THE CONCEPT OF THE KINSMAN
IN THE
BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF THE

SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IN

PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

BY

GARLAND K. OFFUTT

July 14, 1948 Louisville, Kentucky

TO

ELMORE THERALL OFFUTT

WHO TAUGHT ME, HIS SON,

IN HIS LIFE THE MEANING OF

SERVICE; IN HIS DEATH THE

MEANING OF LIFE.

PREFACE

The effects of a word or thought dropped in casual conversation are sometimes far-reaching. As a pebble, when it strikes the quiet surface of a pool, disturbs the tranquility of the water, causing it to tremble at the impact and send its silent protest in all directions, until at last its agitations are abated and again it rests in silent repose, so a word or thought may, by its implications, disturb the seeming imperturbability of the mind, provoking it to ceaseless striving to overcome its inner conflict caused by the initial impact of the word or thought. And never shall this striving cease until the conflict has been totally dissolved.

Several years ago a friend and I were riding on a train. We were engaged in a general conversation concerning the Bible, the relevancy of the Old Testament to the New Testament. Suddenly he asked me this question, "Does the concept of the kinsman in the doctrine of redemption in the Old Testament have any relevancy to the doctrine of redemption in the New Testament?" I was not prepared to answer. I became aware of a mental conflict. I tried to bring to bear all that I had read concerning the doctrine of redemption in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. The works of various authors who have treated this subject, supposedly exhaustively, came into my mind - but there was something missing. They had ignored in their treatment of

the doctrine the concept of the kinsman. I had a feeling that this was not as it should be. I was extremely aware, yet I could not tell why, that the concept of the kinsman is basic and fundamental in both Testaments, the Old and the New.

This thesis is an effort on my part to solve the inner conflict that is mine as a result of that question asked by my friend. I do not claim to have exhausted the theme. I hope, however, that others may be challenged, in the light of my feeble effort, to put to use their greater intellectual powers, and larger factual information to a fuller and more enlightened treatment of the theme.

As the reader will note, my method of approach is simple and direct. As a student of Biblical theology my interest has been mainly concerned with what the Bible says. The problem of the dates and authorship of passages has been outside of our concern.

This thesis, whatever its worth, is not my own. It is a reflection of the years of toil spent on my behalf by many illustrious teachers whom I have been privileged to know and whose wise counsel has sustained me during my years as a student. Especially would I mention in this particular Drs. Harold W. Tribble, Edward McDowell, Dale Moody, Clyde Taylor Francisco, John Joseph Owens and others of the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, who throughout my

Seminary years, at all times, manifested a sympathetic interest and kindly regard.

Garland K. Offutt

Louisville, Kentucky
July 14, 1948

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing tendency on the part of Christians today to reexamine the basic ideas and content of the Old Testament Scriptures in an effort to secure a more rational approach to a full and accurate interpretation of the great truths of the Christian faith as set forth in the New Testament. While it is true that there are a few students of the Bible who would diminish the importance of the Old Testament in the Christian philosophy of life, it is also true that the great majority of Christian scholars are unanimous in their opinion regarding the unity of both Testaments, the Old and the New. This latter group conceives the effort to minimize the Old Testament in Christian thinking as endangering the very fundamentals in our Christian faith. They liken the Bible to a tree, the trunk of which symbolizes the Old Testament; the branches and leaves, the New Testament.

The Bible is the record of God's redemptive work in man's behalf in history. That record in its beginning is revealed only in the Old Testament. The New Testament sets forth the consummation of God's redemptive effort in the person and work of Jesus Christ. The bottom roots of the doctrine of redemption are found in the Old Testament and come to their fruition in the New Testament.

The influence of the Old Testament ideas and institutions upon the ideas and institutions of the New Testament

is undeniable. This may be discerned by a clear study of the New Testament. Many concepts in the Old Testament have been carried over into the New Testament. The great difference between the Old Testament concepts and institutions and the concepts and institutions of the New Testament is not to be found in form, but in meaning. The New Testament has given new content and meaning to Old Testament concepts.

Basic in the Old Testament is the idea of kinship. This idea pervaded the total fabric of Hebrew life. We see it in the various units of the social compact: the clan, the tribe, and the nation. It influences person to person relations. It makes itself felt in civil law, marriage, and is not found wanting in the religious ideology and ritual of the Hebrew people.

The Old Testament has a doctrine of redemption, all its own. It is suitable to the needs and aspirations of a people such as is described in its pages. Conspicuous in this doctrine of redemption is the kinsman. Discard the idea of kinship from the Old Testament doctrine of redemption and it is totally destroyed.

In the New Testament the central character is a redeemer, Jesus Christ. Volumes of books have been written concerning this indescribable personality. But the greatest confusion and inquiry have evolved around his person and work. He presented himself as the Savior, the Messiah, who incorporated within himself two natures, the human and the di-

vine. Such a personality would necessitate an incarnation.

It is my opinion that the idea of kinship is as essential to the New Testament doctrine of redemption as it is to the Old Testament doctrine of redemption and that no clear understanding of the subject and object of redemption can be had without the recognition of kinship as the basic unifying idea in the New Testament doctrine of redemption.

CHAPTER I

KINSHIP AMONG THE EARLY SEMITES

The date and origin of the Semitic people are still shrouded in mystery. They were probably in possession of the lands bordering on the eastern end of the Mediterranean as early as 4000 B.C. This may be inferred from the description of the natives of the Sinaitic Peninsula as early as the time of Sneferu, the first king of the 11th Egyptian dynasty (C. 3216 B.C.). These natives were depicted with an unmistakably Semitic cast of countenance on the tomb of Ptahhotep.[1] However, the oldest Egyptian and Babylonian records do not reach back further than 3500 B.C., and in earlier unknown antiquity many races may have preceded the Semites.

The Semites as they appear to us in history were not an aboriginal people. All the branches of this race, Assyro-Babylonian, Canaanitic, Aramaean, Sabaean, Ethiopic and Arabian are closely similar to one another, both in physiological structure and in language. This points to their being descendants of a single primitive stock.

The question: "Where did this primitive stock take its rise?" is difficult to answer. The evidence we have to deal with is very slight and is differently inter-

---

[1] The Early History of Palestine, Paton, L.B., p.3.

preted by many scholars. Von Kremer, Guide and Hommel advocate the Babylonian theory. Von Kremer reached his conclusion after comparing the vocabularies of the different Semitic tongues. Guide's line of argument and conclusions are similar to those of Von Kremer. His method of induction appears to have been somewhat broader. Hommel, like Guide, held that lower Mesopotamia, i.e. Babylonia, and not upper Mesopotamia on the one hand nor Arabia on the other, was the home of the primitive Semitic people.[2]

Opposed to the view that Mesopotamia is the cradle of the Semites is the view that Arabia was the primitive home. This view has been defended by Sprenger, Sayce, Schrader, Wright and others. Berry is so committed to this theory that in one instance he dismisses the question as unworthy of lengthy discussion.[3] It may be said, though, that the general opinion of scholars favors this latter view.

Arabia and its adjacent areas, then, become a spawn-ground for the Semitic peoples. The populations of this whole region constitute a well-marked ethnic unit, a fact that is usually expressed by giving to them the common name of Semites. In regard to the word, Semite, Smith

---

[2] A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, G.A., pp. 1-4.

[3] The Old Testament Among Semitic Religions, Berry, George R., p. 1.

says, "The choice of this term was originally suggested by the tenth chapter of Genesis, in which most of the nations of the group with which we are concerned are represented as descended from Shem, the son of Noah. But though modern historians and ethnographers have borrowed a name from the book of Genesis, it must be understood that they do not define the Semitic group as coextensive with the list of nations that are there reckoned to be the children of Shem. Most recent interpreters are disposed to regard the classification of the families of mankind given in Genesis X as founded on principles geographical or political rather than ethnographical; the Phoenicians and other Canaanites, for example, are made to be the children of Ham and near cousins of the Egyptians. Ethnographically the Canaanites were akin to the Arabs and Syrians, and they spoke a language which is hardly different from Hebrew. On the other hand, Elam and Lud, that is Susiana and Lydia, are called children of Shem, though there is no reason to think that in either country the mass of population belonged to the same stock as the Syrians and Arabs. Accordingly it must be remembered that when modern scholars use the term, Semitic, they do not speak as interpreters of Scripture, but include all peoples whose distinctive ethnical characters assign them to the same group with the Hebrews, Syrians and Arabs.[4]

---

[4]The Religion of the Semites, Smith, Wm. R., pp. 5-6.

It is upon the presumed reasonableness and validity of the foregoing statements that we proceed to look into the matter of kinship among the Semites. A study of kinship among the early Semites will naturally lead to a brief study of family life.

When we seek to determine the constitution of the early Semitic family, we are faced with great difficulty. There are those who hold that the early Semites engaged in promiscuous sexual relations and that the family as such passed through a series of social evolutions, namely: temporary monogamy, polyandry, polygamy, and monogamy. This view presupposed that in the development of society the relation between the sexes had everywhere advanced according to one general law. In the polyandrous state of society it was found that kinship was reckoned through the mother, and it was inferred that woman and not man was the head of the clan. Thus, it was supposed that a matriarchate everywhere preceded a patriarchate, and that in the evolution of society the relative position of the sexes has been reversed.

However, recent investigators of social problems are unanimous in the opinion that polyandry is not a social condition through which all mankind has passed. Barton refers to the works of Spencer, Starke, Westermarck and Giddings to substantiate this view and adds that, "it frequently happens where polyandry is practiced that the brother of

the mother is the head of the family and rears his sister's children, so that there is an avunculate rather than a matriarchate."[5]

There is sufficient evidence to assert that there existed among the Semites that form of family life that is common to primitive peoples. In its earliest stage it may be called temporary monogamy. Giddings maintains that "all human beings from the lowest savages to civilized men, live in family groups. The simplest form of human family is a pairing arrangement of relatively short duration."[6] That this was true among the Semites of ancient times may be seen in the facts which show that the primitive Semitic marriage tie was an evanescent bond. These facts are abundantly attested by the Old Testament, the Babylonian contracts, the Qur'an, by numerous instances in Arabic life, and by the conditions of Abyssinian society at the present time.

Among the Israelites of the Old Testament the sentiment seems to have been somewhat against divorce; and yet the Law of Deuteronomy[7] makes it so exceedingly easy that it evidently points back to a time when divorce was much more common.

Among the Babylonians the frequency of divorce is not so easy to trace, since our inference must be drawn from the

---

[5] A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, pp. 40-41.
[6] Principles of Sociology, Giddings, p. 155.
[7] Deut. 24: 1-3.

study of special cases. Nevertheless, a study of Babylonian divorce reveals a sufficient number of instances to make it clear that divorce was not uncommon, Barton states that Peiser "has pointed out that two tablets in the British Museum reveal, upon comparison, that a woman who had been married to one man was within eight months married to another.[8] The fact, too, that extreme caution was taken by women in protecting their interests before entering into the marriage relation, by drawing up marriage contracts, implies that a woman's position as wife could be greatly insecure.[9]

But however varied may have been the status of the woman in the early Semitic family, there is little doubt as to the supreme role she played in determining kinship. It is the general observation of most sociologists that the present patronymic family has superseded a metronymic organization wherein kinship was reckoned through the mother.

Robertson Smith and others have established the fact, as well as the state of evidence will permit it to be established, that, back of the custom of tracing descent through the male there was a time when the Semites traced it through the female.[10] Barton gives the following summary of his arguments: (1) The well-known Biblical phrase for relationship is "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh."

---

[8] A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, p. 46.

[9] A History of Babylon, King, L. W., p. 185

[10] Kinship and Marriage in Arabia, Smith, pp. 145-165

"Flesh" is explained in Lev. 25:49 by the word, clan. The Arabs attach great importance to a bond created by eating together; we must suppose, therefore, that the bond between those born of the same womb and nurtured at the same breast would be more nearly of the same "clan" than any others. (2) The word, rahim, womb, is the most general word for kinship and points to a primitive kinship through the mother. (3) The custom called 'acica' by which a child is consecrated to the god of his father's tribe, cannot have been primitive. It must have sprung up in a state of transition to insure the counting of the offspring to the father's side of the house. (4) Cases occur in the historical period in which a boy when grown attaches himself to his mother's tribe. (5) The fear that sons would choose their mothers' clans led men who were wealthy to marry within their own kin. (6) The relation between a man and his maternal uncle is still considered closer than that between a man and his paternal uncle. (7) Joseph's sons born to his Egyptian wife were not regarded as members of Israel's clan until formally adopted by him. (Gen. 48:5-6). (8) Abraham married his paternal sister who was not the daughter of his own mother. Tamar might have legally been the wife of her half-brother, Ammon, the relationship being on the father's side.[11]

---

[11] A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, p. 52.

Although these arguments of Smith are interwoven with some theories of polyandry and with some arguments that do not appear to be valid, these which we have summarized present facts, which, regardless of any theories of marriage prove that at one time kinship was reckoned through the mother.

If this be true the status of the primitive wife is clarified and certain forms of marriage wherein the wife returned to her kindred may be understood. If children did not belong to the clan of the father, then in the type of marriage wherein the mother left her husband's residence, she must have taken the children with her; and if she resided in her own clan, it is clear that she retained the children. The point proved by Smith[12] however, that in early pre-Mohammedan times the natural protectors of a woman were not her husband and his kindred, but her own relatives, makes it improbable that in the earliest Semitic communities the woman left her own people at all.

When we turn to a study of the Hebrews we find numerous evidences of the metronymic practice. There are indications that the child is under the control and direction of the mother, or the brothers of the latter. This authority and right of the mother finds first expression in the

---

12 Kinship and Marriage in Arabia, Smith, pp. 101-103

giving of a name to the child. It will be of interest, then, for us to consider the naming of children in the Old Testament. If it should transpire that the instances in the latter portions of the book are namings by the fathers, whereas those in the earlier documents are namings by the mothers, this fact should substantiate the premise that a metronymic stage preceded the patronymic in Hebrew history.

Earl Bennett Cross in attempting to substantiate the metronymic stage as preceding the patronymic stage in Hebrew history bases his argument on the Old Testament.[13] He begins by distinguishing four main documents in the Hexateuch. These are known to scholars as the J, E, D, and P sources. The J document in its written form does not go back of 850 B.C., and probably antedates 800 B.C., in the main. The E document is the product of the next half century (800-750 B.C.). The D document is the work of the period following the exile; its various parts were written between 570 and 400 B.C.

In his summary of the evidence in the earliest document (J) Cross cites twenty-one instances of mother-naming; three or possibly four (he is uncertain about the unrevised text of Genesis 38:3, "And he called his name Er") of father-naming.[14]

---

[13] The Hebrew Family, Cross, p. 6

[14] Ibid., p. 8.

Other cases of mother-naming that may be cited are: the three instances in early documents of the Old Testament, outside of the Hexateuch, I Samuel 1:20; 4:21; II Samuel 12:24. In the E document only one instance, Genesis 35:18. The naming of the child by the mother in I Chronicles 4:9 and Isaiah 7:14.

Metronymic customs persist for a long time after patronymic ideas have come into being. The latter obliterate the former only after a long process of civilization in any human society. The historical period of Hebrew life begins long after the patronymic idea has gained the upper hand, so that we can expect no more than to trace the fading customs and practices of metronymy in the midst of a regularly instituted patronymic life.

In endeavoring to understand kinship and its implications among early Semites, it is well to realize the religious outlook of these people. The Semites were deeply religious. Religion was not just a part of their lives; it was all of their lives. Every activity, every primitive institution had at its center the religious motif. In fact, the original religious society was the kindred group and all the duties of kinship were part of religion.[15] This is true in the totemic kindred group which had as its original nucleus a group of actual brothers and sisters.[16] The duties

---

[15] The Religion of the Semites, Smith, Wm. R., p. 47.
[16] Principles of Sociology, Giddings, p. 270

of kinship are founded on the belief that men are akin to supernatural beings. Each individual believes that the relationship between himself and his totem is as real as the relationship between himself and his human brother. The relation between the gods of antiquity and their worshippers was expressed in the language of human relationship, and this language was not taken in a figurative sense but with strict literality.[17]

The outstanding fundamental conception of ancient religion is the solidarity of the gods and their worshippers as parts of one organic society. This concept affected not only their worship, but social organization as well. This is true with the Aryan religion as well as Semitic. Among the Semites we note the intimate relationship of a man's religion and his political connection brought out in the Old Testament as it speaks about the relation of the nations to their gods. David is told, "Go, serve other gods,"[18] when he complains of those who "have driven him out from connection with the heritage of Jehovah." In driving him to seek refuge in another land and another nationality they compel him to change his religion, for a man's religion is part of his political connection. The reply of Ruth, "Thy people shall be my people and thy God, my God,"[19] implies the change of nationality involves a

---

17 The Religion of the Semites, Smith, P. 29.
18 I Samuel 26:19.
19 Ruth 1:14.

change of religious loyalties.

