
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08164022 3

NEW YORK CITY LIBRARY

XEROX

Index

The Lord's Day our Sabbath
etc see Contents page

INDEX

Newton

ZEC

N.

THOUGHTS

ON

SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

[V. 2.]

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE—CITY 4488.

—
1871.

P

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
345261A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1927 L

LONDON:

VARTY, PRINTER, CAMOMILE STREET, BISHOPSGATE.

ROY WAT
JUN
VARTY

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE title of "Occasional Papers" having been elsewhere appropriated, I have thought it best to adopt another name for the present volume. Its general character, however, is not unlike that of the publication that preceded it under the former title.

The subjects of the present volume are less varied than those found in the "Occasional Papers." This was not intended when the work was commenced. It has been the result of finding that the Press teems at present with publications which seek, either openly or covertly, to undermine the great doctrines of Justification and Atonement. The Pauline doctrine of Justification (as it has been contemptuously termed by some) and with it the doctrine of Luther and the Reformers, is being widely rejected. Some magnify the Incarnation with the view of obscuring the Cross : others preach

“Justification in the risen Christ,” and under pretence of exalting the Resurrection, depreciate the work of Christ in death. Justification by *imputation*, which is the key-stone of the Gospel, is being, almost on every side, virtually, if not expressly denied. Under these circumstances, it becomes of infinite moment to determine what constitutes Atonement—when it was finished—and what are its results. The present volume is, *not a systematic treatise* on these doctrines; but they form its chief subjects. That they are very imperfectly treated, I am well aware; yet if the readers of these pages should be induced diligently to examine the questions of which they treat, and should be confirmed in their faith towards the ONE SACRIFICE and its results, I shall not be unrewarded.

I could not, perhaps, more suitably conclude this Preface than by subjoining an extract from a letter written to me by my valued friend, Dr. S. P. Tregelles, a few weeks before the illness which may possibly terminate his *public* labours. Although written incidentally, and not intended for publication, the extract shows his sense of the danger of the present hour: and it will supply, perhaps, one of his latest protests against errors which he has long felt to be subversive of the true faith.

In a letter dated December 17th, 1869, Dr. Tregelles writes as follows :

“I have seen an advertisement lately of a book on Hades. This announcement sets forth that it refutes the doctrine that Christ’s atonement was effected on the Cross. This, I suppose, is some new way of setting aside, ‘IT IS FINISHED.’ All these things are only new varieties of what Socinus says, that the propitiation of Christ was effected by His presenting Himself before God in resurrection. We may see the paramount importance of a doctrine from the pains that are taken to set it aside.”

Contents.

	PAGE.
The Lord's Day our Sabbatic Day	1
The Feasts of Israel as appointed in Leviticus xxiii.	
§ I. The Sabbath	30
§ II. The Passover	37
§ III. The Sheaf of First-fruits in its relation to the Passover	43
§ IV. The Sheaf of First-fruits and Pentecostal Loaves	47
Note on Hebrews xiii. 10	66
Note on the Lord's Supper	80
Note on Certain Statements of Dean Goode on the Eucharist, &c.	85
Remarks on a Tract entitled "Justification in the Risen Christ".	106
Romans iv. 25, considered, &c.	133
On Isaiah liii.	145
Notes on Isaiah lii. 13 to end, and on Isaiah liii.	175
On the Imputation of Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness	226
Representative and personal condition of Believers contrasted	259
The excellency of the person of Christ unalterable, &c.	278
Modern Doctrines respecting Sinlessness considered	296
On the use of the preposition ANTI in the New Testament	374
Appendix	384

Corrigenda.

It is especially requested that the errors marked with an asterisk should be corrected.

The lines are numbered from the top of the page.

- Page 19 [note]* For (Christians' day) read (Christians') day.
,, 21, line 15* For, inasmuch as that, read inasmuch as.
,, 80 ,, 15* For 1 Cor. xiv. 16, read 1 Cor. x. 16.
,, 89 ,, 5 For penalties read penalties.
,, 92 ,, 10 For *αναβεγκας* read *ανεβεγκας*.
,, 94 ,, 24 Idem.
,, 129 ,, 17* For Rev. v. 17, read Rev. vii. 17.
,, 133 ,, 18* For Acts xxi. 34, read Acts xxi. 35.
,, 140 lines 1, 8, 19* For Romans iii. 17, read Romans iii. 21.
,, ,, line 13 For substitutionably read substitutionally.
,, 141 ,, 3* For Romans iii. 17, read Romans iii. 21.
,, 142 ,, 18* For Romans iii. 17, read Romans iii. 21.
,, 143 ,, 20* For but that became, read, but that it became.
,, 159 [note] For Scriptures, read Scripture.
,, 164 line 23 For comformity, read conformity.
,, 169 [note] For inacurately, read inaccurately.

