



**SUBSTITUTION OR
INCLUSION?**

A.E. KNOCH

Substitution or Inclusion?

by A.E. Knoch

*originally published in
Unsearchable Riches (Vol. 73, p. 7, 53, 99, 147)*

Contents

I	—	SUBSTITUTION OR INCLUSION?	1
		THE WHY OF SALVATION	2
		THE INCLUSION OF ALL	3
II.	—	(Part Two)	5
		INCLUSION	6
		RELATIONSHIP	7
		HEADSHIP	7
		FEDERAL HEADSHIP	8
		REPRESENTATION	8
		IDENTIFICATION	9
		UNIFICATION	9
		SOLIDARITY	9
III.	—	(Part Three)	11
		SON OF MANKIND	13
		THE NEW HUMANITY	14
		NUMBER AND QUANTITY	15
		ONE FOR MANY	15
		CHRIST MADE SIN	17
IV.	—	(Part Four)	23
		THE QUANTITY OF SUFFERING	24
		THE TIME OF SACRIFICE	28
		THE DEATH OF THE CROSS	28

SUBSTITUTION OR INCLUSION?

SIN and suffering and death came through the single offense of one man because all humanity was generated by him; so salvation comes through the solitary sacrifice of our Saviour since all were created in Him. God's method of salvation is *inclusion*, not *substitution*. Christ does not take the place of each sinner of the race, as though He were a mere man. He displaces Adam, and His work affects all, even as Adams has done. He is the second Man, as though none had intervened between Him and the first. He is the last Adam, in Whom there is a new humanity, which will be blessed by His one sacrifice, even as the old humanity was doomed by Adam's single transgression.

The *why* of salvation may be answered by a single word—*love*. God saves because He loves. The *how* may also be explained by one word—*sacrifice*. But thoughtful saints are not satisfied with so summary an explanation. The further question arises, *How does sacrifice save?* Many are the philosophies, and more are the illustrations used to show how Christ can save the sinner. These have come between us and the simple truth so effectually that it is almost impossible to brush them aside and get through to the facts. The only encouraging sign is that few who really investigate are fully satisfied with any "theory of the atonement" propounded hitherto.

THE WHY OF SALVATION

All was created in the Son of God's love (Col.1:16). God loved His Son. Creation should never be divorced from that substratum of divine affection which brought it forth. This is the unbreakable tie which binds God to His creation, and the Son to every creature in the universe. Whatever occurs, this underlying love abides, even though it be eclipsed temporarily and assume the garb of hate. Like the foundation of the temple of Solomon, this solid substructure is seldom seen during the eonian times. It is covered by the debris due to the destructiveness of sin.

The immanent love residing in God and in His Son, which occasioned creation, craved a response from His creatures which they were not qualified to give. Like Adam, they had not the knowledge of good, hence could not appreciate or give thanks for it, or adore the Giver. As we are constituted, such a knowledge can come only through an experience of evil. That is why God planted the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the garden.

In considering Adam's transgression, almost everyone focuses his eye on the word "evil," as though the tree did not give the knowledge of *good*. This, coupled with the expressed warning of God, gives the impression that it was not His intention that Adam should get the knowledge of this tree. It would have been far simpler to cut it down if that were His object. God did wish Adam and his race to appreciate the good He gave them, even though it involved the knowledge of evil. The very act which brought sin into the race, while it was a direct transgression of His word, was in line with His underlying purpose, for it gave the knowledge of good.

Though God's love demanded the presence of evil and sin in order to make itself known, it also required that this process should be limited in time. Endless evil and sin would defeat the

very purpose for which these were introduced. Hence a definite duration is devoted to this process, called the eonian times. These eons were made in God's Son (Heb.1:2). Sin and evil are strictly confined to them. The first three eons are devoted to the development of sin, the last two to its retirement. As a result, all creatures will revel in a knowledge of God's goodness and grace, and He will become All in all, thus accomplishing the object for which they were formed.

THE INCLUSION OF ALL

The *method* of salvation has proved a standing puzzle to expositors as well as to the inquiring student of the Scriptures. Why did Christ die, and how can that sacrifice effect the reconciliation of all? The solution lies in a closer acquaintance with Christ and His relations to God and to creation before He undertook the work of redemption and deliverance. As the Son of God's love, all was created in Him and through Him and for Him. Hence He is closely related to creation apart from and prior to His sufferings for sin.

It seems difficult for us to associate Christ with aught else than redemption. The great truth that He is the Firstborn of *creation* seems to have vanished from the consciousness of Christendom. Yet it is vital to an understanding of redemption. It corrects all those false ideas that He was an unwilling Sufferer, a third party upon Whom the role of scapegoat was forced, which led rationalists to the conclusion that the cross was an exhibition of injustice to One and partiality to others.