The solidarity of the gods and their worshippers is also noted in its most pronounced expression in the share taken by the gods in the feuds and wars of their worshippers. The enemies of the god and the enemies of the people are identical. To affront one is to affront the other. This may be seen in the Old Testament.[20] In battle the god fights for his people and often the divine image or symbol accompanies the host to battle.

A more concrete statement of the place of the divine element in the social partnership must be considered. The two leading conceptions of the relation of the god to his people are those of fatherhood and of kingship. Fatherhood (kinship) is the foundation of the system of clans or gentes. Kinship, which is the union of kins, living intermingled or side by side, and bound together by common interests, is the foundation of the state. Let us turn our attention to the former.

The relation of a father to his children has a moral as well as physical aspect, and no true meaning of "fatherhood" in respect to deity as understood in ancient religion, can be had without considering both aspects.

In the physical aspect of the father is the being to whom the child owes his life, and through whom he traces

---

[20] I Samuel 30:26.

kinship with the other members of his family or clan. This tracing of kinship through blood which passes from parent to child, and circulates in the veins of every member of the family Smith designates the "Antique Conception of Kinship."[21] The unity of the family or clan is viewed as a physical unity, for the blood is the life, an idea familiar to us from the Old Testament,[22] and it is the same blood and, therefore, the same life that is shared by every descendant of the common ancestry. This idea is also present in the racial history of Israel. Pfeiffer states this very clearly: "The racial history of Israel in P (Priestly Code) is like a funnel comprising ten rings of decreasing size, down to the extremely small but important tube at its bottom --- the theocratic community. ... Racially, the origins of Israel were traced back to Adam."[23] The theocratic community here mentioned by Pfeiffer is none other than the family unit. The idea that the race has a life of its own, of which individual lives are only parts is expressed even more clearly by picturing the race as a tree of which the ancestor is the root or stem and the descendants are the branches.

Among the older Semites the conception obtained that the races of men have gods for their ancestors, so that men are really, in a physical sense, of the stock or kin of the

---

[21] The Religion of the Semites, Smith, W.R., p. 40.
[22] Gen. 9:4; Deut. 12:23
[23] Introduction to the Old Testament, Pfeiffer.

gods. That this is true appears from the Bible. Jeremiah describes idolaters as saying to a stock, "Thou art my father;" and to a stone, "Thou hast brought me forth."[24] In the ancient poem in Numbers 21:29, the Moabites are called the sons and daughters of Chemosh. Malachi calls a heathen woman "the daughter of a strange god."[25] Smith remarks that several names of deities appear in the old genealogies of nations in the book of Genesis and gives as an example Edom, the progenitor of the Edomites, who was identified by the Hebrews with Esau, the brother of Jacob, but to whom divinity was ascribed by the heathens.[26]

The belief in their descent from the blood of the gods was not confined to this or that clan, but was a widespread feature in the old tribal religions of the Semites. This may be seen in the common features of Semitic ritual and especially of the ritual use of blood which is the primitive symbol of kinship. There are many evidences that all Arabic deities were originally the gods of particular kins, and that the bond of religion was originally coextensive with the bond of blood. This may be seen in the priesthood being confined to men of one family or clan; in the fact that when sacrifices were offered and when tribes of different blood worshipped at the same sanctuary and adored the same god, they yet held themselves apart from one another and did

---

[24]Jer. 2:27.

[25]Mal. 2:11.

[26]The Religion of the Semites, Smith, p. 42

not engage in any common act that united them in religious fellowship. The circle of worship was still the kin, though the deity worshipped was not of the kin, and the only way in which two kindreds could form a religious fusion was by a covenant ceremony. Smith holds regarding this situation that among the Arabs the circle of religious solidarity was originally the group of kinsmen, and that the god himself must have been conceived as united to his worshippers by the bond of blood, as their great kinsman.[27]

The clan is found in tribal societies that trace descent through mother names, and in a modified form "it persists in societies that have begun to trace descent through father names."[28] It is called by Smith the "earliest social unit."[29] Through many sources its organization may be traced in the Semitic domain. In the genealogical lists of the Old Testament we can trace the clans of which the Israelitish tribes were composed since the writers, in accordance with the patriarchial ideas of their own times have personified the nation as a man, tribes as his sons, and clans as his grandsons or descendants. Barton believes these clans can be traced in extra-Biblical sources as Heber and Malkiel, clans of the tribes of Asher, in the El-Amarna tablets.[30]

---

[27]Ibid., p. 48.

[28]A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, G. A., p. 34.

[29]The Religion of the Semites, W. Robertson Smith, p. 35.

[30]A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, p. 31.

Giddings[31] regards the clan as having for its nucleus an actual group of brothers and sisters, who form a totemic kindred and constitute a household. Its development is admirably sketched by him. It forms at first an economic and defensive group for the mutual gathering of food and redressing of wrongs inflicted by other groups. At a time, says Giddings, so early in the development of social relations that we can hardly hope to discover the origin of the practice, natural brotherhoods were by expulsion and adoption converted into semi-artificial fraternities. These brotherhoods acquire in the animistic stage of culture a peculiar sanctity through the belief that men are akin to supernatural beings. The belief that the individual is akin to his totem reacts on his conception of human relationship; and in time, though the members of a family may have individual totems, the household regards itself as a unit. Adoption, then, becomes a sacred ceremony; exogamy now becomes a religious obligation. From time to time, the members of such a household would encounter others who accidentally hit upon the same totem These they reason must be their brothers and sisters, since they are kindred to the same totem as themselves.

That the above description of the genesis of the clan in general may be taken as a tolerably accurate description

---

[31] Principles of Sociology, Giddings, p. 270.

of the Semitic clan may be seen in the proofs of Semitic totemism. Robertson Smith accepts three basic findings as sufficient proof of totemism, namely: (1) stocks named after plants and animals; (2) the prevalence of the conception that the members of the stock are of the blood of the eponym animal, or, are sprung from a plant of the species chosen as totem; (3) the ascription to the totem of a sacred character found many Arabic tribes bearing the names of animals as stock names, and many traces in the Old Testament of the same thing.[32] In Judges 7:25, Oreb and Zeeb (the raven and the wolf) are the names of Midianitish chieftains.

In ancient times the fundamental obligations of kinship had nothing to do with degrees of relationship, but rested with absolute and identical force on every member of the clan. For one to know that a man's life was sacred to him did not necessitate that he count cousinship with him by reckoning up to their common ancestor; it was enough that they belonged to the same clan. In the earliest Semitic communities a man was of his mother's clan; in later times he belonged to the clan of his father. A kin was a group of persons whose lives were so bound up together that they could be treated as parts of one common life. The members of one kindred looked on themselves as one living

---

[32] A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Barton, P. 35.

whole. This is expressed in the Semitic tongue in many familiar forms of speech. In a case of homicide Arabian tribesmen speak of the blood of one of their number, saying, "Our blood has been spilt." In Hebrew the phrase by which one claims kinship is "I am your bone and your flesh."[33] Both in Hebrew and in Arabic "flesh" is synonymous with "clan" or kindred group.

The smallest united and organized society which is composed of lesser social groups that are themselves larger than single families is a tribe. It is distinctive in that it occupies a defined territory, speaks one language or dialect, and is conscious of its unity based on a common ancestry. But this common ancestry in most cases is more or less of a polite fiction. Cross says that "any claims of a patronymic social order in pride of descent are but half true." With respect to the Hebrew tribes he further states, "The descendants of a great man may pride themselves on having his blood coursing through their veins. They ignore the fact that the blood of his wife also flows in their bodies. Kinship is found, upon scrutiny, to be somewhat tenuous and arbitrary."[34] All the Hebrews of the days of the monarchy were not descendants of Abraham. It is evident that there were descendants of Abraham who were not counted as Hebrews, as well as that there were lesser tribal groups

---

[33] Ibid. p. 51

[34] The Hebrew Family, Cross, p. 80.

which merged into the body politic of the Hebrews which had not relationship by descent with the patriarchs. In the stories of the patriarchs and their families we have the broad outlines of the tribal history of the people who are called Hebrews and their sense of kinship with neighboring Semitic groups.

In summarizing the preceding discussion we note the following: (1) The Semitic peoples were composed of various groups of a common stock that first settled in Arabia and and finally, through numerous migrations, covered the entire Sinaitic Peninsula. Among these people of similar ethnological culture were the Hebrews. (2) That kinship among the Semites, in its earliest form, was reckoned through the mother and the system of reckoning kinship through the father was a later development, both methods being predicated on the basis of common blood. (3) There existed among the Semites the conception that they were, in a literally physical sense, the offspring of the deities and thus kin to the gods. (4) That in the larger social group, the tribe, kinship was reckoned, not on the basis of common blood, but in a more indirect way, ---the common adoration and relationship to a totem or divinity. Therefore, we see that among the Semites kinship appears on three different levels: (1) human kinship of man to man reckoned on the basis of common blood; (2) supernatural kinship--- kinship of God and men; and (3) spiritual kinship --- kinship based upon mutual interests and common worship.

CHAPTER II

REDEMPTION IN HEBREW RELIGION

The English word, "redeem," is the translation of two words, "padhah" and "ga'al," in the Old Testament. "Padhah" (better, for distinction from "ga'al," rendered "to ransom") is used of the money payments required under the law for the redemption of the firstborn in Numbers 3:46-49:[1] "And for those that are to be redeemed of the two hundred and threescore and thirteen of the firstborn of the children of Israel, which are more than the Levites; thou shalt even take five shekels apiece by the poll, after the shekels of the sanctuary shalt thou take them: (the shekel is twenty gerahs). And thou shalt give the money wherewith the odd number of them is to be redeemed, unto Aaron and his sons. And Moses took the redemption money of them that were over and above them that were redeemed of the Levites."[2] This law of the redemption of the firstborn by money was given to Aaron by God and he was held responsible for its execution.[3] Padhah is also used with reference to the release of persons from slavery.[4] "Ga'al" is used in a legal sense of the recovery of property, which has passed into other hands. This may happen in the case of a poor man, who be-

---

[1] A Dictionary of the Bible, Brown, W.A., Edited by Hastings, Vol. IV, p. 211.

[2] Num. 3:46-49.

[3] Num. 18:15.

[4] Exod. 21:8.

cause of necessity sells his possession, but who becomes able later to pay the redemption price in money to the man to whom he sold it.[5] Again the word is used of the money payments required for the release of persons from slavery. Evidence of this may be noted in the provisions made for the redemption of a female slave who has been betrothed to her master; yet who does not find favor in his sight.[6] In Leviticus the same idea is expressed with reference to a Hebrew who, because of poverty, sells himself unto a stranger or sojourner. The money payment may be supplied by one of his brethren, or near kinsmen, or, if he is able, the slave himself.[7]

In the prophets and Psalms both "ga'al" and "padhah" are used figuratively, with the general meaning, "deliver," of the saving activity of God, as shown in the history of Israel and in the experience of individual Israelites. The prophet, Isaiah, encourages the house of Jacob by repeating to the house of Jacob the message that God had given him, "Therefore, thus saith the Lord, who redeemed (אָמַר) Abraham, concerning the house of Jacob, Jacob shall not now be ashamed, neither shall his face wax pale.[8] Delitzsch comments on this passage, seeing in the redemption of Abra-

---

[5]Lev. 25:26.

[6]Exod. 21:8.

[7]Lev. 25:47-49.

[8]Isaiah 29:22.

ham from paganism into which mankind had fallen, a type of the redemption of Israel from the apostasy that characterized her present state. "As Abraham was separated from mankind when sunk in heathenism to become the progenitor of a people of Jehovah, so a remnant will be separated from the mass of Israel sunk in apostasy from Jehovah to become the basis of a holy community acceptable to God."[9] The idea of deliverance is clearly expressed in this statement. Cheyne[10] holds that if the words of Isaiah 29:22, "He that delivered Abraham," are genuine, they refer to the migration of Abraham from Mesopotamia as caused partly by the " vexing of his righteous soul" by his idolatrous kinsmen." There may, however, he says, "be an allusion to the fire out of which, as a Talmudic legend declares, explaining Ur Kasdim as "the fire of the Chaldees," Abraham escaped. Nevertheless, he agrees with Delitzsch that the general meaning of the word implies a deliverance through the saving activity of God in the history of Israel. Barnes, likewise, commenting on the term, "padhah," says, "The word, "redeem," here properly denotes a ransom, i.e., to redeem a captive or a prisoner with a price paid. But it is used also as meaning to deliver in general, without reference to a price, to

---

[9] Commentary on Isaiah, Delitzsch, Franz, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, Vol. 2, p. 24.

[10] The Prophecies of Isaiah, Cheyne, T.K., London, Kegan, Paul, Trench and Co., Vol. 1, pp. 173-174.

free in any manner, to recover."[11]

"Ga'al" is found in Isaiah 48:20 and 52:9. In the former passage the people of God are to go forth from Babylon, and quickly and joyously leave the land of bondage and idolatry far behind them. "Go ye out of Babylon, flee ye from Chaldea with shouts of joy." But as they go they are to make known the fact of their deliverance by Jehovah. "Declare, proclaim this, carry it to the end of the earth; say ye, 'Jehovah has redeemed Jacob, his servant.'" The meaning of "redeem" here is expressly that of deliverance through the saving activity of God. In the latter passage, *Isaiah 52:9, the prophet appeals to the ruins of Jerusalem* to rejoice because the word of consolation that God has given his people in promising them that Jerusalem shall be restored, has become an act of consolation. The ruins of Jerusalem, now rising again, are to break forth into rejoicing. "Shout aloud, rejoice together, ye ruins of Jerusalem; for Jehovah hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem." The same use of "ga'al" in symbolizing the activity of God in the history of Israel may be noted in Psalms 77:15: "Thou hast with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph." The Psalmist emphasizes the personal interest manifested by God, "Thine own arm," an illustration of God's power in his special intervention for

---

[11] Notes on Isaiah, Barnes, Albert, New York, Leavith and Allen, 1864, Vol. I, p. 471.

his people.[12]

The word, "redeem," is used with the saving activity of God in the experience of individuals. The Hebrew word used is "padhah." David declared that "The Lord redeemeth the soul of his servants, and none of them that trust in him shall be desolate."[13] McLaren in commenting on this passage joins it with the preceding verse, "Evil shall slay the wicked; and they that hate the righteous shall be desolate." To do evil, he says, is to suffer evil, and all sin is suicide. Its wages is death. Every sin is a strand in the hangman's rope, which the sinner nooses and puts around his own neck. That is so because every sin brings guilt, and guilt brings retribution. The redemption of the souls of God's servants is the antithesis to that awful experience.[14]

David becomes more personal in his testimony concerning the saving activity of Jehovah in his life, and even though he is undergoing much trouble and sorrow, yet he expresses his confidence in God to deliver him by uttering the fact of his past redemption, "Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth."[15] Cremer finds, in the use of these words, rather than others which might have been chosen, a

---

[12] Commentary on the Old and New Testaments, Jamieson-Fausset-Brown, p. 370.

[13] Psalm 34:22.

[14] The Psalms, MacLaren, A., New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1900, Vol. 1, pp 330-331.

[15] Psalms 31:5.

suggestion of the property relation conceived to exist between Jehovah and Israel.[16] He bases his conclusion on the following passages: Deut. 9:26, "Remember thy congregation, which thou hast purchased of old, which thou hast redeemed to be the tribe of thine inheritance;" so Deut. 9:26, "I prayed, therefore, unto the Lord and said, O Lord God, destroy not thy people and thine inheritance, which thou hast redeemed (padhah) through thy greatness, which thou hast brought forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand." And II Sam. 7:23, "And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, from the nations and their gods." In all these passages the idea, "to redeem," is expressed by "ga'al."

