

A Letter on the Doctrines of Restitution and Substitution

Andrew J. Jukes (1815-1901)

[With additional comments by John H. Paton (1843-1922)]

My Dear Brother:

Your letter of July 23, 1890, reached me this week. I am now an old man, and all the writing is more or less an effort to me. The days are past when I could gird myself and walk whither I would. But I cannot receive your letter without attempting to send you a few lines of thanks and loving greeting, to bid you be of good cheer, and to rejoice, whatever reproach for a time may come upon you for your testimony as to *the full salvation which Christ has wrought in giving Himself a ransom for all men.*

I too have suffered for this testimony. You can hardly believe how bitterly the truth of “*the restitution of all things,*” was opposed when I first brought out my little book on this subject.¹ First, the publisher to whom I offered it said they were afraid to issue a book holding the doctrine I advocated. Then, when it was printed, not only the religious magazines generally, but even some of my best and oldest friends, condemned me. I was charged by one dear soul with not believing the Bible, and denying the “atonement,” and I know not what else; and a dear and honored brother in Christ, when he heard that I had been invited to a conference of Christian brethren in Switzerland, said, that if I was permitted to be present, or to take a part, he would not attend the meeting.

I need not speak of things like this, I only refer to them to tell you to fear none of these things. The truth is stronger than all lies. If it is misrepresented and condemned and slain, it yet will rise again.

1. *The Restitution of All Things*, available from StudyShelf.com

You ask me if there are any magazines in this country that advocate the doctrine of Restitution. I know of none. But the truth spreads in spite of all opposition. The fact that my little book is in its 12th or 13th edition is one proof of this. I feel sure, that, even among those who still profess to believe in the endless torment of the lost, there is much inward doubting. It was, I think, the *Contemporary Review*, a so-called worldly magazine, which brought my little book very prominently into notice some seventeen years ago. One of the professors of *King's College*, London, wrote an article in that magazine, giving an outline of the views advocated and recommending all who were interested in the question to read the book for themselves. This review, or notice, made my book known everywhere, for the professor signed his name, and the *Contemporary Review* then, as now, circulated everywhere, both in England and the Colonies. I regard all this as the hand of God. He gave me the thoughts in my book, He helped me to publish it, it is, I believe, His help which has made it so widely known.

Of course there are now several other books, more or less clearly advocating the same views – Farrar's *Eternal Hope* is one of these; Plumtre's *Spirits in Prison* is another. Besides these there are many single sermons on the same subject, but I forget their titles.

The other matter of which you speak in your letter is the doctrine of Substitution. This subject, perhaps, requires even more care in the handling than the doctrine of Restitution. For though the popular so-called Evangelical view of Substitution is a gross mistake, and practically denies the union of Christ and His members, in His death and cross, saying that He died that we should not die, and suffered that we should not suffer, etc., there yet is a truth in Substitution, if that word is taken in its proper and original sense. "Substitution" literally means "standing in the place of another," or "being placed under the burden of another."

The true sense of the doctrine of Substitution is that the Son of God came into and stood in our place or stead or standing. This surely is the truth. By His taking flesh of a woman, He came into our nature and into our place and standing and still comes there to save us, **joining Himself to us**, when we are by nature under the fall, to **give us His Life**, and to bear our curse and burden **for us and with us**.

The wrong view of Substitution, which is the so-called Evangelical or Puritan view, is that Christ, the Son of God, came into our place, not only by death to deliver us out of our place, (which is true,) but that we never should be in our place, which is simply nonsense and contradiction. Certainly He did not die that we should not die, as is so often and so falsely said; for **ONLY** "if we be dead with Him shall we live with Him." He did **not** take our place that we should never take it, for it is **our** place and we are by nature in it – "by nature children of wrath, even as others." But He took our place, our nature and curse – standing **with us** in our lot, first to give us His life, and then by His death and "**resurrection**" to bring us out of our lot into **His** lot. In a word, we are delivered not **from** death but **by** it, and **OUT OF IT**. Our salvation is not the saving or reinstating of the old man; but his condemnation through the incarnation and death and resurrection of the Son of God, through our death and resurrection **in Him and WITH Him**.

The line of the offerings in Leviticus, however, shows us, not only that there are various and

distinct aspects of the **one great offering**, which may be seen either as a sweet savor offering, or as a sin and trespass offering; but also that there are, and always will be, very differing and imperfect apprehensions of the same offering, and even of the same aspect of it. We only see what we have learnt to see; and our first views of Christ, as our first views of everything, even in this world, are, and must be more or less imperfect. God knows **this**, if we forget it. Thank God, we are not saved by our views but by His grace. And just as by grace we walk in **His** life and in **His** light, the things of His kingdom will open to us and in us.

I write now with some difficulty, for years are telling on me, but I think perhaps that you will understand what I have written. If I can I will send you by this post, a copy of some lectures which I delivered on the Offerings in Leviticus some forty-three years ago or more. I was a young man then, but even then, by grace, I was a cross-bearer: and though I might now, here and there, perhaps alter a word to make my meaning clearer, I still thank God for what He **then** showed me of the offering of Christ and **His BODY**. If the little book reaches you, please accept it with the writer's Christian love.

Yours Very Truly,

Andrew Jukes
Woolwich, England.

This letter was published in *The World's Hope*, September 15, 1890, with the editor's (John H. Paton) following comments:

We are heartily glad thus to hear from the aged veteran in the cause of the **FULL** gospel of Christ. He has stood long and faithfully in the front of the battle. In regard to the nature of the work of Christ, we think the writer's explanation as to the relation it sustains to the salvation of man is clearer than the definition, by the word Substitution. He does not believe that Christ took our place in such a way as to exclude us from our **UNION WITH HIMSELF** in the work. To this we say a hearty **AMEN**. This is substantially what we have taught – Union with Christ as a means of life and reconciliation to God. But we cannot see why the word **SUBSTITUTION** should be used, when it is not Scriptural and conveys to the minds of many the idea that Christ did something instead of us, in such a sense that we are excluded from any part in the work. The Scriptures, so far from teaching that Christ suffered and died “in our room and stead,” as it is often expressed, plainly show that we are to “suffer **WITH Him**,” (Romans 8:17), and “be made **CONFORMABLE** unto His death,” (Philippians 3:10), in order to share His resurrection life and glory. And against the imaginary and unscriptural idea, of one class of believers in Substitution, that there must be a perfect Adamic nature given to us before we can have anything to sacrifice, our aged brother has well said: “our salvation is not the saving or re-instating of the old man, but his condemnation, through the incarnation and death and resurrection of the Son of God, and through our death and resurrection **IN** and **WITH Him**.”

This is the grand doctrine of the New Testament, and we think it should not be dishonored by being even seemingly linked, by the use of an unscriptural word, with the barbarous

and unjust idea that God **SUBSTITUTED** His innocent Son to suffer the punishment due to sin instead of the guilty. Neither love nor justice could either demand or be satisfied with such an arrangement. Both love and justice will be satisfied when, **IN** and **THROUGH** Christ, all mankind will be “reconciled to God.”

John H. Paton

Taken from the *Bible Student's Notebook*[™], a weekly Bible study publication available in two formats (electronic and printed)

www.BibleStudentsNotebook.com

Study Shelf, PO Box 265, Windber, PA 15963
1-800-784-6010 / www.StudyShelf.com

B i b l e S t u d e n t ' s P r e s s [™]
W i n d b e r , P e n n s y l v a n i a