The relation of the Son to creation is expressed by the title *Firstborn*. This is elaborated by a series of prepositions, *in*, *through*, *into* or *for*, and *before* (Col.1:16,17). These express the various aspects of His connection with creation, apart from

sin or sacrifice. We are accustomed to think of this as God's universe. We should include Christ, for it is created in, through, and for Him. This is the basic truth which explains the manner of its deliverance. Its method cannot be understood until first we see that the Saviour is not a distant, disinterested Victim, but as close of kin as could possibly be, apart from sin. A father toils and suffers for his family with no thought of injustice. Relationship calls for more than justice demands.

It is desirable to have a name for Christ as the One in Whom all was created. English has two words for *progenitor*, seeing that *procreator* has the same sense. We suggest that progenitor be applied to Adam as the generator of the race, and Procreator be reserved for God's Son as the One in and through Whom creation was effected. Then we can state our case clearly and succinctly thus:

*As Adam, the progenitor of humanity,
by one selfish act, involved it in
unutterable woe, so God's Son, the
Procreator of all, by one sacrifice,
involves all in ineffable blessing.*

During the eons this is reserved for the chosen, who are redeemed through faith. All are not made alive *in* Christ until death is abolished at the consummation (1 Cor.15:26).

A.E. Knoch

SUBSTITUTION OR INCLUSION? (Part Two)

GOD saves because He loves—that is the *why* of salvation. He saves by means of *sacrifice*—that is the *how* of salvation. But a further question arises: *How does sacrifice save?* It is this that has proved a standing puzzle to expositors as well as the inquiring student of the Scriptures.

The solution lies in a closer acquaintance with Christ and His relations to God and to creation before He undertook the work of redemption and deliverance. As the Son of God's love, all were created in Him and through Him and for Him. Hence He is closely related to creation apart from and prior to His sufferings for sin. God's method of salvation is *inclusion*, not *substitution*. Christ does not take the place of each sinner of the race, as though He were a mere man. He displaces Adam, and His work affects all, even as Adam's work of transgression has done. As all were created *in* Him, so all will be reconciled *in* Him as the Son of God's love, through the blood of His cross (Col.1:13-20).

Today, in evangelical circles, the doctrine of "substitution" is not only deemed scriptural but fundamental. The phrase "in our room and stead" is so widely used and accepted that it may seem blasphemy even to suggest that it is not satisfactory in describing

God's way of salvation. Yet the dignities and prerogatives of Christ must not be eclipsed. He is more than a "means" of salvation.

The great fact that all was created in the Son of God's love is the only firm foundation for God's evangel. That the universe was in Him, as mankind later came to be in Adam, is the key to God's method of salvation. In God's thoughts, salvation is first. Sin is merely the necessary preliminary to make it possible. To reveal His love, God must be a Saviour. To reveal His salvation He must see that all are lost. The method by which they are lost, through their inclusion in one offender, Adam, is a shadow of the method of their salvation, by inclusion in One, our Lord Jesus Christ. All were potentially saved before they were lost. God is not experimenting. He is not a gambler. He knows the outcome from the beginning. He is a great and glorious and gracious God.

INCLUSION

A good English word is sorely needed to express the idea conveyed by the preposition *in*. "Inness" is awkward and obsolete. "Immanence" is misleading. The best word available seems to be *inclusion*. It adds nothing to the word *in*. If we say that all humanity was *included* in Adam we have added nothing to the sense, but we have found a word which can be turned into a noun. We are practically compelled to say "the *inclusion* of all in Adam." We suggest this word as a special theological term to indicate the "inness" of the universe in Christ when it was created, as revealed in the first chapter of Colossians.

There are a number of terms which may be used to express the "inness" of mankind in Adam and its consequences. Among these may be mentioned *relationship*, *headship*, *federal headship*,

representation, identification, unification, and solidarity. But a close study of each one will show that it has no clear Scriptural basis, and is not fully satisfactory, yielding no definite explanation of the method of salvation.

RELATIONSHIP

The broad word *relationship* has much to commend it. The method of salvation is to be explained on the ground of our Lord's relation to the race rather than individual substitution. Its defect lies in its indefiniteness. It does not specify the nature of the relation which He sustains, to those He saves. Conversely, we are related to Him. But that does not give us the power and privileges which belong to Him. Relationship is right, but has no definite scriptural equivalent, and does little more than point out the direction of the truth. It is helpful in illustrating the fact that Christ had the privilege of doing far more than what is just for those to whom He was related by creation and generation. A father does not expect to be repaid for his sacrifices for his children. A Creator must care for His creatures.

HEADSHIP

Hitherto we have used the word *headship*, for lack of a scriptural noun. But headship is only one of the results of inclusion, and does not express the central idea. Humanity was included in Adam at a time when there was as yet no race, so that he was not its head, except in a potential sense. Sin did not affect all his progeny because of his *authority over* them, but because of his *inclusion of* them. "Inness" involves headship, for the father of a family is its head because of his priority and position. But his headship does not necessarily denote the fact that his offspring

were in him and are involved in his activities for them. The *rule* of Adam over the earth and its creatures is best expressed by the term headship.