In the great majority of cases, however, the idea of a money payment falls altogether into the background and the words are used in a purely general sense of "save," "deliver." To "ransom" or "redeem" means to deliver from any calamity or misfortune, however that deliverance may be brought about.

In the Old Testament redemption is thought of as deliverance from adversity. David is recorded as taking a

---

[16] A Dictionary of the Bible, Hastings, James, New York, Charles Scribner's and Sons, Vol. IV, p. 211.

vow on him who had delivered him out of all adversity, that he would punish the slayer of a righteous man.[17] Again he is pictured as swearing before Bathsheba that her son, Solomon, would be king of Israel, the certainty of which is to be established upon the truth of God who is able and who had "redeemed" his soul "out of all distress."[18] In each of these references the word, "redeem", is "padhah.".

Redemption from oppression and violence is expressed in Psalm 72:14 by the word, "ga'al." In this beautiful Psalm the author prays for Solomon and shows the glory of his kingdom as shall be made known in the remarkable leadership of Solomon. In the fourth verse he states that "He shall redeem their soul (the soul of Israel) from deceit and violence, and precious shall be their blood in his sight.

The idea of deliverance is noted in the book of Zechariah and in the Psalms. In Zechariah the idea of deliverance is seen in the use of the verb, "padhah." The prophet reveals God as being aware of the captivity of Israel, even to the particular condition of the several tribes of the nation. He portrays God as predicting that Ephraim shall grow strong like a mighty man, though he is scattered and in captivity... His means of gathering the nations and his purpose are both stated. "I will hiss for them, and gather them; for I have redeemed them. And they shall increase as they

---

[17] II Sam. 4:9.

[18] I Kings 1:29.

have increased."[19] In Psalm 107 the Psalmist exhorts the people to praise God and calls especially upon those who have been redeemed from the hand of the enemy. He would not be satisfied with an unvoiced thanks, but desires that such as have experienced delivery from captivity say so, or give voice to their thanks to God.

Redemption in Hebrew religion involved a deliverance from death. "Padhah" is employed in Psalm 49:15 to express the idea of redeeming. The Psalmist has just finished discussing the fate of the wicked. Like sheep, he says, "They are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them." And then he turns from his contemplation of the end of the wicked to a consideration of his own fate and with great joy exclaims, "But (antithetical to what has happened to the wicked) God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave."

In Hosea we find the same idea of deliverance from death with "ga'al" used to express the idea of redemption. God despairs of Israel in that she destroyed herself. But he is determined that he will be their king even though he must redeem Israel from the grave. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death."[20]

In Job we have an interesting observation of Eliphaz, in which he particularizes the circumstances of condition out of which God shall deliver from death. "In famine he

---

[19] Zech. 10:8.

[20] Hosea 13:14.

shall redeem thee from death."[21]

The idea of redemption is especially associated with deliverance from Egypt. There are three passages in Deuteronomy and one in Micah where the word, "padhah," occurs in connection with the experience of Israel in Egypt. In the exhortation of Moses to Israel in which he enjoined them to keep the commandments of God he reminds the people that God's choice of them from among the nations was not predicated upon their strength in numbers, and that their freedom was to be found in the character and purpose of God. "But because the Lord loved you and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh, King of Egypt."[22] Again in the drastic penalty of death imposed upon those prophets who misled the people of God we have another instance of the use of "padhah." "And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord, your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage."[23] In the third passage under consideration, Moses instructs Israel to observe the highest standards of justice and moral conduct

---

[21]Job 5:20.

[22]Deut. 7:8.

[23]Deut. 13:5.

shall redeem thee from death."[21]

The idea of redemption is especially associated with deliverance from Egypt. There are three passages in Deuteronomy and one in Micah wherein the word, "padhah," occurs in connection with the experience of Israel in Egypt. In the exhortation of Moses to Israel in which he enjoined them to keep the commandments of God he reminds the poeple that God's choice of them from among the nations was not predicated upon their strength in numbers, and that their freedom was to be found in the character and purpose of God. "But because the Lord loved you and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh, King of Egypt.[22] Again in the drastic penalty of death imposed upon those prophets who misled the people of God we have another instance of the use of "padhah." "And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord, your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage."[23] In the third passage under consideration, Moses instructs Israel to observe the highest standards of justice and moral conduct

---

[21] Job 5:20.

[22] Deut. 7:8.

[23] Deut. 13:5

toward a stranger in their midst, realizing that they, too, were once strangers and bondmen; "But thou shalt remember that thou was a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord, thy God, redeemed thee hence."[24] The last passage is a portion of the Lord's controversy with Israel in which the Lord seeks the answer for the conduct of Israel toward him, saying, "O my people, what have I done unto thee? And wherein have I wearied thee? Testify against me. For I brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron and Miriam."[25]

In Isaiah 35:9 which Delitzsch describes as a "prelude in thought and language to the Deutero-Isaianic Book of Consolation for the Exiles"[26] we have an idealized deliverance from Babylon. "No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there." Also in Isaiah 62:12, where the prophet comforts Israel by reemphasizing the purposes of God in Israel and his determination to consummate those purposes among the nations who now despise the people of God; "And they shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord; and thou shalt be called Sought out, a city not forsaken."

Among the Hebrews there was little emphasis placed on

---

[24] Deut. 25:18

[25] Micah 6:4.

[26] Commentary on Isaiah, Delitzsch, p. 75.

the idea of the redemption from sin. This may be understood, perhaps, only through a clear recognition of the Hebrews' evaluation of the covenantal relationship. This relation virtually existed from the time of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. When they proclaimed the moral demands of Yahweh, they did not conceive him as a cold and unimpassioned judge, but as Israel's king, father, husband, actively concerned to maintain the covenantal relation, even when it had been broken by Israel's sin. Robinson remarks, "The prophets did not think, with Augustine, of a ransom to be paid to the devil, or with Anselm, of a debt to God's honor to be discharged, or with the Protestant reformers, of a penal satisfaction to be rendered, before grace was free to prevail. The prophets of the eigth century do not even insist on sacrifice as a condition or means of forgiveness, so that their attitude is very different from that implied in the later Levitical system of offerings necessary to the restoration of ceremonial holiness. They think of a direct personal relation between Yahweh and Israel not destroyed, though challenged, by Israel's sin.[27] Snaith designates the struggle of the eighth century prophets to reconcile the stated purpose of God to redeem Israel in the face of their sin as "The Dilemma of the Prophets." He says, "The prophets were the first to be sure that the sins of their

---

[27] Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, Robinson, H.W., New York, Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1913, p. 165.

the idea of the redemption from sin. This may be understood, perhaps, only through a clear recognition of the Hebrews' evaluation of the covenantal relationship. This relation virtually existed from the time of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. When they proclaimed the moral demands of Yahweh, they did not conceive him as a cold and unimpassioned judge, but as Israel's king, father, husband, actively concerned to maintain the covenantal relation, even when it had been broken by Israel's sin. Robinson remarks, "The prophets did not think, with Augustine, of a ransom to be paid to the devil, or with Anselm, of a debt to God's honor to be discharged, or with the Protestant reformers, of a penal satisfaction to be rendered, before grace was free to prevail. The prophets of the eighth century do not even insist on sacrifice as a condition or means of forgiveness, so that their attitude is very different from that implied in the later Levitical system of offerings necessary to the restoration of ceremonial holiness. They think of a direct personal relation between Yahweh and Israel not destroyed, though challenged, by Israel's sin.[27] Snaith designates the struggle of the eighth century prophets to reconcile the stated purpose of God to redeem Israel in the face of their sin as "The Dilemma of the Prophets." He says, "The prophets were the first to be sure that the sins of their

---

[27] Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, Robinson, H.W., New York, Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1913, p. 165.

own people must meet with a just and terrible retribution. They were equally sure that God's love for them and his peculiar care would never let them go. They were sure that the old idea was wrong, whereby God must save them whatever they did, and yet when they thought of the love that they themselves bore to their own, they knew that there was something in the old idea, however strict the demands of righteousness were. And so we have seen that even in the eighth century prophets righteousness is more than ethical rectitude and is always toppling over into the preference for the poor and helpless. How much more should the word come to mean salvation in the fullest sense, when it is God's own people who themselves are poor and helpless, exiles in a far land at the mercy of those who are stronger than they.

"In these circumstances," Snaith further says, "the double aspect of righteousness (tsedaqah) resolves itself into a definite dilemma. What is the balance of mercy and justice? The prophets solved it by giving precedence to the rule of mercy and joining it with the rule of justice. God's love (chesed) for Israel is, therefore, seen all the more certainly to be sure, strong and steadfast. It stands for God's eager, ardent desire for Israel, the people of his choice...There are no words to describe the depth, and strength, and certainty of this divine compassion. In order to appreciate its steadfastness, we must measure it by his demand for righteousness. His demand for right action is so

insistent that it could not be more so, but his love (chesed) for the people of his choice is more insistent still. This may seem contradictory, but it is true. God's determination is that the bond between him and Israel shall never ultimately be broken; that the covenant shall survive, even though with the smallest remnant. The waywardness of Israel was so inborn, her stubbornness and her rebellion so sustained, that for the preservation even of the remnant God has always, in every age, had more need of mercy than any other quality."[28] Sin, then, is incidental in the covenant relationship and not of primary concern.

There is a single instance only in the Old Testament where "redeem" is used for redemption from sin. In the Psalms the Psalmist in the midst of distress professes his hope in God and exhorts Israel to do the same, for God is merciful and "He shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities."[29] Whether or not this paucity of reference to redemption from moral evil is evidence of the crudity of the Old Testament is debatable.

C.R. North[30] reminds us that redemption in the Old Testament is always redemption from a concrete situation, which may, in part, at least, have been brought upon man

---

[28] The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, Snaith, Norman H., Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1946, pp. 152-153

[29] Psalm 130:8.

[30] The Redeemer God, (Interpretation - A Journal of Bible and Theology, North, C.R., Vol. 12, January, 1948, p.8.

by his own moral delinquency. "Iniquity" in the Old Testament can stand not only for the wrongdoing itself, but also for its consequences (cf. Gen. 4:13, A.V. and A.S.V. margin); for the Hebrew the two are inseparable.

We remark, then, by way of summary, that the Hebrew conception of redemption was based upon their view of human destiny and of the chief good of life. The Old Testament outlook was, for the most part, restricted to the earthly sphere, and hence for the Hebrew the SUMMUM BONUM was made up of such particular goods as we enjoy in the present life; therefore, slavery, oppression, captivity, violence and adversity in all of its forms were antagonistic to the full and happy life and were thus the dreaded enemies from whose power the Old Testament Hebrew sought deliverance.

CHAPTER III

THE KINSMAN REDEEMER
(On the Human Level)

History records no greater drama than that given in Exodus, the 14th chapter. Here we see a group of people numbering up to six hundred thousand and bound together by ties of tribal kinship only, under the leadership of one, Moses, dare to throw off the bonds of four hundred years of slavery and start the difficult climb toward becoming a nation. Of this event H.W. Robinson says, "The history of Israel began with the migration of certain nomadic tribes of Semitic origin from the Egyptian borders and control and with their invasion of Palestine."[1] Moses taught them to see in this escape the hand of God, and from that time onward these tribes believed that Yahweh was their God and they were Yahweh's people. As such they became wholly subject to the rule of God. God became their chief and their laws the commandments of God. Thus, we have the most notable theocratic government of all times established by Moses among the Israelites.[2]

The Children of Israel brought with them into Palestine cultural patterns which they had held in common among the Semites and which were destined to be interwoven in the very

---

[1] Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, Robinson, H.W., pp. 7-8.

[2] The Encyclopedia Americana, Vol. 26, p. 508.

fabric of their theocratic form of government. Not only this, but certain concepts of relationship and mutual responsibilities that were basic in their former tribal and community life were to be elevated and translated into a higher use and meaning in the future religion of Judaism. Though many of these early conceptions of the Hebrews as seen in the Old Testament seem secular rather than spiritual to many of the readers of the Old Testament today, we must remember that ofttimes the deepest religious truth lay buried beneath their commonplaceness. I agree with Pfeiffer when he says, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets," (Hebrews 1:1); has revealed his character and his requirements in the pages of the Old Testament: by subtly ingenious interpretation and by allegorizing the literal meaning of the text, the deepest religious truths can be detected in the most secular words of the Scriptures."[3] Among the many concepts which the Hebrew brought out of his former cultural environment was the concept of the kinsman and the obligations that appertained unto him. It is our purpose to show how this original idea evidences itself in the Old Testament doctrine of redemption.

It is significant to note that the Hebrew words for kinsman and redeemer are the same [redacted] form, "go'el."

---

[3] Introduction to the Old Testament, Pfeiffer, R.H., Harper and Brothers, 1941, p. 1.

"Go'el" in both of its meanings is derived from the verb, "ga'él," which is capable of translation by either "redeem" or "ransom." However, the American standard version consistently renders "go'el" by "redeem" in Isaiah 35:98; 51:108; Jer. 31:11; Hosea 13:14. It also is used in the ransoming from slavery and in the buying back of property which had passed or was in danger of passing from its original owner into the possession of others outside the family. By the latter extension of meaning it came to be used of the "redemption."[4] The "redeemer," "go'el," is one who redeems or ransoms. "As the right of redemption belongs to the nearest relative, hence "go'el" denotes a blood relative, kinsman."[5] Other relationships of "kinsman" and "redeemer" will appear as we proceed. Our purpose here is to call attention to the common word form which is used to express the meaning of kinsman and redeemer and which in doing so shows the close relationship of both.

The Kinsman in the Redemption of the Land in the Theocratic State

The original idea in a theocracy is "that government, of which the chief is, or is believed to be God himself, and the laws the commandments of God."[6] The word itself is from the Greek, "Κρατος" "power." This conception of God rule

---

[4] Interpretation, North, C.R., Vol II, 1948, p. 5.

[5] Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Genenius, William, New York, p. 170.

[6] The Encyclopedia Americana, Vol. 26, p. 508

or God power was a common one among the Hebrews from earliest times. We may doubt the authenticity, or have varied opinions concerning the date of the creation story in the first chapter of Genesis, but we cannot disallow the fact that its statement of God rule is not a contrast to the beliefs and traditions of the early Hebrews as expressed in their recorded history, the Old Testament. In the first chapter of Genesis it is God that gives to man dominion and freedom of action; yet it is God also who makes man accountable for any infringement upon this freedom so lavishly given. "And the Lord commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."[7] Herein is expressed the God rule over the first of the human race. But this idea was not common to the Hebrew alone but was also found among other peoples of early times. This may be seen in the practices of the early Babylonians and Assyrians, especially in their transactions concerning land ownership. There are indications that the deity exercised control over village land and that every title represented simply the rental of the land from the nominal owner.[8]

---

[7] Gen. 2:16-17.

[8] Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters, Jones C.H.W., p. 186.

The theocratic idea presents itself in the Scriptures in a two-fold view: First, as an ideal, that is, a conception of a relationship between God and man, wherein God's government among men is joyfully received by man and the commandments and laws appertaining to that government faithfully and obediently carried out by men with the full and voluntary assent of their will; Secondly, coming into existence and the manifestation of those theocratic concepts on the level of human experience. Thus it may be stated that from Adam to Moses we have the theocratic idea mostly in its conceptual stage, although there are now and again given hints of its true meaning --- Adam, Abraham and the Patriarchs in their particular relation to God typifying in some respects that form of God rule which would obtain in the relationship of God with his chosen people, Israel. Therefore, it is necessary that we differentiate between the theocratic idea as it relates to the undefined and unlimited rule of God and the theocratic idea as it relates to a particular and select group of people as symbolized in Israel; for in the undefined and unlimited rule of God we may trace the racial history of Israel in P back to Adam. As Professor Pfeiffer says, "The racial history of Israel in P is like a funnel comprising ten rings of decreasing size, down to the extremely small but important tube at its bot-

tom --- the theocratic community. Racially the origins of Israel were traced back to Adam."[9] But in the case of Israel the theocratic idea with reference to its history begins with Moses. The theocratic idea becomes existent in the realm of experience.