- Page 185 line 14* For Job xxxix. 9, read Job xxix. 9.
,, 188 ,, 1* For from, read form.
,, 192 ,, 1* For Ps. xx. 5, read Ps. xxi. 5.
,, 198 ,, 9* For Ps. lxix. 30, read Ps. lxix. 29.
,, 200 ,, 29 For *μολωπι*, read *μωλωπι*.
,, 208 [note] For *imp̄ii et violente*, read *imp̄ii et violenti*.
,, 218 line 28* For when is is applied, read when it is applied.
,, 221 ,, 24 For “grounding for” read “grounding” for.
,, 227 ,, 5 For authoratively, read authoritatively.
,, 247 ,, 15 For unalienably, read inalienably.
,, 257 lines 22 & 23, For found on, read found in.
,, 286 line 8 For His body was, read His body is.

The Lord's Day our Sabbath Day.

WHEN God had, in six days, finished the creation of "the heavens and the earth, and all that in them is," He first appointed the observance of the Sabbath. "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

Thus, even in Paradise, there was a distinctive honour attached to the Sabbath. God having undertaken to create, had attained the end proposed. He "saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good." The operation, therefore, of His hand ceased, because the end for which it had been put forth was reached: and God "rested." As a memorial of this, the seventh day was to be distinguished from the other days of the week, as a day in which the creative power of God and the perfectness of His work were peculiarly to be had in remembrance. As to *the manner* in which the Sabbath was appointed to be kept before sin entered, Scripture is silent.

We do not read in Scripture that the commandment to observe the Sabbath was formally repeated at the

Fall. It is evident, however, that there was no repeal of the primeval ordinance, for in the narrative respecting the manna, at a period previous to the giving of the Law at Sinai, we read as follows: "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning, as Moses bade; and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none. And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Exodus xvi. 22—30.

It is very obvious that in this passage the observance of the Sabbath is spoken of as an ordinance of which the people of Israel were fully cognisant. Otherwise

the Lord would not have upbraided them for their disobedience in not observing it. "How long refuse ye to keep my *commandments and my laws?*" Moreover, when the commandment to observe the Sabbath was formally repeated at Sinai, it was given, not as one with which Israel was unacquainted, but is prefaced by the word, REMEMBER. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Exodus xx. 8—11.

These words plainly show that the observance of the Sabbath was an acknowledgment of God as the Creator of all things, and also an acknowledgment that He created all things *in six literal days*. For as the seventh or sabbatical day was a literal day, so the six days with which it is contrasted must have been literal days also. They who deny this, do, if they keep the Sabbath, profess in act, what they deny in word. On the other hand, a refusal to keep a sabbath day is a refusal to recognise God, as the Creator, in the way in which He has appointed that recognition to be made. That the primeval commandment repeated to Israel at Sinai, and previously enjoined on mankind at large, had, for the most part, been neglected, there can be

little question. Men, in abandoning Jehovah and giving themselves over to the service and worship of false gods (for even Abraham's family had done this when Abraham was separated) had relinquished, no doubt, the observance of the Sabbath. In so doing, they virtually renounced their allegiance to God, and ceased to own Him as the Creator in the appointed manner. Nor is it otherwise now. The original commandment has respect to a relation in which men stand to God as their Creator. Whatever qualifications or alterations may since have been introduced, the commandment to observe a sabbatical day has not been repealed: and although the mere outward observance thereof does not constitute men faithful subjects of God's kingdom, yet the refusal to observe it is an act of rebellion against an ordinance which God was pleased to enjoin on men *as men*. The vast majority of mankind having altogether abandoned the observance of God's Sabbath, do thereby indicate that they have refused to acknowledge God, as the Creator, in that specific way in which He has appointed the acknowledgment to be made.

When the original rest at creation had been marred by man's sin, the observance of the Sabbath could no longer be (what it once was) the memorial of a *present* rest. It became the memorial of a rest that had been, but was departed; for God could no longer, as in Paradise, rest in and with His creatures. The Sabbath, therefore, was in this respect a witness *against* man. It spoke of that which had been, but which had ceased to be, by reason of man's sin. Yet there were many reasons

why the Sabbath was still to be kept: first, as the memorial of a rest that once had been, but which, by reason of man's sin, no longer was: secondly, as a continued acknowledgment of God as the Creator: thirdly, as a mercy to man himself: for it is a mercy, in a world like this, to have a seventh-day respite from toil and from the sweat of the brow. Lastly, it indicated the design of God to bestow another more blessed and more abiding rest.

