarious and sacrificial language of the New Testament." P. 8.

If we wish to know in what sense Christ bare our sins, we have only to inquire in what sense he bore our sicknesses. "Does it mean," asks our author, "that he became blind for the blind, lame for the lame, a leper for the lepers, suffering in himself all the fevers and pains he took away from others"? P. 9.

Now, it is not a little remarkable, that this text which is of so "great and decisive importance," is not only consistent with, but finds its most natural and easy explanation in the very doctrine of penal substitution which it is expected to expunge from the Bible.

The Scriptures distinctly recognize physical death, of which disease is only an incipient form, as the penalty of sin. This Dr. Bushnell not only admits but argues at length. "The fall of sin carries down body and soul together." P. 97. This, he tells us, was the view constantly expressed by Christ. He recognized "in diseases the virus of sin." P. 98. If this view is correct, this text is profoundly in harmony with the doctrine of penal substitution. Christ, in taking upon him our sins, took upon him our diseases and sicknesses, in the very root from which they spring. He took the effect, when he took upon him the cause. Having thus taken upon him our sins in order to bear their penalty, it became his right to dispense pardon and grace to the soul, and healing to the body, according to his good pleasure. And every cure thus wrought by him becomes an evidence of penal substitution. It is because Christ has fully rolled away the penalty of sin from his people, that his work issues for them in a glorious resurrection, when their bodies are finally redeemed from the power of corruption. The text, therefore, which is of so "decisive importance" that Dr. Bushnell can rest his whole system, like an inverted pyramid, upon it, refuses to bear the smallest portion of the