The Hebrew conceived of the land as belonging to God. It is true that when Moses divided the land among them, he divided it among them by lot, according to the names of the tribes of their fathers.[10] But this merely emphasized the sacredness of the inheritance in the mind of the Hebrew. In the theocracy the land belonged to God. "And the land shall not be sold in perpetuity; for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me."[11] The Jews were merely the recipients of the goodness of God in his bestowing upon them the dignity and privilege of possessing the land for Yahweh. They were taught to cherish it as a part of their divine inheritance, says Galer,[12] and were forbidden to alienate it.

It was not difficult for the Hebrew to conceive of the land as belonging to Yahweh nor to accept the religious implication involved. Among the Semites in Arabia or some-

---

[9] Introduction to the Old Testament, Pfeiffer, Robert H., p. 197.

[10] Numbers 26:55.

[11] Lev. 23:28

[12] Old Testament Law for Bible Students, Galer, Robert Sherman, p. 94.

where on the Sinaitic Peninsula the idea of a close relationship of the land and the deity was prevalent.

Jones remarks that among the Babylonians and Assyrians "A settled hamlet soon had its temple. Some think that God was ideally landlord of all the village land and that every title represented simply the rental of the land from the nominal owner."[13] It follows, then, that it was easy for the Hebrews to understand their "new" God when he proclaimed himself owner of all the land.

It is evident, therefore, that in the mind of the Hebrew the ownership of the land in the theocratic state was of great significance. It was a badge of relationship between the individual and the nation, symbolizing not only a political and social bond, but greater still his relationship with Yahweh. As long as he possessed his inheritance he held an honorable place in the esteem of the people of Yahweh. The loss of his inheritance signified an impairment in the relationship of the individual not only to the members of the community, but to God himself. In a sense the loss of one's inheritance was the loss of the privileges of full citizenship in the theocratic community.

A further insight into the importance of land ownership among the Hebrews may be seen in Leviticus. In the twenty-fifth chapter of this book provision is made for the

---

[13] Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters, p. 186.

redemption of land that has been sold. The provision is made for a Hebrew, who because of his poverty sold his possessions, to redeem his land. The provision includes two alternatives for the redemption of the land. First, it may be redeemed by a near kinsman, who has the preference in the matter of redemption. Secondly, the seller of the land may himself redeem it. In the event neither the former owner nor his kinsman redeems the land, then it shall remain in the possession of the present owner. But the present owner may not keep it forever. He may keep it until the Year of Jubilee when it shall return to the original owner. This restoration of property in the Year of Jubilee applied only to land, not to houses, "And if a man sell a dwelling-house in a walled city, then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold; within a full year may he redeem it. And if it he hath not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house that is in the walled city shall be established forever to him that bought it throughout his generations; it shall not go out in the Jubilee."[14]

In Jeremiah[15] we have a striking instance of the kinsman redeeming land. He relates how that the word of the Lord came unto him telling him that his uncle's son, Hanameel , would come to him while he was in prison and request him to buy a field in Anathoth, which he had sold. As a kinsman of

---

[14]Lev. 25:29,30.

[15]Jer. 32:1-12.

Hanameel it was the rightful privilege of Jeremiah to redeem the land. Hanameel did come to Jeremiah as he had been told he would by God, and Jeremiah bought the field. In his own words Jeremiah sums up the actual transaction: "And I bought the field of Hanameel, my uncle's son, that was in Anathoth, and weighed him the money, even seventeen shekels of silver. And I subscribed the evidence, and sealed it, and took witness, and weighed him the money in the balances. So I took the evidence of the purchase, both that which was sealed according to law and custom, and that which was open. And I gave the evidence of the purchase unto Baruch, son of Maaserah, in the sight of Hanameel, mine uncle's son, and in the presence of the witnesses that subscribed the book of the purchase, before all the Jews that sat in the court of the prison."

In the fourth chapter of the book of Ruth we have another instance of the kinsman redeeming the land which had been sold. Boaz and a relative sit talking, discussing a parcel of land which once belonged to their brother, Elimelech, but which had been sold by Naomi of their kindred. From the context it seems that this relative with whom Boaz talked was nearer of kin to Naomi than he, and, therefore, had the first right of redeeming the property. This privilege Boaz reminded him of, meanwhile informing him that should he fail to redeem the land, then, he, Boaz, would redeem it. The attitude of the relative is clearly put in the

following, "And the kinsman said, I cannot redeem it for myself, lest I mar my inheritance: redeem thou my right to thyself; for I cannot redeem it."[16] Thereupon Boaz did the part of the kinsman, redeemed the land, and as is further related in this book, which Goethe declared to be "the loveliest little whole that has been preserved to us among the epics and idyls," married Ruth who became the great-grandmother of none other than King David.[17]

In order to better understand the role of the kinsman in the sphere of redemption, I think it would be well for us to note the Hebrews' idea of the relation of the individual to society. Unless we understand this particular concept of the Hebrew, I do not think we will find any meaning or significance in the activity of the kinsman in the levirate or in the role of avenger of blood.

The unit for morality and religion among the Hebrews was not so much the individual as the group to which he belonged. The Old Testament Hebrew had a sense of corporate personality.[18] Yahweh was the God of Israel, and only secondarily the God of the individual Israelite. And so on down the line the individual was subsidiary to the whole. He existed in the whole and not apart from it.

---

[16] Ruth 4:6.

[17] Literature of the Old Testament, Bewer, J.A., Columbia University Press, New York, 1922, p. 286.

[18] The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, Robinson, Wheeler, p. 87.

There is recorded in Ruth, the third chapter, the incident of a kinsman marrying his brother's wife. (Note: this does not correspond with the Deuteronomic basis for this type of marriage; for Boaz was not the brother-in-law of Ruth.) This has been commonly termed levirate marriage. Usually we do not associate the redemption idea with this type of marriage, but see in it only a method of passing on property and material advantage to a widow who is exposed to being disinherited in accordance with the system of kinship, but who may substantiate her claim to the property and security which were hers while her husband lived, by marrying her husband's brother. All of this is to be considered and, for the most part, admitted. But I think we can see something of the deeper idea of relationship that was in the mind of the Hebrew, even in the prevailing materialistic atmosphere, if we take into consideration the sense of corporate personality that was part of the feeling and thinking of the Hebrew. We must remember that his sense of immortality as we view it, was very dim, if, indeed, it existed at all. To the Hebrew the life of the group was his life. He existed in the far tomorrow only through his descendants, only through his seed. Therefore to die without offspring was to be totally cut off from the nation. But to have many sons and daughters was to be most fortunate;[19] was not to

[19]Psalms 127:5.

suffer what to the Hebrew was an awful fate, have one's name cut off from the land of the living.

For the widow, then, to bring up children by her dead husband's brother, and by so doing to perpetuate his name, in the nation, was in a very real sense redeeming the honor, the name, and the future of the deceased husband. This, I think, is the redemptive element in the levirate marriage. What is virtually an enactment of the Levirate law, and that the oldest, is given in narrative form in the story of Tamar and Judah.[20] Here the object of the marriage is to raise up seed to the deceased. "And Judah said unto Onan, go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother;" the person upon whom the obligation rests is the younger brother, failing whom the next in age (v.26) takes upon himself the obligation. The issue of the marriage becomes the head of the family.

In the formal enactment of the Deuteromic code (25:5-10) the ancient custom is similarly motivated and as earnestly supported, if with some relaxation in detail. The obligation rested on a brother only if he had "dwelt together with the deceased and only the eldest son of the new marriage was to be reckoned as the son of the deceased."[21]

It was the duty also of the kinsman to redeem his

---

[20]Gen. 38:9.

[21]Deut. 25:5-10.

brother that had been sold to a sojourner or stranger in the land of Israel. It appears that sometimes a stranger chanced to become rich while living among the Hebrews, while many Hebrews waxed poor, so poor that they were obliged to sell themselves under bondage. Therefore, some provision had to be made for the deliverance of the Hebrew bondservant. The law provided that he could be redeemed by one of his brethren. In Leviticus the details of the procedure of redemption as it relates to native Hebrews under bondage to wealthy strangers is set forth. Aside from his brethren either his uncle or his uncle's son had the privilege to redeem him, or he could redeem himself.

Lee[22] asserts that the above was a very equitable law, both for the sojourner to whom the man was sold and to the Israelite who had been sold. The Israelite might redeem himself, or one of his kindred might redeem him; but this must not be done toward the prejudice of his master, the sojourner. They were, therefore, to reckon the years he must have served from the time when began his bondage till the Jubilee; and taking the current wages of a servant per year at the time of the beginning of servitude, multiply the remaining years by that sum, and the aggregate was the sum to be given to his master for his redemption. The Jews hold that the kindred of such a person were bound to

---

[22] The Self-Interpreting Bible, Lee, James W., Vol. 1, p. 407.

redeem him, lest he should be swallowed up among the heathen; and we find from Nehemiah 5:8 that this was done by the Jews on their return from the Babylonian Captivity. "We after our ability have redeemed our brethren, the Jews, who were sold unto the heathen."

We come now to a consideration of the kinsman in the role of an avenger of blood. Is there any relation, that is in the Hebrew mind, between the avenger of blood and the concept of redemption? The common expression for "avenger of blood" in the Hebrew is "go'el haddam," which literally means the blood kinsman, and hence, because the law of blood revenge required the kinsman to avenge the blood of a relative, avenger of blood. In commenting on the kinsman and his relationship to the law of blood revenge, Knudson says, "This law not only required the Israelite to avenge the blood of a relative, but permitted him to execute that vengeance on a relative of the guilty person as well as on the guilty one himself."[23] Other definitions of kinsman that emphasize the idea of blood revenge may be quoted: "Blood-relative: As the right of redemption and duty of blood revenge belonged to the nearest relative, hence גֹּאֵל denotes a blood relative. This corresponds to the Arabian avenger of blood, friend, kinsman, protector, avenger."[24]

---

[23] Religious Teachings of the Old Testament, Knudson, A.B., p. 322.

[24] Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Gesenius, p. 188.

Davidson gives a similar definition.[25] These ideas do not contradict the idea of redeemer or kinsman, but express the resultant idea of avenger of blood, which emerged because of the natural inclination to identify the former with a peculiar duty that was associated with them.

But back to the question proposed. Is there any relationship, that is in the Hebrew mind, between the avenger of blood and the concept of redemption? I think so. And I make this assertion on the basis of the idea of corporate personality which lay deeply imbedded in the social mind of the Hebrew. This idea conditioned his thinking regarding sin. The greatest sin that one could commit, as the Hebrew saw it, was to commit an offense which materially injured the life of the clan. This is seen in their conception of sacrifice. The primary motive for atoning for sin is fully to restore one's standing in the theocracy. Sacrifices had to do, then, as Berry states, "with the individual in his national relation, not with the individual purely as such." [26] Therefore, one who committed a sin that materially injured the clan had forfeited his right as a member of the clan; only two courses were then possible, death or banishment.

---

25 A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, Davidson, B., p. 171.

26 The Old Testament Among the Semitic Religions, Berry, George Ricker, p. 139.

Smith explains this very forcefully, "The practical test of kinship (among the Semites including the Hebrews) is that the whole kin is answerable for the life of each of its members. By rules of early society, if I slay my kinsman, whether voluntary or involuntary, the act is murder and is punished by expulsion from the kin; if my kinsman is slain by an outsider, I and every other member of my kin are bound to avenge his death by killing the manslayer or some member of his kin."[27]

How, then, do we see in all this, this avenging of blood, intimations of the concept of redemption? I think we may approach the question thus: first, by recognizing the seriousness of murder in its effect on the theocratic community; secondly, by examining the rationality of the act of blood revenge.

The seriousness of the act of murder was not questioned by the Hebrew. Murder was classified among the cardinal sins. This was due to the high regard that the Hebrew had for life. He held life to be sacred. The effect of murder was twofold. It infringed upon the development of the clan in that it destroyed a part of its component life as represented in the individual. And, secondly, it destroyed the individual's connection with the life of the clan. This was, indeed, serious, because, as we have observed, the in-

---

[27] Kinship, Smith, W. Robertson, p. 47.

dividual existed only inasmuch as he was associated in a corporeal sense with the life of the nation.

Let us examine the rationality of the act of blood revenge. The Hebrew did not kill because of hate alone, although the act, no doubt, was accompanied by such feeling. It is more reasonable to believe that he killed because he found in the act the only expiation of sin. Expiation of sins is specifically assigned to the blood in the Old Testament. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life."[28] Since he (the Hebrew) felt a definite loss had been sustained by the group in the death of a kinsman through the act of murder, it is plausible to assume that that loss could only be effaced through the exaction of a penalty corresponding in value to the life of the slain kinsman. The integrity, honor and morale of the group could not be recaptured till this was done. Therefore, in this light the life of the murderer or the murderer's kin may be viewed as a ransom or price of redemption in reestablishing the clan or theocratic community to its former estate.

However this may be, among the Hebrews in primitive times, the murdered man's next of kin, i.e., his "go'el", was

---

[28] Lev. 17:11.

bound by tribal custom to avenge his blood by compassing the death, not merely of the murderer himself, but of his family; for the family was in these early times the unit of society, and so the murderer's guilt was shared by all his family. (cf. Jos. 7^{24}, 2K 9^{26}.) Such, at least, is the Arab custom, and the law of Deut. 24:16 seems first to have limited the responsibility for a crime to the criminal alone.[29]

It is interesting to observe that a characteristic feature of blood revenge as regulated by Hebrew legislation is the very limited extent to which compensation for blood (even when accidentally shed) by a money payment is admitted. Among many widely different peoples, money compensation, the Greek ποινή, the Saxon wergold --- was legally admitted; but among the Hebrews such compensation or ransom, "kopher," was expressly forbidden for the case of wilful murder.[30]

THE KINSMAN REDEEMER
(On the Divine Human Level)

The break-up of the theocratic state and the subsequent exile of the Jews had a tremendous impact upon the thinking and expectations of the people of God. Formerly, they addressed the wrongs done them to the king of the nation who symbolized on the human level their go'el or re-

---

[29] 2Kings 14:6.

[30] A Dictionary of the Bible, Kennedy, A.R., Edited by Hastings, Vol. II, 1902, p. 224.

deemer. It was he who led them victoriously into battle against their enemies; it was he who removed their reproach. While it is true that the obligations of the human go'el (in the immediate family circle) had been, in the gradual process of civilizing the nation, lifted from the shoulder of the immediate kinsman, especially in matters pertaining to the redressing of wrongs done, and had become the responsibility of the representatives of law and order, yet in their present state they found themselves subject to humiliation and oppression and longed again for someone to vindicate them. They had to cease thinking of deliverance at the hands of a king, for they had no legal king. The entire nation was scattered like dry leaves before the wind, among their enemies. Impotence was their lot. Jerusalem was trod under foot by the pagan war-lords. They had not even access to the temple. It is no wonder, then, that the ancient idea, a fixation in their Semitic culture, the kinship of God, came again to the fore with a new meaning and power. Heretofore, they had conceived of God as the holy God, unique in his greatness, fearful in power, righteous in his judgments. They reverenced him, but did not see in him that moral qualification that would cause them to take him warmly to their bosoms in a mutual fellowship of love. The qualities which the human being so desires: sympathy, deep concern and identity in suffering and sorrow, they did not recognize in him; and if recognized these qualities

had been blanched by the sterner qualities of Jehovah's moral character. But now, in the exile, there came about a shift in the thinking of the Jew about God, and in the way of contemplating divine motives. Wade[31] remarks that during this period, the balance of thought was shifted from what Jehovah required from his people to what he proposed to do for them. Hence, righteousness, which in the pre-exilic Isaiah signifies the civil justice and uprightness which God demands of his people (V. 7), is, in the Second Isaiah, generally synonymous with redemption, i.e., the deliverance which Jehovah pledged to bestow upon his people in virtue of fidelity to his promises, (Isaiah 45:8, 46:13). Thus, we note a turning to God, the go'el, on the divine human level, for salvation on the part of the Jews, after the fall of the Jewish theocracy, rather than a dependence on the go'el on the human level alone.