FEDERAL HEADSHIP

“Federal” headship brings before us a theological system which is quite unscriptural and inadequate. “Federal” theology is based on the theory that, before the “fall” man was under a “covenant of works,” God having promised mankind, through Adam, the “federal head” of the race, eternal blessedness if he kept His law, but since the “fall” humanity is under a “covenant of grace,” and God gratuitously promises the same blessing to all who believe in Christ, the “Federal Head” of the church, whether by faith in a coming Messiah, in times past, or in the revealed Saviour, since His incarnation. This merely needs to be stated to show how unscriptural it is. These covenants are pure inventions, and are quite unknown to the divine records.

REPRESENTATION

Representation also possesses some elements of truth not found in *substitution*. All for whom a representative stands may be said to be *in* him. His acts are theirs. He is engaged *for* them. The difference between the two terms may be readily seen if applied to a delegate to a legislative assembly. If he is ill, another may act as his substitute in some of his work. That is one person taking the place of another. As a representative, however, he is supposed to be chosen to act *for* his constituency, not simply as a substitute for each of them. But representation fails to indicate any vital relationship. We did not choose a stranger to save us.

IDENTIFICATION

Identification seems to come still closer to the truth, for mankind and Adam were the same when it was in him. It does not, however, show how this identity came about. We cannot use it freely and say that we are all identical with Adam. There is always the possibility that it will be abused, because it has implications which are not in *inclusion*. We were all included in Adam, and consequently are identified with him within certain limits, but we can hardly make the absolute assertion that each human is identical with him. The great diversities which have entered, such as sex and race and idiosyncrasy, make it difficult to apply to the individual. One who has been in Adam may be a part of him, but not necessarily wholly the same.

UNIFICATION

Unification is a good word to express one aspect of our relation to Adam and to Christ. Being in Adam, we were one with him, and the race has been treated as though it were Adam in some respects. God speaks of only two men when dealing with life and with making all alive. Unification may express the fact that humanity and Adam are one and humanity and Christ will be one. But it does not explain how. A man and woman may be united and become one in an entirely different way. And the pressing need is to point out *how* mankind is united to Adam.

SOLIDARITY

Solidarity, a term sometimes used in this connection, is not very acceptable. It denotes a compact, rigid unity, which might well have characterized humanity if sin had not come in. It is true

that all men are brothers beneath the skin, but they do not coalesce or combine. The color of their skin often seems of far more consequence than the composition of their blood, so far as solidarity is concerned. There is nothing in this term to indicate the source of their solidarity. It merely expresses a result, which is by no means as evident as it should be. It will be far more apt when used of the new humanity of the future. In Christ the present lack of solidarity will no longer obtain.

God's method of salvation has been much dimmed by terminology which does not reflect the language of the Scriptures. We should trace the details of God's design starting with the revelation that all was created *in* Christ. And we call upon all whose hearts are touched by our Lord to do their utmost, in every way, to help in heralding the high honors of Him in Whom we were created, by Whom we are saved, and for Whom we wait.

A.E. Knoch

SUBSTITUTION OR INCLUSION?

(Part Three)

THE TRUTH that all creatures were in the Son of God's love is difficult to entertain or explain. It is much easier if we bring it down to our level, and see it illustrated in humanity. When Adam sinned we were *in* him. All that we are has come to us from him, so it must have been at least latent in him first. The investigations prompted by the theory of evolution have shown that no living thing transmits anything permanent from its environment or experiences. All comes to it through heredity, so that all we see is the development of potentialities which were given to the first member of each species at its beginning. The whole human race was created in the first Adam. In a very real sense all mankind sinned in him. It is impossible to be of his race and not partake of the penalty of his act. *In* Adam *all* are dying. Not through, but *in*.

In order to realize and appreciate what Christ is to creation, we will use Adam as an illustration. The weakness of this parallel lies in Adam's failure. To strengthen it we propose to relieve Adam temporarily of the disabilities brought about by sin, so that we can see more clearly what Christ would be, in his place, and what Christ is, in His higher and earlier position.

Let us suppose that sin had not come in and that Adam were alive today, the firstborn of humanity, the head of the human

race. The fact that he was not *born*, but *created*, would not bar him from the title “firstborn,” for that is a faded figure, indicating rank and dignity, even when literally untrue. He would not only be the one in whom the race had its rise, the one *through* whom it came into being, but, in a very real sense, the one *for* whom it exists. All humanity would belong to Adam. All would be members of his family. His honors as head of the race would depend on them. if there were no race he would have no headship. There would be a vital relation between him and his progeny.