But in order to this, it was needful that God should again work, not now in creating, but in *redeeming*. Hence the words of our Lord to the Jewish teachers when they accused Him of breaking the Sabbath—"my Father worketh hitherto, and I work." The Lord Jesus apprehended fully the reality and depth of the woe that sin had brought into the midst of a once resting creation: He knew that Israel's professed observance of their Law had been no observance; that under it, transgression had multiplied and made more manifest the vastness of the moral ruin; and therefore, He had come to effectuate another and an eternal sabbatism founded on *redemption*.

Israel should not have been slow to recognise that they could have no valid hope that was not founded on redemption. The relation in which they avowedly stood to God was not simply that of creatures. They were a typically *redeemed* people; and on this very account, a new commandment respecting the Sabbath had been given distinctively to *them*. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the

Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." Deut. v. 15. Their redemption from Egypt was indeed a redemption of *power*; but it was power put forth on the ground of redemption by blood: for they were spared only because their houses were found marked with the blood of the paschal lamb. Henceforward, therefore, there was another reason for the observance of the seventh day by Israel. In keeping it, they still showed that they owned God as their Creator; but they also showed that they owned Him as their Redeemer.

If the redemption out of Egypt had been other than a *typical* redemption, the superiority of the rest of redemption to the original creation-rest would doubtless have been indicated (as afterward it was when the result of redemption was declared) by such an alteration in the order of days, as should, whilst yet retaining the thought of the creation-rest, mark the rest subsequently attained as being a new rest, springing out of and founded on redemption, and established in a new creation. But this alteration in the order of days was not made, until the *typical* redemption wrought in Egypt gave place to the *real* redemption of Jesus.

The Sabbath, through man's sin, had become, as I have already said, a witness against man. The day of rest had been marred. It was no longer kept in the midst of a happy, peaceful, resting creation, but in the midst of a creation "subject to vanity," and "groaning in the bondage of corruption." Each groan bore

witness to man's guilt. Was the guilt of that sin light which had broken up the primeval rest of God, and brought woe, and defilement, and curse, where there had been joy, and purity, and blessing? The Sabbath, therefore, so far as it reminded of the past, brought necessarily with it the remembrance of guilt—guilt as yet unexpiated, for atonement had not yet been made. It was indeed the purpose of God to give back to His believing people a day of rest—to appoint for them a new Sabbath; yet not until the sin that had marred the primeval Sabbath had been expiated, and it had again been made, though in an entirely new sense, a day of rest.

It has been commonly said, and truly, that the period during which the Lord Jesus remained in the grave was one that bore witness to the judgment and curse that had fallen on Him for our sakes. Hence some have used expressions which seem to imply that His tarriance in the grave was necessary in order to effectuate atonement. His lying in the grave was, indeed, an evidence of the curse of the law having fallen on Him for our sakes; but it was an evidence of curse ended. His tarriance in the grave was an evidence that He *had been* the sin-bearer; but he was the sin-bearer no longer. The hand of Jehovah was no longer stretched out against the holy One to bruise Him. The fire of wrath had expended itself. The fire of the altar had fed gratefully on the accepted sacrifice and been satisfied. Jesus had said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Accordingly, as soon as His atoning death had been accom-

plished in association with the wicked (for He was crucified between the thieves), God's hand rescued His holy body as soon as death had passed on it, and He caused it to rest in a tomb provided by "the rich," in attestation that "He had done no violence, neither was there any deceit in His mouth."* His grave was indeed a place of humiliation, but of humiliation that had ceased to be connected with suffering, for atonement had been finished. Although the grave of the humbled One, it was the grave of One who had gotten to Himself the victory. "Christ," says Bishop Pearson, "did not, would not suddenly arise, lest any should doubt that He ever died. It was as necessary for us that He should die as that He should live; and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. * * * * The reward of His resurrection

* "Wherefore" (says Bishop Pearson) "to rescue the body of our Blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those who caused His crucifixion there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just; who also himself waited for the kingdom of God: this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave and commanded the body to be delivered: he came therefore and took the body of Jesus. Besides, there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a master of Israel: this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. And thus was the burial of the Son of God performed according to the custom of the people of God." *Bishop Pearson.*

was immediately due upon His passion, but He deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them." *Pearson on the Creed, Art. 5. § 260.* The cords of death were indeed still drawn round Him as He lay in that grave, but they had ceased to cause anguish. They were but as the seven green withs that bound the strength of Samson. Firmly and carefully wound around him, they did but make manifest the mightiness of his power. "He brake the withs as a thread of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire." And when he was shut up in Gaza and deemed to be a sure captive, he suddenly put forth the might of his Nazarite strength and carried the gates, bars and all, to the mountain's top. So was it with the great Nazarite of Israel. The grave was, no doubt, to Him a prison; but He entered it to show that He could make it the place of rest—a recovered Sabbatic rest. "My flesh," said He, "shall rest in hope." He entered also as the Conqueror—as One who had purchased to Himself the title to destroy it, saying, "O death, I will be thy plagues; O Hades, I will be thy destruction." Hosea xiii. 14.