A striking reference to the kinsman redeemer is found in the writing of Deutero-Isaiah. In fact, it is a favorite term of the author, who often speaks of "Jehovah" as the go'el of Israel. To one who is acquainted with the cultural and religious background of the Hebrews, this reference to Jehovah as one who takes the role of the kinsman is not strange; for in their early Semitic background, as we have seen, kinship existed on three levels; the human, the super-human, and

---

[31] Old Testament History, Wade, G. W., 8th Edition, p. p. 455-456.

the spiritual.[32]

In Isaiah 41:14 Yahweh is presented as saying to Jacob, "Fear not, thou worm, Jacob, ye little people of Israel: I will help thee," the writer adds, "saith the Lord, and they redeemer, (go'el), the holy one of Israel." Orelli[33] thinks that the words, "worm, Jacob," denote here smallness, weakness and helplessness... The people who are in exile by their own fault cannot deliver themselves, but have an almighty go'el. He sees in this the germ of the New Testament idea of redemption. Alexander remarks concerning the use of go'el in this verse, "The word, go'el, redeemer, would suggest to a Hebrew reader the idea of a near kinsman (Lev. 25:24, 25) and of deliverance from bondage by the payment of a ransom."[34] The kinsman, as one who pays a ransom, is also implied in the Septuagint translation. "O Jacob, thou little Israel; I have helped thee, saith the God that ransometh thee, Israel."[35] The kinsman redeemer is presented here, then, as being God who delivers his people out of bondage and oppression.

The same idea is found in Isaiah 43:14. The word for redeemer is the same. Once more God is represented as speaking of his people, "Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the

---

[32]See p. 19

[33]The Prophecies of Isaiah, Orelli, C. Von, p. 231.

[34]Later Prophecies of Isaiah, Alexander, J. A., p. 39

[35]Isaiah According to the Septuagint, Ottley, R. R., Vol. 1, Second Edition, p. 225.

holy one of Israel, for your sake have I sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans whose cry is in the ships." In this chapter we have also emphasis placed on God as redeemer or go'el. In the sixth verse, Chap. 44, the eternal nature of the redeemer, God, is set forth, "Thus saith the Lord, the king of Israel, and his redeemer, the Lord of Hosts.: I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God." Verse twenty-four further develops the same idea coupled with the idea of omnipotence, "Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth from the heavens alone; that spreadeth above the earth by himself."

In the forty-seventh chapter of Isaiah, which Smith describes as a triumph and taunt song in the kinah or elegiac[36] we have the children of Israel addressing the fallen Babylon, "Come down and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground: there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans: for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. Take the millstones and grind meal: uncover thy locks, make bare the leg, uncover thy thigh, pass over the rivers. Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen: I will take vengeance and I will not meet thee as a man. As for our redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is his name,

---

[36] The Book of Isaiah, Smith, George A., p. 210.

the Holy one of Israel.[37]

In chapter fifty-four we come across several ideas that were common among the Hebrews and which were part of the general concept of kinship among their earlier progenitors. In this chapter the people of God are represented under the double figure, with which the book of Revelation has made us familiar, of bride and city. "To imagine a nation or a land as the spouse of God is a natural religious instinct; the land deriving her fruitfulness, the nation, her standing and prestige, from her connection with the Deity,"[38] says Smith. But in ancient times the figure of wedlock meant more than it does now to us; then the husband was the lord of his wife, as much her baal as the God was the baal of the people, her law-giver, in part, owner, and with full authority in every way over her. Marriage thus conceived was a figure for religion almost universal among the Semites. We must admit that the idea of human and divine unity, as expressed in the symbol of marriage among the early Hebrews and their heathen kin, was conceived with a grossness of feeling and illustrated by a foulness of ritual, which in many instances led to a demoralization of the people. But the idea was deeply imbedded in their idea of kinship. The prophets of Yahweh dared the heavier task

---

[37] Isaiah 47:1-4.

[38] The Book of Isaiah, Smith, George A., p. 421.

of retaining the idea of religious marriage, rather than excluding the figure altogether from its religious system, and won the diviner triumph of purifying and elevating it. Only by understanding these facts can we appreciate fully the beauty of the religious sentiment expressed in the following: "For thy maker is thy husband; and the Lord of Hosts is his name: and thy redeemer, the Holy one of Israel."[39]

Outside of Isaiah the term, go'el, is not applied to God except in Ps. 19:14; 78:35; Job 19:25; Prov. 23:11; Jer. 50:34. We shall note each briefly:

Psalm 19 is one of meditative praise. The psalmist, looking abroad over the whole world, finds two main subjects for his eulogy --- first the glorious fabric of the material creation (verses 1-6); and, secondly, the Divine Law which God has given to man (verses 7-11). Having thus poured out his heart in praise and thanksgiving to God, he turns his eye inward upon himself, and finds many shortcomings (verse 12). The thought of these leads him to prayer. So the hymn concludes with a few short petitions, verse 14 being the last: "Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer (go'el)." Perowne[40] interprets go'el as here used as God delivering from the guilt and power of sin.

---

[39] Isaiah 54:5.

[40] The Book of Psalms, Perowne, J.J., Vol. 1, p. 201.

In Psalm 78:35 we have relatively the same idea as above. The entire psalm is a historical psalm designed to keep the people faithful to David and his house, and to check their tendency to place themselves under the leadership of the tribe of Ephraim. God's dealings with Israel in the past are recalled from the time of the sojourn in Egypt to the establishment of David's kingdom. During this period they experienced many ups and downs, and when things went sore against them, "they remembered that God was their rock, and the high God, their redeemer." It was sin, continuous sin (verses 32,33) that brought about their suffering, hence a turning back to God in true repentance, and being delivered from sin and guilt was to be delivered from the effects of sin as evidenced by their deplorable condition.

In Job 19:25,"I know that my redeemer liveth," we have, perhaps, one of the most memorable sayings of Scripture. Job has a go'el, an avenger, who will plead his cause and deliver him from his trouble. Clearly he is thinking of God. He has no idea of another being who shall be his friend while God remains his persecuting enemy. He flees from God to God. He knows that, although he cannot understand God's present treatment of him, he will be ultimately delivered if he trusts God. Robinson[41] in his commentary on the book of Job, gives

---

[41] Homiletical Commentary on the Book of Job, Robinson, Thomas, p. 119.

three applications of go'el, which occurs in this verse: first, to the kinsman whose duty under the law was established in the early period of the Mosaic Law, but was recognized long before; second, to God as the redeemer and deliverer of his people, especially of Israel from Egyptian bondage and Babylonian captivity; and third, to God, the Son. Watson[42] remarks on these memorable words of Job saying, "The go'el or redeemer pledged to him (Job) by eternal justice is yet to arise, a living remembrancer and vindicator from all wrong and dishonor. On the dust that covers death he will arise when the day comes. The diseases that prey on the perishing body shall have done their work. In the grave the flesh shall have passed into decay; but the spirit that has borne shall behold him. Not for the passing stranger shall be the vindication, but for Job himself. All that has been so confounding shall be explained, for the Most High is the go'el; he has the care of his suffering servant in his own hand and will not fail to issue it in clear, satisfying judgment."

In Proverbs 23:11 we are reminded by the use of go'el of the theocratic community among the Israelites. In this community formed under divine direction there was a possession of personal and private property. When the land of Canaan was first divided among the tribes it is evident that each

---

[42] The Book of Job, Watson, R.A., p. 234.

family had its respective allotment, the boundaries of which were clearly defined.[43] Each head of a family became, therefore, a possessor of property to which no other person, not even the king in the days of the monarchy, had any right. Each man had his own inheritance, which became more or less valuable according to the industry and skill expended upon it. Under such a system it was inevitable that inequalities would result. The depravity of human nature manifested itself in the strong taking advantage of the weak. The widow and the fatherless became the first victims of the greedy strong. But, as asserts Harris, "From the earliest days of Jewish history God declared himself to be the guardian of the widow and the fatherless, and the field which was their inheritance might have been well called God's Acre, from which all intruders were warned off by divine command and threatening."[44] Toy[45] states the technical term, go'el, used in this verse to describe God in his relationship to the widow and the fatherless, means "redeemer or protector," and amplifies this by adding that it was the go'el whose duty it was, under the Hebrew law, to redeem the lands of kinsfolk which had for any reason been alienated. Here

---

[43] See Deut. 19:14.

[44] The Preacher's Homiletic Commentary - Proverbs, Harris, W., Vol. 13, p. 666.

[45] A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs, Toy, Crawford H., p. 432.

the supposition is that there is no human go'el, or kinsman, in which case God himself will act as kinsman.

In Jer. 50:34 go'el is applied to God. It is used in the special sense of advocate. The Children of Israel and the Children of Judah are being oppressed by the Chaldeans and inhabitants of Babylon. They shall be vindicated and find release from this oppression by their redeemer. He is more powerful than any kinsman on the human level of kinship. The Lord of Hosts is his name. Their redeemer is strong.

We make the following observations by way of summary: We have noticed thus far in our study of the kinsman redeemer in the Old Testament a gradual supplanting of the idea of the go'el, as represented in human kinship, by the idea of a go'el on a super-human or divine human level. This idea of a kinsman who possessed a divine nature was not without background in the early culture of the Hebrew people. They shared with others of their Semitic kinsmen the ancient belief in the unity of the human and the divine, as evidenced in their ideas concerning the marriage of men with gods and God being the progenitor of man.

This turning away from the human go'el by the Hebrews in the theocracy was given new impetus by the disintegration of the Jewish state. In this catastrophe the Israelite found no hope of deliverance among human kindred. His brethren like himself were impotent. It was in this crisis of the

individual and the nation, when hope was almost blotted out by despair, that the prophets of Israel's Jehovah and the firm believers in Israel's God discovered in him Israel's true go'el.

CHAPTER IV

CHRIST, THE KINSMAN REDEEMER

Redemption as we have found it in the Old Testament begins on a natural and national plane. It was the deliverance from Egypt that created both the Israelitic nation and the Israelitic religion. This deliverance was preeminently one from natural evil, physical and political bondage; and it was a redemption of the race, a new birth of the national consciousness. For many years afterwards the thoughts of the Israelite reverted again and again for inspiration to this significant event in their national history. In fact, the Israelite never outgrew the natural and national elements in his original conception of redemption. But gradually, says Knudson, "the course of events led the people to fix their attention more and more upon the future. They remembered gratefully the redemption from Egypt, but they looked forward to a yet greater redemption in the days to come under the leadership of a Messiah."[1] As the Messianic hope developed along with it went a gradual moralization of the idea of redemption and also a larger recognition of the place of the individual in the redemption plan. The eighth century prophets contributed most to the moralizing while Jeremiah[2] and Ezekiel[3] and the author of

---

[1] The Doctrine of Redemption, Knudson, Albert C., p. 278.
[2] Jeremiah 17:14; 31:31-34.
[3] Ezekiel 18; 14:12-20.

the book of Job did much to individualize the conception of redemption. The most important development in the latter direction, however, came toward the close of the Old Testament period with the rise of the belief in the resurrection of the dead.[4]

Knudson[5] gives four respects in which the New Testament's view of redemption marked an advance beyond that of the Old Testament: (1) The idea of salvation was more thoroughly and consistently moralized. Redemption was conceived of as primarily deliverance from sin. (2) Redemption was thought of as individual and universal. Its social aspects were retained in the idea of the kingdom of God, but all national limitations were removed. (3) The New Testament represents redemption as past and future. In one sense redemption was thought of as past. It was connected with the death and resurrection of Christ, as in the Old Testament it was connected with the deliverance from Egypt. (4) A still more distinctive feature of the New Testament idea of redemption was the way in which it linked redemption with the person and work of Christ.

What we have stated does not destroy the fact of the striking parallel of what the New Testament has to say about redemption to what we have found in the Old Testament. North

---

[4]Isaiah 26:19; Daniel 12:2.

[5]The Doctrine of Redemption, Knudson, A. C., pp. 279-280.

finds that in the authorized version the words, "redeem" and "redemption", occur twenty-two times, and "ransom" (as a noun only) three times. Again, too, all the examples are renderings of two Greek words and their derivatives, namely, lutroo (with the nouns, **lutron**, antilutron, lutrosis, apolutrosis) and agorazo (with exagorazo).[6] Lutroo means to release on receipt of ransom, lutron being the price paid; agorazo, "to buy (in the market place, agora), " though slaves were frequently offered for sale there it could have much the same meaning. Lutroo and its cognate forms have always, in the New Testament, a soteriological reference. Only once is a word from this stem not rendered by "redeem", "ransom"---namely in Acts 7:35, where Lutrotes (literally "ransomer," not found earlier than the New Testament) is used of Moses. (So in RVM; AV and RV tr. 'deliverer'). In the LXXX lutrotes stands for go'el in Ps. 18 (19;14).[7]

That the New Testament carries on the metaphor of the Old is clear. Indeed, it would seem that the metaphor is applied more literally in the New Testament than in the Old. The Old Testament placed at the center of God's redemptive activity of Israel the deliverance from Egypt and Babylon; the New Testament puts the cross at the center of the divine activity of redemption. In five passages the ransom price

---

[6]The Redeemer God, North, C. R., (Interpretation) Vol. II, p. 8.

[7]Dictionary of the Bible, Hastings, Vol. Iv, p. 211.

said to be paid by Christ is his blood, namely, Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14, "in whom we have our redemption through his blood ("through his blood" not in the Colossians passage in the A.S.V.); Rev. 5:9, "thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe and tongue, and people and nation;" Hebrews 9:12, "nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once and for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption; I Peter 1:188. "knowing that ye were redeemed not with corruptible things, with silver or gold... but with the precious blood of Christ;" while in Gal. 3:13 it is said that "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree;" nor must we forget the words of Jesus himself, "the Son of man came ... to give his life a ransom for many," Mark 10:45.

This word, lutron, ransom, admits of no ambiguity. It means "purchase-money," the price paid for the release of anyone from captivity, from prison, or from peril. The Septuagint uses it for כֹּפֶר and כֻּפֶּר- compensation, redemption, satisfaction by a price. Thus, by the Levitical law the owner of an unruly ox was responsible in various penalties for the mischief done by the animal. When liable to the penalty of death, he might redeem his life by a fine, and this was the lutron ; "If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid

upon him.[8] A universal ransom money was levied upon the people to avert a judgment from Jehovah. "When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them when thou numberest them."[9] The same redemption-tax is afterward spoken of as the "atonement money."[10]

Thompson observes that the same term, lutron, is employed by the Septuagint for the price of the redemption of a slave, and also of land that had been alienated.[11]

On the other hand it was forbidden to accept a ransom for a murderer: "Ye shall take no satisfaction (lutron) for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death.[12]

The same word, chiefly in the plural form, lutra, is common in classic Greek in the sense of ransom, a price paid for redemption. Plato uses it in describing the rich presents that Chryses brought to the Greeks for the ransom of his daughter.[13] Thucydides speaks of Hippocrates, tyrant of Gela, having received the territory of Camarina as a ransom

---

[8] Ex. 21:30.

[9] Ex. 30:12.

[10] Ex. 5:16.

[11] The Theology of Christ, Thompson, J.P., p. 63.

[12] Numbers 35:31.

[13] Plato's Republic, 39, 3D.

for some Syracusan prisoners.[14] Herodotus, describing the victory of the Athenians over the Chalcidians and the Boeotians, says, "All the Chalcidian prisoners whom they took were put in irons, and kept for a long time in close confinement, as likewise were the Boeotians, until the ransom asked for them was paid ... ransom-money -τῶν λυτρων'.[15] In the great tragic poet, Aeschylus is a striking instance of lutron in the sense of an expiation or atonement for murder. The chorus of mourning women bewailing the untimely end of Agamemnon, exclaims, "What atonement is there for blood that has fallen on the ground?[16] How admirably comes in here the New Testament doctrine of an expiation, a ransom, sufficient to atone for every crime. The Son of man gave his life, "a ransom," "lutron" for many.

Thus we see that the New Testament idea of redemption does not exclude the basic ideas of redemption as exhibited in the Old Testament, but becomes the embodiment of the Old Testament ideas and more in that it fulfills in a greater and higher sense the redemptive hopes and expectations of men. The Old Testament set forth the idea of man's redemption as a possibility and a hope. The New Testament presents redemption as a present reality, as demonstrated in the per-

---

[14] Thuc. VI. 5.

[15] Herod V. 77.