Furthermore, let us suppose that, in our day, some spirit being from outside our world should entice a pair to sin and disobedience and death. What would be Adam’s attitude toward this incursion into his race? Could he refrain from exerting all his power to recover his lost progeny, even at the risk of suffering to himself? If he were sinless and powerful (as Christ), would he not take upon himself some of the consequences if he could recover his sons? Even if he found it necessary to judge the culprits, had he the power, would he not bring them back from death?

Now let us change our supposition slightly, so as to accord more fully with the facts. Leaving Adam alone untouched, let us suppose that sin is contagious, that it spreads from one to another until all humanity is inoculated with its deadly virus. What then would be Adam’s proper reaction? Immune himself, would it not be torment for him to behold the plight of his progeny? Could he be inhuman enough to stand aside in his holiness and allow his race to go to wreck and ruin? If he were the least bit like Christ he would go far beyond the bounds of justice in his efforts to serve and to succor. Christ is not some cynical spirit from another sphere, unmoved by the plight of

humanity. They are His. They are for Him.

Long before humanity was in Adam, all creation was in Christ. He is vitally related to every creature in God's universe. He included creation in a higher sense than Adam incorporated humanity. There is a unity among the genus *Homo* which declares their relationship to Adam. There is a oneness in all creation which proclaims its connection with Christ. Its cohesion is in Him. The scientific theory that the unity of creation points to a single origin finds its answer, not in a primordial germ, but in Christ. All its potentialities were in Him before they became manifest in the creatures of His hand.

SON OF MANKIND

Our Lord continually insisted on His close relation to mankind, as such, apart from redemption. This is concentrated in His title Son of Man, or, better, Son of Mankind, or humanity. That this title means far more than the fact that He was a human being is evident wherever it is used. In Hebrew it could be rendered Son of Adam. This gives the key to its significance. He inherits the headship of the race. All that belonged to Adam, apart from sin, is His. Indeed, seeing that He is sinless and superior to Adam, He claims more authority than we would accord to Adam. Since Adam cannot fulfill his functions in regard to the race it devolves on the Son of Mankind to shoulder them.

The sabbath was made because of mankind, and for this reason the Son of Mankind claims lordship over it (Matt.12:8). He has authority on earth to pardon sins (Matt.9:6). He came to seek and to save that which Adam lost (Luke 19:10). It is as the Son of Mankind that He suffered and died and rose and will come again in glory to rule the earth. As such all judgment is committed to Him (John 5:27). Every member of the race must

stand before Him to give an account of himself. None of this is based on His redemptive work. It is His by creation. Adam, the subordinate source, has failed. Now Adam's Source descends to undo the work that Adam did, and do the work that Adam should have done.

THE NEW HUMANITY

The mode of application of the benefits of Christ's sacrifice are evident from the fact that He heads a new humanity (Eph.2:15; 4:24). He does not start, as Adam did, by wrecking His race. Nor does He commence by preserving a negative innocence. He transmits to each one of the new humanity the positive benefits and infinite values of His great sacrifice. Adam transmitted death, and through death sin. The channel is flesh. Christ transmits life, and through life righteousness and holiness. The channel is spirit.

Not all the saints will die. Not all will be made alive from death. Some will be living when Christ comes. How will they be rid of the presence and practice of sin? They will be vivified, that is, become deathless. Mortal, they will become immortal. Death will cease to operate in them. They will have superabundant life, so that it will be impossible for them to sin. There is no such thing as the "eradication of the sinful nature." It will not be necessary to take out the propensity to sin. All that is needed is the reversal of the process started by Adam. He doomed us with the process and crisis of death. Vivification is the impartation of superabundant life.

NUMBER AND QUANTITY

To minds accustomed to the idea of substitution, there are two principal points that need explanation, in treatment of the method of salvation. They may be expressed by the commercial terms *number* and *quantity*. How can one Man take the place of so many? We have all heard stories of men giving their lives as substitutes for others. But they could save only one. Then, how can one sacrifice be sufficiently severe to outweigh the weight of all the sins which have ever been committed? In these regards, the theory of substitution is quite inadequate. Instead of explaining, it calls for explanation, and none can be given.

ONE FOR MANY

How can *One Man* settle for the sins of so many? This is, perhaps, the chief problem in the minds of many who stop to think about the matter. It is evident that no mere man can die for another's sins, for he is doomed to death for his own. Nor could a sinless man (if such there were) take the place of the race simply because he had no sin of his own. That would keep him from perdition on his own account, but would not save anyone else. It is evident that Christ's sinlessness was not sufficient to make Him a sacrifice for all. He must be more than spotless to be adequate.