Truly may it be said that He who on the primeval Sabbath rested from the work of creation, did on that *seventh* day which followed the sixth day on which He ended the period of His long and sore travail on earth, *rest* in His holy grave. There the wicked ceased from troubling: there He ceased to know weariness and con-

flict, and pain and sorrow, and the contradiction of sinners against Himself. Circumstantially indeed, the rest of the Redeemer in the grave was far different from that other rest when, as God the Creator, He looked down satisfied on the work of His hands—"when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." No manifestations of joy or of glory attended His rest in death: on the contrary, it was the *apparent* triumph of the world, and sin and Satan. Nor was His rest in death His true sabbatic rest; for that was to be in power, and life, and glory. Nevertheless, His rest in death was truly a rest; standing in marked and forceful contrast with the scene of toil and suffering through which He entered it. The primeval operation of God's power in creation encountered no resisting agencies: it brought no weariness: it was attended by no sorrow. The elements, created by His word, were the ready servants of His will. "He spake and it was done: He commanded and it stood fast." Creation required indeed the putting forth of power, and the exertion of thoughtful wisdom: but it was power and wisdom exercised apart from toil—apart from resistance—apart from suffering. It was the rejoicing development of almighty strength triumphing in the effectuation of results that were in harmony with its own perfectness. But when sin had entered, and sinners were to be saved in the presence of the claims of the holiness of God, how changed the circumstances! When the Son of God entered this world as the Redeemer, what was there that was not arrayed against Him in stern and terrible

resistance? The rulers of earth put forth all their power—power “given to them of God” against Him. Satan and all the unseen spiritual world of evil were against Him. Jehovah also, because of the outraged claims of His holiness, “bruised Him,” and “put Him to grief.” Jesus stood before Him as the Representative and Substitute of sinners. The Father spared not the Son, and the Son consented to tread the appointed path of toil and anguish, even to the end. Well therefore might Jesus say, “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” His was indeed “work” and “sore travail”—travail of body and travail of soul. He laboured truly as in the fires; but He failed not. He laboured on till the appointed end was reached—till He could say, “it is finished:” and so He rested. And although it was not, as I have already said, His true sabbatic rest, yet it was truly the rest of a Conqueror. It bore witness to the triumph of grace. It was the rest of One who had overcome sin and Satan, and met the wrath of the living God, and made expiation for sin, and procured for His people the title to an everlasting rest in glory. The victory had been won, though the results were yet unmanifested.*

* The language prophetically placed in the lips of the Lord is: “My flesh shall REST in hope.” He was in the grave only a very small part of the sixth day and a still smaller part of the eighth, for He arose very early in the morning: but He was in the grave *all* the seventh day, so that that day was peculiarly *the* day of His rest in death. It was a principle of the Hebrew law that if a day had been once entered on even for one minute, the

It was appointed that He should rest in death for a season, in order that we, by faith, might stand, as it were, by the side of His sabbatic grave, and consider what the results are that flow from that death unto us. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." The sacrificial death of the Holy One not only removed the curse due to our sins, but also brought to us acceptance according to the acceptableness of that one perfect oblation which He once and for ever presented when He offered up Himself. When the worshipper of old had seen the Burnt-offering burned for a sweet savour on the altar until only *ashes* remained, was there no preciousness in those ashes? Their very name was *fatness*.* They were the witness that the claim of God had been fully met—that the holy fire of the altar had fed on something acceptable and grateful to itself, and been satisfied. Precious, indeed, to us are the ashes of the true Sacrifice. In their preciousness, we find our meritorious title to all that time or eternity shall unfold of

whole twenty-four hours were reckoned to the person who had so entered on the day. Thus, *legally*, the Lord was regarded as having been three days and nights in the grave. If a child was born on the last minute of a day, after six more days had passed, the eighth day was considered to have come, and it was circumcised. The last recorded recognition of the seventh-day Sabbath in the Scripture is, where it is said of those who went to see where the body of Jesus was laid, that "they returned and prepared spices and ointments *and rested the Sabbath day according to the Commandment.*" Luke xxiii. 56.