[16] Aesch. Cho. 42.

sonality of Jesus who is the redeemer of the world. It tells us, Dr. Harold Tribble says, that "Eternal redemption grows out of eternal love, the love of God, the Father, for man, his child, revealed and made available through Jesus Christ, the eternal Son."[17]

A distinctive feature of the New Testament idea of redemption was the way in which it linked redemption with the person and work of Christ. Jesus did not apply the title, redeemer, to himself personally; but it may be definitely inferred from statements which indicate his Messianic consciousness that he considered himself as being the key personality in bringing to pass an adjustment of man in his relation to God. He spoke of himself as the perfect revealer of the Father.[18] But after his resurrection the hope of his disciples was set upon him as savior. They declared that his very name, Jesus, was significant in that it was prophetic of his supreme work in behalf of man, for he was to save his people from their sins.[19] All that had previously been done by others to effect the redemption of Israel and the world was transcended by him. In him were fulfilled the hopes of the past, so he stood forth apart, alone - the only redeemer. "In none other is there salvation, for neither is

---

[17] Salvation, Tribble, Harold W., p. 53.

[18] Matt. 11:27

[19] Matt. 1:21.

there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.[20]

It would be impossible to treat the topic, "Christ, the Kinsman Redeemer," without going into a consideration of the person of Christ. It is only by discovering who he is that we can determine whether he is a kinsman --- and if a kinsman, in what sense or on what level of kinship. The Old Testament in its latest stages of development, pictured the terribly sinful state man had degenerated into, and found no possibility for man to redeem himself. This had been demonstrated in the actual activities of man. Serious attempts at self-redemption had been made by men, but all had come to nought. The Old Testament had very effectively built up the idea that redemption in the highest sense cannot be gained by man himself. It comes from God. Now if this redemption comes from God, if it is God who effects the redemption of man, who, then, is Jesus? What of his person? Thus we note the great significance of the person of Christ. Every effort to silence debate on the subject by an appeal to the authority of the past or to the supposed metaphysical bankruptcy of the human mind has failed. Men still insist on the right to a rational answer to the question, "What think ye of the Christ?"

The primary stress in Scripture is laid upon the conception of man's kinship to God. This kinship is expressed

---

[20]Acts 4:2

by two figures, says Knudson, "the image of God and divine sonship."[21] The first of these appears in the Old Testament account of man's creation, and the second as the correlative of the divine fatherhood as prominent in the New Testament.

In the Old Testament the idea of kinship is conveyed in the statement that man was created in the image of God. What should be understood by the divine image in man has been much discussed. Some ascribe the image to the supposed similarity of the human body to the divine likeness; others maintain that what is meant by the divine image is merely the capacity to rule over the lower animals. At times the divine image has been identified with man's spiritual nature. However the image of God may be interpreted by the various schools of thought, I do not think there is much disagreement among Bible scholars as to the certainty of the teaching in the Old Testament of the kinship of man to God.

Now there are several things we wish to note concerning this statement of kinship in the first chapter of Genesis. In the first place the fact of kinship became an actuality upon the positing of the essence of God in those basic elements that constitute the material nature of man. The subsequent result was a "man-like God." God remained unchanged, only man had changed. Secondly, kinship so devolved was, in fact, kinship, yet one strangely conceived in

---

[21] The Doctrine of Redemption, Knudson, A. C., p. 284.

a material world and impracticable in the everyday intercourses of men. A kinsman who was bone of one's bone and flesh of one's flesh was a kinsman to be relied upon in every situation. But that kinsman who was kin in some far away spiritual sense, but who could not participate in a practical situation became vague indeed, and seldom an object of burning faith. Perhaps, herein lies the need of a doctrine of "incarnation."

The term, incarnation, shortly expresses the fundamental fact of Christianity, as St. John describes it in his Gospel, "The word became flesh."[22] It signifies the act of condescension whereby the Son of God, himself very God and of one substance with the Father, took to himself human nature in order to accomplish its redemption and restoration. The New Testament insists upon the incarnation as a physical, historic fact,[23] but points to its true explanation, to the grace or love of God.[24] The expression of Paul, "mystery of godliness,"[25] implies, on the other hand, that the redemptive action of God is beyond our power to analyze or comprehend. Such being the general aspect of the fact we find the most comprehensive statement of it in the prologue to St. John's

---

[22] John 1:14.
[23] I John 1:3.
[24] John 3:16.
[25] I Tim. 3:16.

Gospel.[26] John begins by intimating a plurality of persons within the Godhead; he describes the function of the Logos, the objective utterance or self-expression of Deity in his relation to the created universe of which he is the author and sustainer, and to man, whose conscience and reason owe whatever illumination they possess to His presence and operation. John also teaches as a further presupposition of his doctrine of the incarnation, the occurrence of a fall, or process of aversion from God, whereby man became subject to the power of "darkness" or moral evil. It was to recover man from his state of alienation and to raise him into the life of divine sonship that the Word was finally made manifest in human form.

In the Incarnation, therefore, we see shadowings of the go'el, the kinsman. The plan of redemption required a kinsman who was just a little more real, a little more practical than the former far-off kinsman who was related in an intangible spiritual sort of way. The Incarnation provided the answer. Whereas in the beginning kinship was established by divinity positing itself in the material and resulting in the birth of the first man, Adam, all the while remaining isolated and apart, now it is the divine that is in some sense diminished, limited, abased, in that it becomes clothed in the flesh, resulting in a God-like man. In the first, man

---

[26] John 1:1.

was made in the image of God; in the latter, God, in his Son, is manifest in the image of man. Thus the Incarnation ushers into the arena of life a true kinsman, who shares in all things common to man; yet who has the necessary authority and power to bring redemption to his brethren.

For the Christian Fathers the Incarnation theory was the only adequate religious interpretation of the person of Christ. No one who believed profoundly in God and who realized the full religious significance of Jesus could be content to ascribe his personality and his influence to a merely human quest after God. Back of the human Jesus and expressed through him there must have been a divine quest after man. No life so freighted with meaning and with vital consequences to mankind as that of Jesus could have been grounded in a merely human will. It must have been expressive of the divine purpose. It must, itself, have been a divine act, a special divine advent into the world.

The tenor of the New Testament may be described as distinctly favoring the conclusion that the person of Christ was inclusive of a complete human nature. Even though there is not a single sentence that definitely asserts this conclusion, in not a few passages there are points of view which suggest that Christ was truly man, whatever more he may have been.

There are two writings which most emphazise his divinity, namely the fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

These contain the fullest evidence in behalf of his divinity. This fact reveals that in apostolic thinking divinity and humanity were not thought of as mutually exclusive. The language in the epistle to the Hebrews is especially cogent. In representing Christ as taking hold of the seed of Abraham instead of angels, as holding to man the relation of brother, and as being made in all respects like unto his brethren, (Hebrews 2:11-17) it falls little short of a dogmatic assertion that Christ possessed human nature in its integrity.

The same truth is brought out indirectly in those passages of Scripture which speak of the growth of Christ, of his temptation and of various traits and experiences which are appropriate to the human soul.[27] Sheldon comments on the implications of these passages and the humanity of Jesus, saying, "Doubtless those who believe the complete humanification of the Logos to be possible have a way of explaining these passages without postulating a human soul in Christ. But their position encounters a serious rational objection. It also involves a forfeit from the religious point of view. For, unless one who proceeds from this standpoint has the hardihood to affirm that the Logos was perma-

---

[27]Luke 2:40, 51-52; 4:1-12; 22:41-44; Matt. 4:1-11; 11:29; 12:46-50; John 4:6; 5:30; 11:33-38; Cor. 15:45; Heb. 2:10-18.

nently alienated from the divine mode of being, He must be supposed after the season of humiliation to retain the distinctively human element only as a memory of past experiences. That which in particular constituted him a brother among men is no longer present to his person."[28]

A testimony to the human nature of Christ may also be discerned in the name, "Son of man," which the Gospel narratives report to have been applied by himself several scores of times. There are many theories which have been common among scholars respecting the meaning which Jesus attached to this self-designation. Stevens[29] gives the following principal ones:

(1) The title meant for Jesus simply "the Messiah," and was derived directly from Daniel 7:13. This view encounters the difficulty that if Jesus meant by the title simply "the Messiah," he would have been proclaiming his Messiahship from the beginning of his ministry, which is quite contrary to the synoptic representation.

(2) "Son of man" means the ideal, typical representative man. This interpretation has been widely current since Schleiermacher.

(3) The title may be regarded as connected, primarily, with the Old Testament representations which use the phrase

---

[28] System of Christian Doctrine, Sheldon, Henry C., p. 327.

[29] The Theology of the New Testament, Stevens, George Barker, pp. 46-48.

to emphasize finite loneliness and weakness (in Ezekiel and elsewhere.)

(4) Another type of explanation makes use of the Old Testament concept of the Servant of Jehovah in explaining the title. According to this view the notion which is given in Daniel has been influenced and developed by apocalyptic usage such as we find in the book of Enoch. In that book the Son of Man is a supernatural being who sits upon God's throne and possesses universal dominion.

As to Stevens' own view of the meaning of the title, "Son of Man," he says, "I believe we must adopt the conclusion that it (Son of Man) had Messianic significance for Jesus; that it was a veiled designation of his Messiahship. We have seen that it was not in popular use as a Messianic title. Its use by our Lord would not, therefore, carry an explicit assertion of Messiahship. His use of it involved the claim of a unique mission, a calling distinguishing him from all others... The term as used by Jesus was more generic than Messiah, and just on this account it was adapted to his use. But the head and founder of the Kingdom of God was, in reality, the Messiah, and the more explicit he made his claim to found and complete his kingdom, the more naturally would 'Son of Man' assume the character of a Messianic title."[30] However, if the name, "Son of Man," served thus

---

[30]Ibid. p. 53.

to give an unobtrusive and partially veiled expression to a Messianic consciousness, and this was a motive for its choice, it still witnesses in a negative way to Christ's sense of partnership in human nature.

Sheldon, though admitting the rational ground for imputing complete humanity to Christ to be less cogent than the scriptural evidence says, "Without this component in his person he would seem to fall short of the ideal qualification for the office of redemption, reconciliation, and kinship. We are not, indeed, disposed to contend that without the hypostatic union of a human nature with the divine in the redeemer, he would have had no true means of saving men and uniting them with God. Men are saved by spiritual influence exercised upon them individually, and not by the mere exaltation of a specimen of human nature into divine union. The lot of human nature in Christ can affect positively the lot of human nature outside only as it is a medium of manifesting truth, or conveying some form of spiritual potency. The means of actually grappling with men, influencing, persuading and subduing them, are above all else, the necessary instruments of their salvation. And it is going much too far to say that there would have been no such means, that all the purity, beauty, and grace manifested in our incarnate Lord could have no redeeming efficacy, unless the complete essence of humanity was united in him with the essence of divinity. Again, we are not disposed to affirm that the Son of

God needed to assume a human soul in order to stand in a sympathetic relation with men. This line of thought is derogatory to the divine heart. Whence come the tenderness of human sympathy and the warmth of human love? What more are they than reflected beams of that incomparable light which shines in divine altitudes? But notwithstanding these concessions, there is room still to hold that the human nature of Christ enters as a completing element into the conception of his office as redeemer and head of the race. If it does not make the Son of God nearer to men in the fact of a sympathetic interest, it does make him nearer in the apprehension of men... Taking men, accordingly, as they are, and making due account of their actual needs, it seems necessary to conclude that the ideal fulfillment of his gracious offices requires the redeemer to share truly in the nature of those to be redeemed."[31]

The manhood of Christ is represented in the New Testament as being distinguished in two eminent particulars, namely, supernatural conception and sinlessness. The former is distinctly affirmed in two of the Gospels. Matthew tells us that Joseph, the husband of Mary, finding her with child, was minded to put her away privately, but was prevented from doing so for "While he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying,

---

[31] The System of Christian Doctrine, Sheldon, H.C., pp. 328-329.

Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."[32] Luke also gives credence to the supernatural in the birth of Jesus.[33] It is true that if Mark had dealt with the infancy of Jesus, a reference to the supernatural conception might be looked for in his narrative. But inasmuch as this evangelist saw fit to begin the story of Jesus at his baptism, his omission of one of the conditions of the nativity in nowise discredits the report of the other evangelists. As for John the plan of his narrative excluded any detailed reference to the birth of Christ.

The supernatural conception of Christ is essential to the integrity of his human nature. We use the term, integrity, to signify not merely completeness, but perfection. That which is perfect is a fortiori complete in all its parts. To deny the supernatural conception of Christ involves either a denial of the purity of Mary, his mother, or a denial of the truthfulness of Matthew's and Luke's narratives. Strong quotes Julius Miller in reference to this particular matter, as saying, "Jesus Christ had no earthly father; his birth was a creative act of God, breaking through the chain of human generation."[34]

---

[32] Matt. 1:20.

[33] Luke 1:31-38.

[34] Systematic Theology, Strong, A.H., Vol. II, p. 676.

The second distinction of Christ, his sinlessness, was manifestly one with which the apostolic consciousness was thoroughly penetrated. John represents Christ as saying with evident reference to himself, "He that seeketh the glory of him that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him."[35] Again the evangelist puts these words in his mouth: "He that sent me is with me; he hath not left me alone, for I always do the things that are pleasing to him."[36] Other passages which bear out the same facts may be noted, particularly I John 3:5; I Peter 2:22; Heb. 4:15; Heb. 7:26; II Cor. 5:21; and Romans 8:3.

Positive proof of Christ's sinlessness by way of analysis is, of course, out of the question, since large areas of his life are hidden from view. But adequate grounds for a rational faith are not wanting. Aside from apostolic witness we have the unique fact of a total abstinence in the life of Christ of any disclosure of a consciousness of sin. How explain this exemption from the shadow which belongs to all ordinary human consciousness? If it was not due to a genuine reality, it was an eccentricity which naturally would have borne fruit in practical aberrations. As Bushnell aptly remarks: "Piety without one dash of repentance, one ingenuous confession of wrong, one tear, one look of

---

[35] John 7:18.

[36] John 8:29.

contrition, one request to heaven for pardon --- let anyone of mankind try this kind of piety, and see how long it will be ere his righteousness will prove itself to be the most impudent conceit! How long before his passions, sobered by no contrition, his pride kept down by no repentance, will tempt him into absurdities that will turn his pretense to mockery!"[37]

What I have thus far stated has been by way of expressing the humanity of Christ. Perhaps, the question may be asked again, "Who is Jesus Christ that he should be believed in as no other is believed in by us?"

First of all, Jesus Christ was a man in the full psychological sense sharing truly and fully in the conditions of our empirical humanity. The fact which confronts us in the New Testament in all the wonder of its perfection is an actual human life, which was, at the same time, a true divine life. He was no phantom, archangel, or demi-god, playing a human role on the world's stage; for verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but ... "the seed of Abraham." (Heb. 2:16.)

Dr. Whale is very zealous in emphasizing the humanity of Jesus. He admonishes that, "It is vitally important that we do not, in any way, jeopardize the truth that Jesus was a man living upon victuals. The spiteful and ridiculous cal-

---

[37] Nature and the Supernatural, Bushnell, Horace, pp. 285,286.

umny that he was gluttonous and a wine-bibber (Matt. 11:19) is precious testimony to the fact that in all things he was like unto his brethren. He not only ate and drank; he knew hunger and thirst and weariness. To use Pilate's words, "Behold the man --- poor, born in an outhouse, working, journeying, praying, tempted as we are tempted."[38]

The essential truth here is that in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren (Heb. 2:17, 4:15.) This similarity of Christ to his brethren in the flesh is strikingly brought out in the words of Turgenev: "I saw myself a youth, almost a boy in a low-pitched wooden church... There stood before me many people, all fair-haired peasant heads. From time to time they began swaying, falling, rising again, like the ripe ears of wheat, when the sun in summer passes over them. All at once, a man came from behind and stood beside me. I did not turn toward him, but I felt that the man was Christ. Emotion, curiosity, awe overmastered me. I made an effort and looked at my neighbor, a face like everyone's, a face like all men's faces. The eyes pressed; the upper lip as it were resting on the other; a small beard parted in two; the hands folded and still; and the clothes on him like everyone's . 'What sort of Christ is this?' I thought; 'such an ordinary, ordinary man!! I turned away, but I had hardly turned my eyes

---

[38] Christian Doctrine, Whale, J.S., p. 99.

from this ordinary man when I felt again that it was none other than Christ standing beside me. Suddenly my heart sank, and I came to myself. Only then I realized that just such a face is the face of Christ --- a face like all men's faces."[39]

The title, Son of Man, is used by Jesus and sets forth the fact of his humanity. It is found most frequently in the synoptists. The Son of Man appears as a man among men and is described as having neither property nor home (Matt. 8:20; Luke 9:58); he eats and drinks (Matt. 11:10; Luke 7:34). He can forgive sins (Matt 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24); he is Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5); he is the sower of the parable (Matt 13:37,41); he is come to save (Matt. 18:11; Luke 19:10) and to minister (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45). Sin against him is not without forgiveness (Matt 12:32; Luke 12:10); the sign of Jonas is fulfilled in him (Matt. 12:40; Luke 11:30). He must fulfill the preordained and predicted destiny of his life (Matt. 25:44); must suffer, be rejected, betrayed by the kiss of a Judas (Luke 22:48), and delivered up into the hands of sinners, ill-treated and crucified (Luke 24:7; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22); but he will rise again((Matt. 27:9; Mark 9:9; Matt. 17:23; Mark 9:31); and a great future with the Father and a return in glory for the establishment of his kingdom and for judg-

---

[39]Quoted by Whale in his Christian Doctrine, pp. 100-101.

ment is in store for him (Matt. 10:23; Mark 8:38; Luke, 11:26; Matt. 24:44; Luke 12:40, 21, 36; Matt. 25:31.) Men will be persecuted for his sake (Luke 6:22, cf. Matt. 5:10); he will be ashamed of those who are ashamed of him (Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26); but he will, on the other hand, confess those that confess him, (Luke 12:8).