Let us consider our inclusion in Adam in connection with sin. We know that his transgression brought in death. He became mortal. His life became a slow death process. This he passed on to us. Hence we also sin. It is evident that we were involved in Adam's judgment. If that had been different it would have affected us. If the question of sin had been settled while we were still in Adam we would have profited by it. Let us suppose

that, through Christ, Sin had been completely repudiated while we were still in Adam. Then we would all have been saved in him. Here we have a clear illustration of how one can involve all. Adam did not act as a substitute for each of us in sin, nor could he have done so if he had brought salvation. It is because we were and are included in him, that his fortunes affect ours.

It is a mistake to suppose that Adam transmits *sin*. In his case death came through sin. In the case of his descendants, sin comes through the operation of death. The process of dying, due to a lack of vitality, is transmitted by generation, and this leads to sin. Romans 5:12 should read “*death* passed through into all mankind, *on which* all sinned.” Men do not sin because of the presence of some esoteric “principle” within them, but because they are deficient in vitality, because they are mortal, undergoing a process of corruption. Human nature, or instinct, and conscience, are not sinful. They may be stifled by sin, but they are arrayed against it (*cf* Rom.1:26; 2:14,15,27). This is the key to the cure of sin.

Adam cannot save, for he became a sinner. However, to help us realize the place of Christ, we will suppose that he was sinless, and that sin came in some other way. Can we imagine how Adam would feel if he saw his progeny suffering and sorrowing in sin while he himself is exempt? Is it possible that he would not make some effort to deliver his offspring? The question is, would he have the right to stand for all? Could he alone shoulder the responsibility and deal with sin for the whole human race? He surely could. If, while the whole human family was in him, he affected all for woe, it is evident that he may also effect its weal if he is able. This is the key to our difficulty. The fact that sin entered humanity by one man shows that its exit also may be through One. The first man contained the race. The second

Man also, at one time, contained creation in Himself.

Because creation was once in Him, as mankind was in Adam, the Son of God has the right and the responsibility to stand for all. The apostle reasons that the death of Christ affects all. "If One died for the sake of all, consequently all died" (2 Cor.5:14). Certain it is that Adam's one act has affected us all. If Another, Who included the race within Himself, acts so as to countervail and overwhelm Adam's sin, that must also eventually affect all.

There is nothing immoral in a Sinless One suffering *for* the sake of a sinner. It is utterly contrary to all righteousness for Him to suffer as a substitute or instead of a sinner. Adam did not sin as our substitute, but he sinned for us, on our behalf. So Christ suffered for all. As all were in Him in the beginning so they are all seen in Him on Golgotha.

CHRIST MADE SIN

As Adam is entirely unable to save those whom he generated, it devolves on his Creator, Who, not being weakened by sin, is able to cope with it, to conquer it for all. Thus it is that the Son of Mankind came down from heaven to involve Himself in the sin of the race in order to save them from it. Until the cross, He was Sinless, but there He was made to be sin itself, with a view to its repudiation at the end of the eons.

We are all suffering as a result of Adam's sin. We realize this through sad experience. It is not necessary to reason it out in order to prove it true. It should not be impossible, then, to conceive of the opposite. If Adam had achieved some great deed for Yahweh, not merely just or neutral, but excessively meritorious, more so than his transgression was bad, and God had rewarded him for it by multiplying the abundance of his vitality, would he not have transmitted this to us, his posterity?

Life may be imparted as well as death. Life may be transmitted, even as death has been.

Moreover, if Adam should do this deed long afterward, let us say at the time that Christ suffered, then all of his posterity from that point would benefit. Would that be just to his previous progeny? Seeing that his future offspring are blessed merely because he is their progenitor, it would be necessary to make it retroactive, for he is progenitor of all. Superabundant life would come to all of his race, merely because they were once in him.

In a figure we have transferred all of this to Adam. It is not at all true of him, but it is of Christ. If sin and death and corruption can come through one man, then righteousness and life and incorruption can come through Another, provided that He also included the race in Himself. If we endure sin's penalties because of one sin we may also enjoy the awards of one act that exceeds the demands of righteousness. If the act that brought in sin was in no way the equal, in duration or quantity, of the results which flowed from it, there is no reason why the act which brings in righteousness and blessing should be commensurate, in duration or quantity, with the infinite fruitage which follows it.

As an aid in comprehending the difference in magnitude between Adam's act and Christ's sacrifice, let us consider the rivers of blood which flowed from the veins of innocent animals, merely to set forth His supreme sacrifice. There is nothing trivial here. Millions of animals yielded their lives simply to recall to mind the act that saves. Each one of these sacrifices was a far more serious affair than that which took place in the garden. Adam destroyed insensate fruit by eating it. The priests destroyed a sentient animal of much greater value and higher organization, simply to suggest a picture of Christ's sacrifice.

