

as *bearing the sin of the world*, and on the other as *stricken for the transgression of his people*. It cannot be proved that these two representations are inconsistent with each other. But it is not easy to contemplate them from so high a point of view, that we shall have a complete, distinct and consistent conception of both at the same time. A nearer approach to such a conception of them has certainly been attained during the progress of the investigations and controversies respecting them; and the development of theological science in the future may divest them entirely of their apparent discrepancies, and bring them more completely within our comprehension.

What is called the commercial view of the atonement has served much to embarrass this question. But a commercial transaction can never meet a moral crisis—and the predicament of sinners is pre-eminently such—any more than a moral transaction can meet a commercial crisis. Commercial terms are indeed used in Scripture effectively, but figuratively, to describe the efficacy of the atonement, and so refer, in reality, less to atonement itself than to redemption.

The distinctions discernable between *atonement* and *redemption* help materially toward a solution of this question: the one being a sacrifice offered up to God, the other being a benefit conferred upon men; the one having a primary reference to the honour of law, the other having a primary reference to the forgiveness of sins; the one being an expiation, the other a recovery; the one being a cause, the other an effect; the one being a means, the other an end.

But whether their mutual consistency can now, or ever, be a matter of direct and complete demonstration or not, it can be proved conclusively that both representations are true in fact, being supported by the infallible authority of the Word of God.

The wider aspect of the work of Christ, Infinite Atone-