We see from the foregoing how manifold the use of this expression is, and that there is also, evidently, a purpose in it. Whether it has no historical connection with the Son of man in Daniel 12:13, as is alleged by Schleiermacher, or whether Jesus used it to describe his lowliness as Grotius thinks, or in Herder's opinion, to represent himself as the ideal man is open to debate; yet it seems fairly clear that the fact of his humanity is not left in doubt.

However, we must recognize the peculiar contrast between humiliation and dignity of the Son of Man. Stevens thinks that this contrast between humility and dignity of the Son of Man is reflected in the synoptic writings and that the title, " is a name for the founder and head of the Kingdom of God, and, thus, a veiled designation of the Messiah. The life of lowliest condescension proves to be the life of supreme exaltation. The way of the Cross is the way of the throne. The seeming inconsistency disappears in a higher unity."[40]

---

[40] The Theology of the New Testament, Stevens, G. B., p. 200

Schmid quotes Neander as saying that "He (Jesus) thus calls himself as one, who, partaking of humanity, has worked out such great results for human nature, through which results our nature is glorified; who, also, most eminently answers to the ideal man and realizes the prototype of humanity."[41] He, however, sees the perfect union of the Son of Man and the Son of God in the person of Jesus Christ.[42] Mullins sums up his view of the New Testament teaching concerning the humanity of Jesus thus: (1) "We are impressed in the synoptic records with the fact of the humanity of Jesus. That life is seen in the life of his body with its limitations, its hunger and thirst, its need and dependence. (2) In the synoptic Gospels we have also an account of the human Jesus which represents him as possessing attributes and functions which are wholly extraordinary. His relations to God and man are far above the level of ordinary men. He is in relation to God the supreme and authoritative revelation. In relation to man he is the religious object and medium of salvation.[43]

From the foregoing discussion we reach the conclusion that the incarnation was God's method of coming into saving relations with mankind. Jesus became one with the race in in a profound and real sense. He is, indeed, a kinsman.

---

[41] Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Schmid, C.F., p. 114.

[42] Ibid. p. 114.

[43] The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expressions, Mullins, E.Y., p. 162.

Mullins states that this unity and identity of Christ with mankind had a "backward and a forward reference." The backward reference was his original relation to the human race. As we have already seen, man was made in the image of Christ. Christ is the natural bond of mankind. The new spiritual head of that race was the original creative head.

The forward reference of Christ's unity with mankind is the basis for his redemptive activity in behalf of man, who could not lift himself above himself.

The backward reference of the incarnation connects Christ with God. He was the son of God. Since the backward reference connected him with God and the forward reference to man he became one with God and one with man, and, consequently, could act for both.

We now come to the consideration of the redemptive work of Christ, the kinsman. It is evident that Jesus recognized in his work a relation to the Old Testament. This he did, as the accounts of the evangelists will show, with perfect earnestness. It was also done not only in the presence of the people and scribes, but also before his Apostles.[44] He knew that his appearance was necessarily predicted and prepared for in the Old Testament; and, therefore, in the various predictions and also in the whole progress of the Old Testament dispensation of revelation, and the development of the theo-

---

[44] Matt. 27:24-31; Luke 22:37.

cratic people he found a prophecy as to his person and work.

Jesus defined his relation to the Old Testament when he testified as to himself. This appears in that he declared himself to be the Messiah; and connected with this, that, during the period of his teaching, he confined his ministry within the limits of the theocratic people. His forcible declaration in the case of the Canaanitish woman illustrates this point.[45] He also distinctly declared himself to be the Messiah by accepting the acknowledgment of his disciples to this effect.[46] When the people welcomed him with the salutation, "Messiah," he by no means admonished them, or gave an indication that the term, in his case, was misapplied.[47] He had, indeed, called it forth by the prophetico-symbolical form of his entry into Jerusalem. To the disciples of John, the Baptist, he confessed himself to be "he that should come."[48] Neither did he fail to make this clear to individuals; for he expressly declared himself to be the Messiah to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well.[49]

Jesus recognized the divine character of the Old Testament; for as the Messiah and fulfiller of the New Covenant,

---

[45] Matt. 15:24; Mark 7:27.

[46] John 1:35; Matt. 16:13.

[47] Matt. 21:15,16.

[48] Matt. 11:5.

[49] John 4:26; 9:37; 10:25.

it is he in whom the Old Testament attains its accomplishment. In John 4:22 he recognizes the source-point of salvation as being in the Jews. Thus acknowledging the divine character of that dispensation he limits the dispensation of the Jews to John, the Baptist.[50] He ascribes divine authority to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to which he often appeals. He speaks of them, using various terms which were current among the Jews, such as graphē and graphai.[51]

Jesus also appeals to the historical records of the Old Testament, and especially declares that the Scriptures testify of him and must be fulfilled in him. He states very clearly that it was his personal destination to fulfill the Old Testament dispensation (Matt. 5:17); as in Matt. 21:38, he is the heir of the vineyard, to whom it will revert. In this idea of fulfillment in Christ's person the two aspects of his relation to the Old Testament - the accomplishment of the Old Testament dispensation and its cessation in its temporal form- are most unequivocally contained.

"All real religion," says Whale, "presupposes the grim and inescapable fact of sin; the language it speaks, in judgment and mercy, is the language of atonement. Communion with God is the very end of man's being, but this is impossible without reconciliation to God. Atonement means, therefore,

---

[50] Matt. 11:12; Luke 16:16.

[51] John 10:35; 5:39.

the creation of the conditions whereby God and man come together.[52] No full appreciation of the redemptive work can be had without a proper consideration of the atonement. In fact, the concept of atonement is central in the New Testament. Perhaps, we may go further to state that the whole sacrificial system as described in the Old Testament has validity and worth only as it culminates in the doctrine of the atonement of Christ as set forth in the New Testament. Sheldon ably sets forth this truth in commenting upon the value of the sacrificial system, "The evidence of a divine vocation in the Old Testament religion as a whole, the dependence of its value upon a due balance of different elements, and its prophetical character, the anticipatory relation to the New Testament truth which is bespoken for it in the references of Christ and the Apostles, compel the conclusion that a factor so prominent as the sacrificial system, and so interwoven with the life and thought of Israel was, at least, in its mere essential features, thoroughly in the providential order, a means chosen of God for the tuition of Israel and for the instruction of men to the end of time."[53]

The history of man's quest for reconciliation with God is always, says Whale, "a pilgrimage to the cross." There are three stages in this pilgrimage, stages so related to

---

[52] Christian Doctrine, Whale, J.S., p. 75.

[53] System of Christian Doctrine, Sheldon, H.C., p. 372.

one another that each is a criticism, explicit or implicit, of the one it leaves behind. These may be described as the bargaining stage, the moralistic stage and that stage of utter abasement. All of these lead to the Cross, which is a place where one long road ends and a new road begins. The Cross is a monument to two abiding facts. The first is, that man's age-long effort after reconciliation through sacrifice was no meaningless phantasy. It was a schoolmaster leading him to Christ. All religions agree ~~in~~ that there is no atonement without sacrifice. The idea comes to its grand finale - its climax in the Cross. The second fact is that the Cross reveals an old truth, namely, that atonement must be and is the work of God.

There is some difference of opinion as to what should be included under the atonement. Some understand by it the "saving effects of Christ's incarnation, life, passion and death;" others, "the operations of the preincarnate Logos and the expected results of Christ's Second Advent." But the predominant view limits it to the effects of Christ's passion and death. Personally, I favor this view which is held by Knudson, although he chooses it because he feels that it has the advantage of bringing out what has been theologically most significant.[54]

---

[54] The Doctrine of Redemption, Knudson, A.C., p. 335

The idea of atonement is firmly established by the contents of the Scriptures. Sheldon has found nine groupings of Scriptures which serve to direct attention to the more important aspects of the subject of atonement as found in New Testament references.[55] The following is a brief summary of them: (1) Those passages which reveal that the suffering and death of Christ are not represented as being accidental , but on the contrary, as part of the scheme set on foot by divine wisdom and grace for the salvation of men. Both in the words of Christ and in the apostolic references they are described as matters of forecast and beneficent design.[56] (2) Those in which the sufferings of Christ, his death and his shed blood are represented as being for sinners or directed to the end of taking away sins.[57] (3) Those passages in which Christ is described as a high priest, and his sufferings and death are represented as being sacrificial.[58] (4) Those in which the sacrificial work of Christ which was consummated in his death is set forth as a ground of forgiveness or reconciliation.[59] (5) Those in which Christ is represented as being given or offered as a means of redemp-

---

[55] System of Christian Doctrine, pp. 373-381.

[56] Note: Matt. 20:28; Luke 12:50; Luke 24:46; John 10:11, 17,18; 12:27; Heb. 2:9-10.

[57] Heb. 2:4; Luke 22:19,20; Rom. 5:6,8; I Cor. 15:3; II Cor. 5:14:15.

[58] John 1:29; Heb. 2:17; I Cor. 5:7; Eph. 5:2; Heb. 10:19-22.

[59] Matt 26:28; Acts 13:38,39; Rom. 5:10-11; Eph. 2:13; Rom. 5:18; Eph. 1:7.

tion.[60] (6) Those in which Christ is described as being, through his blood, a propitiation for sins.[61] (7) Those passages in which Christ's mediation is represented as the procuring cause of all positive spiritual benefits, such as the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit, sonship toward God and eternal life.[62] (8) Those in which Christ's mediation is represented as necessary to salvation.[63] (9) Those passages in which Christ's mediatorial work is represented as strongly attesting God's love, as in John 3:16 in which the love of God is given as the source of the gift of Christ in his mediatorial role, and also in the words of the same author (I John 4:9,10) where he implies vigorously that God's love is attested by the mediatorial work of Christ: "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins."

These passages reveal the fact that all is of God. This divine initiative in redemption is the characteristic thought of the whole Bible. Grace means love in action. "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

---

[60] Acts 20:28; I Cor. 6:19; Col. 1:13,14; I Tim. 2:5,6; Titus 2:13,14; Heb. 9: 11,12; I Pet. 1:18,19.

[61] Rom. 3:24-26; I John 2:1,2;

[62] John 14:26; Acts 2:32-33; John 1:12; Rom. 6:23.

[63] John 14:6; Acts 4:12.

In the Old Testament, where all Israel's religious institutions, practices and ideas express the redeeming activity of God, the idea that all is God is the dominant conception. For example, the deliverance of Israel from her bondage was not a deliverance obtained by Israel through her own exertions or merits, but was predicated upon the mercy of God alone. It was the outgrowth of the covenant relation Israel sustained with God, which had no legal basis. "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Indeed, it is Israel which first teaches the world that redemption is God's way of being moral. Righteousness is not based, in the mind of God, upon the fulfillment of legal demands, but as J.S. Whale so admirably states, "Forgiveness is the divine way of doing right."[64] This righteousness does not mean in the Old Testament moral perfection. It means being right with God, that is, being put right or acquitted at his throne of grace. All Israel's characteristic religious institutions operate within this covenant of grace. The sacrifices themselves were offered to a God already in a relation of grace with his people. Dr. Davidson beautifully points this out in commenting on the relation of sacrifice and grace, "They were not offered to attain God's grace, but to retain it."[65]

---

[64] Christian Doctrine, Whale, J.S., p. 77.

[65] The Theology of the Old Testament, Davidson, A.B., p. 317.

Though we cannot thoroughly understand and sympathize with Israel's sacrificial system and while it is true it often creates a feeling of aversion within us, yet it possessed an essential meaning and genius. This, I think, is to be found in that it was the vehicle of God's relation to that Semitic people, and through them to the world.

Most theologians have been led astray in their interpretation of sacrifice in its relation to the New Testament doctrine of atonement because they have had no clear conception of the ritual of sacrifice and the ancient religious significance of shed blood and what the Savior and writers of the New Testament meant when they used the ancient language of blood sacrifice about the Cross, "It is blood that maketh atonement by reason of life." Dr. Hicks in his Fullness of Sacrifice attempts to answer two questions relative to the act of sacrifice, namely, "What happened at the altar of sacrifice? What did it mean?"[66]

First, then, what happened? Something was done; what was it? The sinner is seeking atonement, reconciliation with God. (a) The whole sacrificial action begins, therefore, with his solemn approach to the altar. He does not come alone but with his victim. He draws near, a technical term for making an offering. (b) Next, he lays his hand on the head of the victim, meaning that he is thenceforward solemnly identified with it. What happens to it in the rest of the action

---

[66] Fullness of Sacrifice, Dr. Hicks (Quoted by Whale in his Christian Doctrine, pp. 82-83.)

happens inwardly and spiritually to himself, the sinner. Though it is to take his place in fact, it does not do so in theory; the victim is not substituted for the sinner; the sinner is symbolically one with the victim. (c) Next, he himself slays the victim, thus releasing its blood which is its life. He thus surrenders its life to God, and in so doing he is surrendering his own life. That is the sacramental meaning of the shed blood. In shedding the blood of the victim with which he is now identified the sinner is symbolically yielding up to God the most precious thing he has, his very life. (d) Next, the priest takes the blood, the surrendered life, symbolically into the nearer presence of God, the altar, or even the Holy of Holies. Thus God and the sinner are made one; there is atonement. But this is not all. (e) Next, the body of the slain victim is offered on the altar of burnt offering. It represents the self-offering of the restored and reconciled sinner himself, all that he is and has. This offering is accepted by God in the kindling upon it of the holy fire. It is burned. But the burning has a profound ritual meaning. It means the very opposite of mere destruction. (f) Last of all, the flesh of the sacrifice is eaten in a ritual meal. Now that the rebel life has been surrendered and forgiven; now that the carnal man has been transformed into spirit through self offering, not only God and man, but man and man, all who are worshipping there at the altar, become one in the holy meal?

The above is a fairly good account of the meaning of sacrifice. The actual atonement is seen in the ways and means whereby the resultant reconciliation was obtained. The essence of atonement is found in that which was done. "And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself and for his house."[67] The emphasis is on "Make an atonement," which implies action, and not result. Also in the words of Moses to Aaron we find the emphasis on action rather than result, "And Moses said unto Aaron, take a censer , and put therein from off the altar, and put on incense and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement for them."[68] It seems fairly evident that atonement means more than reconciliation, but that it is, as Pendleton also avers "that which repairs an injury, gives satisfaction, makes amends."[69]

When we consider the meaning of sacrifice and the idea of atonement we must not overlook the underlying concept of corporate personality that was deeply embedded in the Hebrew mind. We have discovered that the Hebrew did not consider himself to exist apart from the kinship group. Individual action had a resounding effect upon the clan, the tribe and the theocratic community. What the individual experienced,

---

[67] Lev. 6:11.

[68] Num. 16:46-48.