I do not think we have a right to expatiate upon the sufferings

of these animals. I do not believe that it is God's purpose that they should suffer, even to portray His passion. A special method of killing was provided, so that they should not suffer. This consisted in draining out the blood at once. There is no sensation where there is no blood. Soul, or sensation (not life), is in the blood (Lev.17:11). Animals properly sacrificed do not suffer much. But the blood was not drained from the great Victim until after His sufferings were over. He suffered beyond our power to comprehend.

The true formula of God's method of salvation is given us in the fifth chapter of Romans. It may be arranged in a variety of ways, thus:

Adam's act *is to* Christ's act *as* Adam's effects *are to* Christ's effects.

Adam's act *is to* Adam's effects *as* Christ's act *is to* Christ's effects.

Christ's effects *are to* Christ's act *as* Adam's effects *are to* Adam's act.

This formula, for it is really only one, is worthy of our most earnest meditation. Our minds are unable to compute the staggering total of human woe. The fruit of Christ's travail is the unknown quantity which we wish to apprehend. How shall we attain a true estimate of the effects of the sufferings of Christ? *By comparing them with the pleasure of Adam.* The eating of the forbidden fruit gave Adam a micrometric measure of agreeable sensations. Compare this with the sufferings of the cross, physical torment for those long hours, spiritual agony due to God's withdrawal, all raised to the highest degree by the exquisite sensibilities of the Victim and His previous experience of divine glory and pleasure.

As *much more* as Christ's sacrifice surpasses Adam's act in its quantitative values, so *much more* will be the measure of its effects over those of Adam's sin. As a result human sin dwindles down into a trivial affair *compared to* the blessings which are due from the cross of Christ. Let no one misunderstand me. I have suffered agonies in the last few years. As I write I am in pain. I do not minimize human sin or the suffering which it entails. But I do magnify the work of our Saviour. There is not much danger that my readers would believe me if I should say that, in the absolute sense, sin's effects are trivial. Not many are really deluded as to that. But, great as sin's havoc is, the happiness to come will dwarf it into insignificance.

This is best realized when we try to expatiate on the delight which came to Adam while he ate the offending fruit. Hardly anyone has ever thought of that. It seems of so little consequence. Yet it is the only *pleasure* which came to him in introducing sin. It is the only act which we can logically compare with the sufferings of Christ. It must sustain the same relation to it as the sufferings of humanity sustain to the bliss brought by His sacrifice. The quantitative difference between Adam's act and that of Christ is enormous. One is almost the least of pleasures, the other the greatest of agonies. So the ravages of sin will appear to us in the future bliss. They will be but light afflictions compared with the tremendous weight of blessedness which will come from the accursed cross.

Ultimate reconciliation was first in the heart of God. There never would have been any estrangement without it. Therefore *enmity was introduced in a manner closely corresponding with the way it is overcome*. Because salvation was planned to be the great achievement of the Son of God's love, the One *in Whom* creation first came into being, therefore sin was planned to reach

the race through the failure of the one *in* whom it was secondarily created. Adam's offense is an inverted silhouette, a shadowgraph reversed, of the sacrifice of Christ. In their main outlines, their outstanding features, they are alike, though as far apart as the poles in moral values.

We may suppose that sin could have been introduced in a different way. It might have been limited to Adam, and each of his progeny might have been tested as he was, so that it would have been an individual failure. Adam might have had a considerable progeny before his transgression, who would have been freed from the effects of his offense. So the race might have been broken up into groups or units. But God did not arrange it so. Sin must enter through *one* man because it was to be settled through One. The relationship between Adam and his descendants must correspond to that which existed between God's Son and creation. Both could act on behalf of all who had been in them.

A.E. Knoch

SUBSTITUTION OR INCLUSION?

(Part Four)

HOW can *One Man* settle the sins of so many? And how can one sacrifice be sufficiently severe to outweigh all the sins which have ever been committed? In these regards, the theory of substitution is quite inadequate.

The theory of substitution demands that Christ should suffer, in time and extent, as much as the sum of all the suffering which it saves. An explanation of this has seldom been attempted. The usual suggestion is that the capacity of the Sufferer was so great that it was possible to concentrate it upon a single Victim, and compress it into the short period of His agony. This is most unsatisfactory, especially as to time. We cannot imagine that the anguish due to billions of beings for considerable periods (let alone for eternity), could be so condensed. It is beyond all comprehension. It appears to be both illogical and immoral.

If substitution is true, and eternal torment the destiny of all who do not believe on Him, He must, at the very least, suffer eternal torment to redeem a single soul. To save more, He should suffer this much multiplied by the number of the lost, not only in amount but in duration. If we see that eternal torment is not true, but that each sinner suffers only for the limited time between his resurrection and the second death, being *judged* according to his acts, the matter comes nearer the sphere of rational inquiry. We cannot comprehend even a single eternity, much less billions of them, but we can compute billions of periods

not more than a hundred years in duration. Yet this is not much relief. Our Saviour did not and will not suffer many hundreds of billions of years in order to save His people or the race.