[69] Christian Doctrines, Pendleton, J.M., p. 223.

either good or bad, loss or gain, the kinship group also experienced. This is the teaching of the Old Testament as set forth in the duties and responsibilities of the kinsman. If one Hebrew was sold into slavery, every Hebrew in the community in a sense shared his bondage. It was a matter of identication of the part to the whole and the whole to its parts. Therefore, by means of personal identification, the freeman could supply the ransom price which the slave lacked and the latter's redemption could be effected. This was true also in the matter of blood revenge. The slain man was impotent and could not redress the wrong done him, but a kinsman on the grounds of corporate personality which made him exist in his kinsman and his kinsman in him could act in his kinsman's stead. In the system of the levirate the same idea is underlying. The near kinsman by identifying himself with the male relative who has deceased without producing offspring removes the dishonor that such failure entails or redeems the honor of the deceased by marrying the widow and bringing up seed in his name.

Now in the rite of sacrifice the same idea of corporate personality may be discerned, but the object of redemption is not found in the realm of the material or physical. Redemption does not have as its primary purpose the regaining of physical freedom, the repossessing of land or the deliverance from physical want. The object of redemption is found in the sphere of the moral or spiritual. It is pri-

marily a redemption from sin or evil. But as it is in redemption in the realm of the material or physical it is not so in the realm of the moral or spiritual. The dead kinsman found in his living relative the necessary means of rectifying the injustice done him. The slave, though himself impoverished and left without the ransom price, found in his near kinsman a ready and able purchaser of his freedom. But in the moral realm all are bankrupt. Man as a creation of God possesses a solidarity in evil. Indeed, St. Augustine used the words, "sinful mass" (massa peccatrix) to describe this solidarity aspect of human sin.[70] Such being the case, the kinsman could find no hope of redemption in his kinsman on the human level; for none possessed the moral surplus sufficient to redeem his brethren. It was inevitable, therefore, that the supplicant would turn to that which symbolized his greatest possession --- life. But to offer literally one's life is self-destruction and self-destruction is inherently repulsive to man. It was only natural, therefore, that he offer a substitute. God himself has prescribed this veritable means of grace. The lamb for the burnt offering is his own provision.

Thus we see that the making of atonement involved not only the death of the sacrificial victim, but an identification of the sinner with the victim. This identification

---

[70] Quoted by Whale in his Christian Doctrine, p. 46.

in the sacrificial system of the sinner with the slain animal was throughout symbolical. The supplicant in no wise considered himself to be corporeally one with the victim; for there was no inherent sense of corporate personality with the sub-human creatures. It pointed to the kinsman who was to come and to whom the Scriptures gave testimony.[71] He would meet the requirements of the sacrifice in a twofold manner. First, he would be one of their kinsmen, and by virtue of the concept of corporate personality become the logical substitute, making possible a meaningful identification of the supplicants at the altar with himself. And secondly, being not just man in the image of God, but God incarnate in human flesh, on the altar he would become representative of all that was intrinsically valuable and necessary to redeem man.

This Hebrew theology in a form of imperishable sublimity is discerned in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. The immortal words of this chapter, filled with the vision of Christ, entered his gospel, shaped his redeeming course, and issued in his Cross. Here we have the picture of the Suffering Servant, who bears the sins of others, being wounded for their transgressions, bruised for their iniquities. By his stripes the nations are healed.

But we do not read into this passage from Isaiah mere-

---

[71] Luke 24:25-27.

ly a substitution which implies in its broadest implications a simple transference of punishment from the guilty to the innocent. It is that and more. The recipients of the sufferings of the servant are not left totally passive. They must do something. In token of this the nations are declared to be witnesses of the sufferings of God's suffering servant. They see what it means and acknowledge their sins and repent. They make the sufferings of the servant their own by identifying the sacrificial offering of the servant with themselves.

Amid the rich variety of New Testament teaching one testimony is presupposed or explicit throughout. The New Testament witnesses to the tremendous fact of a crucified, yet triumphant Messiah. Discard this from the New Testament and you have destroyed it. This is its supreme challenge to a world alienated from God.

Evidences of this may be found in several observations of the New Testament. The Gospel of Mark, the earliest piece of continuous narrative in the Gospel tradition, gives almost a third part of its contents to a consideration of the death of Jesus. The fact in which Christians gloried and on which they took their stand as they conquered the pagan world was this offensive fact of the Cross. "I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures,"[72] was the bold

---

[72] I Cor. 15:3.

statement of Christendom's incomparable statesman, Paul, at Corinth. The message of the New Testament from beginning to end is "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world."

The New Testament sets forth four fundamental teachings relative to the atonement. I refer to the atonement as symbolized in the crucifixion and death of Christ.

First, the New Testament affirms the necessity of the atonement. It regards the crucifixion as the act of God. It originated in the mind of God and was executed under the permissive will of God. It did not happen by accident. Jesus was conscious that it was the will of God. He determined in his heart to fulfill the commission given to him by his Father and realized that nothing short of his own death would consummate that commission. This he implies to his disciples, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straightened till it be accomplished."[73] Jesus was fully aware of the relation between his suffering and the redemption of the race. Suffering in his mind was an index of his calling. As Otto so admirably puts it, "Jesus did not believe that he was Messiah although he had to suffer, but because he had to suffer."[74]

In the second place the New Testament points to the

---

[73] Luke 12:50.

[74] Quoted by Vincent Taylor in Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 174.

atonement as a representative sacrifice for the sins of the world.

In the twenty-seventh chapter of Matthew and the forty-sixth verse we have what has been described as the "Cry of Dereliction." Jesus is represented as crying with a loud voice, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" While it is humanly impossible to obtain a true explanation of that cry, since the whole question of the person of Jesus is involved, we are sure that there are some things that we do know about it. Among them is that it was the voice of one who was identified with sinners. It was the voice of a kinsman. Whale states that "It was the love of God - the grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ - which identified him with sinners completely and to the uttermost. He who knew no sin was made sin for us. We need this desperately bold New Testament metaphor to express the truth that the Savior felt the fact and burden of human sin as though it were his own. He bore vicariously the burden of guilt, and as he utters that Cry of Dereliction we see him stagger under the weight of it. The sinless Son of God was here saying, "Amen," on behalf of humanity to the judgment of God upon sin."[73]

Now whether or not this is vicarious punishment or vicarious penitence, as some aver, we have neither time nor cause to debate. The fact that projects itself so obvious-

---

[75] Christian Doctrine, J. S. Whale, p. 88.

ly here is that the God-man Christ, the go'el, who himself was innocent came so close to sinners that his sense of perdition was real and terrible. Calvin points out that "It is no wonder, if he be said to have descended into hell, since he suffered that death which the wrath of God inflicts on transgressors... The relation of these sufferings of Christ which were visible to men is very properly followed by that invisible and incomprehensible vengeance which he suffered from the hand of God in order to assure us that not only the body of Christ was given as the price of our redemption, but that there was another greater and more excellent ransom, since he suffered in his soul the dreadful torments of a person condemned and irretrievably lost."[76]

In the third place the New Testament testifies to the reality of atoning sacrifice. We draw near, as did the worshippers in the Old Testament dispensation, but the victim that comes with us is not the lamb of the field, but the Lamb of God; for he makes himself one with us in the incarnation. We crucify him, and he, our High Priest, takes his blood, his very life, through the veil of his broken flesh into the presence of God. In so doing he takes our life with him, by the power of the incarnation and by our membership of his body. By reason of our identification with him all our shame and hurt of sin is borne on the heart of his

---

[76] Institutes on the Christian Religion, Calvin, John, Seventh Edition, Vols. I, II, XVI, X.

divine humanity. Bright's hymn beautifully portrays this atoning action:

> "Look, Father, look on his anointed face,
> And only look on us as found in him.
> Look not on our misusings of thy grace,
> Our prayer so languid and our faith as dim;
> For lo, between our sins and their reward
> We set the passion of thy Son, our Lord."

Lastly the New Testament witnesses to unity with Christ which comes about and is only made possible through his dying. There is no atonement without this identification of believers with him. The recipient of the atoning work of Christ must be able to say with Paul, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless, I am alive; and yet not I, but Christ is alive within me. And the life which I now live in the body I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me."[77]

Thus we see that the concept of the kinsman redeemer is also underlying the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. At the Holy Table the remembered words and deeds of Jesus, as set forth in the pages of the Gospels, become the real presence of the Lord. Believers have fellowship with him, with one another, and with the great company of redeemed on earth and in heaven through the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ. Let us understand, says Calvin, "that this sacrament is a medicine for the poor spiritual sick ... Let us believe in these promises which Jesus Christ, who is infal-

---

[77] Gal. 2:20

lible truth, has pronounced with his own lips, namely, that he is, indeed, willing to make us partakers of his own Body and Blood in order that we may possess him entirely, in such a manner that he may live in us and we in him."[78]

In my conclusion I am tempted to take the kinsman and his duties together with the sacrificial system as they are presented in the Old Testament and use them for interpreting the NewTestament sacrificial language or its dialect of atonement. There are those who have done so and have reached interesting conclusions relative to the kinsman's role in Old Testament redemption and the redemptive role of Christ in the New Testament. Their deductions run somewhat as follows: The kinsman in the Old Testament redeems the land which is symbolic of inheritance in the theocratic community. Christ in the New Testament as kinsman of man redeems man's estate, or place in the Kingdom of God which he lost through the sin of Adam. The former was a redemption on the material level; the latter, a redemption on the spiritual level. The kinsman in the Old Testament redeemed not only the property, but the person of his kinsman by paying a ransom price. So Christ in the New Testament, by becoming himself a ransom, redeems men who have become subject to the righteous wrath

---

[78] Quoted by Whale in his Christian Doctrine, p. 91.

of God. As the kinsman avenged the blood of his murdered kinsman, so has Christ avenged man against his arch-enemy, Satan. However, this I dare not do, even though I believe that the above has in it some essence of truth; for I believe the conclusion that the sacrificial system of the Old Testament is neither to be ignored as a mere human product, nor to be taken in the spirit of stringent technicality and literalism furnishes the canon for interpreting the New Testment sacrificial language or its dialect of atonement. I think Sheldon has the proper conception of the matter when he says, "The propriety of taking the former (Old Testament) in a broad, rather than in a stringent way, argues decidedly for the propriety of taking the latter in the same way. For the New Testament writers came to the treatment of Christian themes with minds well-filled with altar images of the Old Testament. In popular imaginative language, discourse addressed quite as much to religious feelings as to sheer intellect, these images could hardly fail to be forthcoming. Apt vehicles they were for the truths of the new dispensation. But they did not come from the workshop of a precise logic."[79]

The above we must admit, yet we see in the Old Testament system of sacrifice and other incidents, historical and religious, materials which afford in their general character

---

[79] System of Christian Doctrine, Sheldon, H.C., p. 373.

a basis for application, in the general bearings of particulars rather than in individual items, to the New Testament. The particulars involved in the Old Testament concept of the kinsman in redemption have their anti-types also in the particulars involved in the New Testament doctrine of "Christ, the Redeemer."

The identification of the Christ & all believers; the human kinship of the Christ and the Christ, all thru in the various applications of the life of the New Israel in Christ Jesus, specifically the concept that the Second Adam became a life-giving Spirit is made on the creative and communicating plane of the concept.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alexander, J.A., Later Prophecies of Isaiah, New York, London, Wiley and Putman, 1847.

2. Barnes, Albert, Notes on Isaiah, Vol. I, New York, Leavith and Allen, 1864.

3. Barton, G.A., A Sketch of Semitic Origins, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1902.

4. Berry, George R., The Old Testament Among Semitic Religions, Philadelphia, Griffith and Roland Press, 1910.

5. Bewer, J.A., Literature of the Old Testament, New York, Columbia University Press, 1922.

6. Brown, W. A., A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. IV, edited by Hastings, 1904.

7. Bushnell, Horace, Nature and the Supernatural, Centenary Edition, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

8. Calvin, John, Institutes on the Christian Religion, Seventh Edition, Vol. II, Westminster Press.

9. Cheyne, T.K., The Prophecies of Isaiah, Vol. I, London, Kegan, Paul Trench and Co., 1882.

10. Cross, Earl Bennett, The Hebrew Family, Chicago, Ill., The University of Chicago Press, 1927.

11. Davidson, A.B., A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, London, Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1876.

12. Davidson, A.B., The Theology of the Old Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

13. Delitzsch, Franz, Commentary on Isaiah, Vol. 2, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1890.

14. Galer, Roger Sherman, Old Testament Law for Bible Students, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1922.

15. Gesenius, William, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Boston, Crocker and Brewster, 1868.

16. Giddings, F.H., Principles of Sociology, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1896.

17. Harris, Wm., The Preacher's Homiletic Commentary, Proverbs, Vol. 13, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1892.

18. Hastings, James, A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. IV, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

19. Hicks, Dr., Fullness of Sacrifice, (Quoted by Whale in His Christian Doctrine), London, Macmillan Co., 1930.

20. Jamieson-Fausset-Brown, Commentary on the Old and New Testaments, Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott and Co.

21. Johns, C.H.W., Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

22. Kennedy, A.R., A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. II, edited by Hastings, 1902.

23. King, L.W., A History of Babylon, London, Chatts and Windus, 1915.

24. Knudson, Albert C., The Doctrine of Redemption, New York, Abingdon Press, 1939.

25. Knudson, Albert C., The Religious Teachings of the Old Testament, New York, Cincinnati, The Abingdon Press, 1918.

26. Lee, James, The Self-Interpreting Bible, Vol. I, New York and St. Louis, N.D. Thompson Publishing Co., 1896.

27. MacLaren, A., The Psalms, Vol. II, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1900.

28. Mullins, E.Y., The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expressions, Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1917.

29. North, C.R., The Redeemer God, (Interpretation - A Journal of Bible and Theology) Vol. 12, 1948.

30. Orell, C. Von, The Prophecies of Isaiah, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1895.

31. Ottley, R.R., Isaiah According to the Septuagint, London, C.J. Clay and Sons, 1904.

32. Paton, L.B., The Early History of Syria and Palestine, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901.

33. Pendleton, J.M., Christian Doctrines, Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society, 1906.

34. Perowne, J.J., The Book of Psalms, Vol. I, London, Draper, 1901.

35. Pfeiffer, R.H., Introduction to the Old Testament, Harper and Brothers, 1941.

36. Plato's Republic, 39, 3D.

37. Robinson, A.W., Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

38. Robinson, Thomas, Homiletical Commentary on the Book of Job, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1892.

39. Schmid, C.F., Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1870.

40. Sheldon, Henry C., System of Christian Doctrine, New York, Eaton and Mains, 1903.

41. Smith, George A., The Book of Isaiah, New York, Doubleday, Doran.

42. Smith, W. Robertson, Kinship and Marriage in Arabia, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1914.

43. Smith, W. Robertson, The Religion of the Semites, London, Adam and Charles Black, 1914.

44. Snaith, Norman H., The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1946.

45. Taylor, Vincent, Jesus and His Sacrifice.

46. Stevens, George Barker, The Theology of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.

47. Strong, A.H., Systematic Theology, Vol. II, Philadelphia, The Griffith and Rowland Press, 1907.

48. Thompson, J.P., The Theology of Christ, New York, E.B. Treat and Co., 1884.

49. Toy, Crawford H., A Critical and Exegetical Summary on the Book of Proverbs, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

50. Tribble, Harold W., Salvation, Nashville, Tennessee, Broadman Press, 1940.

51. Wade, G.W., Old Testament History, 2nd Edition, London, Methuen and Co., 1903.

52. Whale, J.S., Christian Doctrine, New York, The Macmillan Press, 1945.

53. Watson, R.W., The Book of Job, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1900.

54. The Encyclopedia Americana, Vol. 26, New York, Chicago, American Corporation, 1946.

55. The Holy Bible

a. Acts
b. I Corinthians
c. Deuteronomy
d. Exodus
e. Ezekiel
f. Ephesians
g. Galatians
h. Genesis
i. Hebrews
j. Herod
k. Hosea
l. Isaiah
m. Jeremiah
n. Job
o. John
p. I Kings
q. Leviticus
r. Luke
s. Malachi
t. Matthew
u. Micah
v. Numbers
w. I Peter
x. Psalms
y. Romans
z. Ruth
aa. I. Samuel
bb. II Samuel
cc. I Timothy
dd. Titus
ee. Zechariah

P. 27
P. 108

W.O.