The quantity of His suffering is beyond computation, but the duration is well within our ken. His spiritual agony due to God's forsaking Him on the cross did not exceed three hours. If the multitudes who are saved by Him each ought to have endured it for their fraction of the time, it would be so short that not one of them would feel it. Human functions are not quick enough to sense a hundredth of a second. If we divide three hours, or one hundred eighty minutes, or only about ten thousand seconds, by the billions who will be saved, each period would be practically imperceptible. There is no possible parallel between the time periods.

THE QUANTITY OF SUFFERING

The eating of fruit is not an uncommon or important action. In Adam's case its fearfully destructive power lay wholly in its relation to God. Apart from His prohibition it was a trivial incident. After God had spoken, it became a sin, a transgression, an offense, a channel of unutterable woe to humankind. So with its counterpart. Many men have been executed. Some have been crucified, but they were already enemies of God. When Christ was crucified, it was the word of God that intervened and made Him accursed (Gal.3:13,14). Its relation to God changed it from a death to a sacrifice, charged with infinite power for good, with a scope unutterably wider and higher than Adam's sin.

It is evident that any attempt to show that our Saviour suffered the commercial equivalent of that which His creatures were doomed to endure is absolutely hopeless. It is illogical and unnatural. The true equation should read like this: As Adam's

act is to the sum total of its effects, so Christ's suffering is to that which it accomplishes. We must compare Christ's act with Adam's offense, not with its effects on mankind. Mathematically speaking, the formula for substitution has ignored the main members of the equation, so that the formula is insoluble. It may be expressed thus:

Christ's act *equals* Adam's effects minus that endured by unbelievers.

His accomplishment is thus shown to be *much less* than Adam's, contrary to the truth.

God gives us the basic principles of His judgment of mankind in the second chapter of Romans. He will pay each one according to his acts. Those who endure in good acts, seeking glory and honor and incorruption, will get eonian life just as surely as others will get fury, affliction and distress, if they effect evil. The fact that no one qualifies for eonian life does not destroy the principle that God's judgments are just. He rewards as well as condemns with an even hand. If Adam's sin produces such a fearful crop of distress, the sacrifice of Christ must reap a harvest of untold happiness.

If we wish to understand sin's exit we should consider its entrance. Adam enjoyed the pleasure of eating the forbidden fruit for a few moments, and it resulted in all the misery and woe which torments humanity. He did not experience an hour's pleasure to compensate for each hour of our pain. There is no comparison between the duration and extent of his indulgence and the length and amount of human suffering which it has occasioned. He was in no sense our substitute on the debit side of the account. Neither is Christ our substitute on the credit side.

It is a poor rule which does not work both ways. If Adam's momentary indulgence was effective in producing such stupendous suffering and loss because the race was in him, why should not the prolonged anguish of Christ operate to insure much greater happiness and gain, since He is the Son of God, in Whom all was created? His work avails for all, not because of its bulk or duration, but because of the potentiality of His relation to those for whom His sacrifice was offered.

If any comparison is to be instituted, we should note how very mild was Adam's enjoyment of the pleasure of sin. Christ's sufferings were immeasurably greater. No one would endure them for a billion such experiences as Adam had. Then, if Adam's mild act brought disaster to the race, shall not the awful sorrows of Golgotha retrieve the loss and immeasurably more? The Scriptures testify that this is true, hence we may assume that the comparison and reasoning are right. Christ's sacrifice brings us infinitely more blessing than we lost through Adam's sin.

If the sacrifice of Christ had risen above the strict standard of right just as much as Adam's offense had sunk below it, it would have sufficed for the recovery of the race. It would have eventually cancelled the effects of sin. But there would have been no gain. All of the process would have been in vain. But Christ's work soared gloriously high above the demands of justice, far further than Adam's offense was beneath it. Hence there is no mere recovery, no return to innocence, no new probation on Adamic ground. On the basis of the knowledge of evil there is the appreciation of good and of the superexcess of grace which was made possible by the ravages of sin.

This point is of surpassing importance. The act which afflicts us was below the standard of justice. The act which graces us

was immeasurably above the demands of righteousness. Christ's sacrifice was not merely just. Right cannot neutralize wrong. It was infinitely more than that. If Adam had never sinned again, if he had done many signal acts of justice, none of these would counteract his transgression. It brought him into a condition where he could not do anything of sufficient virtue to cancel his offense.

An act which so far transcends justice must appear unjust to those out of sympathy with it. The rationalist, who knows nothing of the love of Christ, is right in claiming that substitution is immoral. Yet even he will go far beyond the bounds of strict justice to save his own child from harm, and never think of that as aught but the very highest phase of morality. It is because saints have lost the sense of their relationship to God and His Son that they have floundered so feebly when they unfold the work of our Saviour. They fail to accord Him His place in creation, hence cannot understand the manner of His salvation.

Every time we transfer something to another without compensation it is, strictly speaking, a departure from justice. Whether it is injustice or kindness depends on our attitude toward the recipient. If we give unwillingly, moved by coercion, it is wrong. If we give freely, motivated by love, it is more than just, but not unjust. If Christ was dragged to death, an innocent and unwilling substitute, to expiate our guilt, it was the greatest wrong that has ever been perpetrated. It is only the love of Christ for us and His devotion to God which redeems the cross from being the greatest crime that was ever committed. He had done nothing to deserve it. On the contrary, He was worthy of blessing and glory. He loved much, therefore He gave His soul and Himself for the objects of His affection.

THE TIME OF SACRIFICE

If he could have borne it, the suffering due to sin might have been laid upon Adam while we were still in him. Then we would have escaped, but we would not have learned the lesson which it is sent to teach. That was neither the right time nor the right person, but it would have affected all. Similarly sin could have been counteracted long before, when creation was still in the Son, even though it was unknown. He was the right Person and it would have affected all, but there would have been no beneficial results. It was only after sin had operated sufficiently to provide a contrast for good that the time was ripe for the sacrifice of Christ.

God could have repudiated sin and saved all immediately after the great Sacrifice had been accepted. What more is needed? Is anything still to be added to Christ's sacrificial work? He could do this at the commencement of the millennium, or of the new creation. Why does He not do so? Is it not clear that God deliberately delays the disposal of sin in order that it may accomplish the work assigned to it in His intention? He even leaves it to afflict the lives of His saints until their vivification.

THE DEATH OF THE CROSS

Christ emptied Himself of the form of God for the express purpose of becoming the Sacrifice for sin. Sin involves suffering and death, hence He took a mortal form, in which alone these could be endured. During His life and ministry He suffered from contact with the sins of others. But it is evident that men could not make Him to be sin without the aid and consent of God. In all their hatred He retained the smile and confidence of His Father, until He deliberately allowed Himself to be placed under the

curse of the cross.

The key to the sacrifice of Christ lies in the *manner* of His death. Had He been stoned, according to Jewish custom, He would not have borne the sin of the world. God could not have made Him to be sin. But, because He was gibbeted, in Roman style, He came under the curse of Deity. “Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree” is God’s own mandate, made to fit this very case. This is what changes the whole scene from a martyrdom, to a Sacrifice. It is *God’s* act in forsaking Him on the cross, which constitutes the basis of our salvation.

In conclusion, let us look at God’s salvation from the divine standpoint, ere sin entered the scene. Since He is Supreme, sin could not insinuate itself apart from His purpose. Since sin is to be introduced to form a background for the revelation of His grace and love, He would surely provide for its control and conquest before it is allowed to play its part. This was done when *all was created in the Son of His love*. If men were logical, this statement alone would absolutely guarantee a universal reconciliation. Given a *God* worthy of the name, and a creation conceived in His *love*, and eternal torment is a noxious nightmare. Even annihilation is utterly subversive of His deity or a direct denial of His love. Both death and suffering must be temporary and serve His purpose, or else He is a hateful and impotent fiend, a fool who cannot satisfy his own affections.

God’s method of salvation was inaugurated long before men were lost. Later on, when sin was introduced, the process was copied from the earlier mode of salvation. In effect God provided the manner and means of salvation before there was any need for a Saviour. He operated through only two, His Son and the head of the human race. First He created all in His Beloved—which assures their ultimate weal—and later He puts all mankind in

Adam—which involves their temporary woe. Their inclusion in Adam made them partakers of the effects of his offense. Their earlier inclusion in the Son involves them in the benefits of His sacrifice. The details of the application of His salvation during the eons should not obscure the universal ultimate, when the eons are over. All were in Adam, and are lost. All were in the Son of His love and shall be saved.

The key word is *in*, or *inclusion*. If anyone was not in Adam he is not a sinner and needs no salvation. If anyone was not in the Son of His love he will not be saved. But, since *all were* created in the Beloved, so long as my mind retains its sanity I shall assert that God Himself will lose His deity if He cannot satisfy His own affections by delivering those on whom His heart has been fixed since the very dawn of creation. May God Himself saturate our very being with the triumphant truth that *He is love, in creation* as well as in redemption. Creation was not the act of a neutral, insensible Power, without aim or object, but the achievement of a heart-hungry Father, seeking to satisfy the longings of latent love, Who first assures the salvation of His creatures ere He lost them for a time, that they might discern the depths of His affection and learn the lesson of His love.

A.E. Knoch

This article is a reprint of a series
originally published in
Unsearchable Riches (Vol. 73, p. 7, 53, 99, 147)
by Concordant Publishing Concern
P.O. Box 449, Almont, MI 48003 U.S.A. 810-798-3563
<http://www.concordant.org>