* In Hebrew the same word denotes "*ashes*" and "*fatness.*"

peace, or blessing, or glory, or joy. Blessed, therefore, are the meditations of instructed faith by the side of the grave of the Holy One. We prize the day of His rest in death. We there learn what it is that has earned for us our Sabbath. Nevertheless, we tarry not there. We know that His rest in death was but the pathway into His appointed rest in glory. The world deemed themselves to have triumphed when they had brought the Holy One into death and made sure His grave: but they were to be undeceived. Though they had brought Him into death, "it was not possible that He should be holden of it." His rest was to be the rest not of death but of life. "In that He died, He died unto sin once, but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God." "I am . . . the Living One and I became dead, but lo, I am One that liveth for evermore, Amen: and have the keys of Hades and of death."* He died; but it was in order that He might become "Lord of the dead." See Romans xiv. 9. He entered Hades, but it was that He might, as respects His ransomed people, destroy it. "I will ransom them from the power of Hades [Sh'ohl]. I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O Hades I will be thy destruction." Hosea xiii. 14. He entered the grave with the power of accomplished redemption in His hand. He brought into it the power of heavenly Life, evidenced already by His own resurrection, and soon to be evidenced again,

* Εγω ειμι . . . ο ζων και εγενομην νεκρος, και ιδου, ζων ειμι εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, &c.

even more manifestly, when countless multitudes, "whom no man can number," shall suddenly arise in all the brightness of the glory of their risen Lord. His tarriance in the grave, for a season, was appointed as the proof of *the reality* of that death whereby He had ransomed His people, and gained for them the victory. As soon, therefore, as that reality had, in the appointed way, been evidenced, the title of His victory was asserted; and He rose to take, as the Representative of His redeemed, His place in glory above the Heavens.

Although, therefore, the original day of Sabbatic rest was honoured before it passed away for ever, by being made *the* day of the rest of the Holy One in death, and so attesting the completion of His atoning work, yet, as being a day which emphatically pertained to the earth and to the old creation, it could not meetly express the rest of One who, as the Head of the *new* creation of God, was to enter into unearthly glory above the heavens. When, therefore, the death-rest of the Holy One terminated, the Sabbath of the old creation expired: yet as it expired, it gave birth to another day which became, so to speak, its offspring: for the *eighth* day, which the day of resurrection was, could not have been, unless the *seventh* day had preceded. The day of resurrection-rest sprang out of the day of the death-rest of our Redeemer. Nor, apart from that death, could it have been a day of rest unto us; for to us, resurrection-rest is the consequence of, and the purchase of, the expiatory death of our God and Saviour. Our title to life in resurrection glory is founded altogether on His atoning death. If

He had not rested in death, we never could rest in glory. Well, therefore, may we speak of our new Sabbath as the offspring of the day of the death-rest of the Holy One. The Lord of life honoured the Sabbath of the old creation by making it the day of His rest in death; but when He rose, the sanctity and hallowment of that primeval Sabbath passed on with Him into the new day—even that day of resurrection-rest into which He entered as “the first-begotten from the dead”—“the beginning of the [new] creation of God.” With His resurrection the seventh-day Sabbath of the old creation expired, transmitting its sanctity and its privileges to the new Sabbath—the first day, which became our day of rest in the power of a new creation. “If any man be in Christ, [to him there is] a new creation. Old things have passed away, behold, all things have become new.” Such is our condition, as viewed in Christ our Representative and Forerunner. Surely, a new Sabbath-day befits those of whom such things can be spoken.

How necessarily, therefore, must the seventh-day Sabbath, seeing that it was bound up with the old creation, resign its claims to that new day on which the Head and Representative and Forerunner of the redeemed rose to take the Headship of the new creation of God. In the types of Israel, the special honour attaching to the eighth day had long been indicated. It was the day appointed for circumcision, that great type of separation from the flesh unto God, according to the power of the resurrection of Christ. See Col. ii. 11. On *the eighth day* the first-born were to be given unto God.

On the *eighth-day* the priests (their consecration having been perfected) entered on their ministrations in the Tabernacle. See Lev. ix. The third day from the Passover, on which the sheaf of "the first-fruits" was offered as a type of the resurrection of Jesus, was an *eighth day*. See Lev. xxiii. 11 and 1 Cor. xv. 20. So also the Pentecostal day, on which the Holy Ghost was sent down as the witness of the resurrection-glory of Jesus, was an *eighth day*. It followed the last of the seven-day sabbaths that completed the seven weeks numbered from the day of the offering of the first-fruits. The *eighth day* was "the great day" of the Feast of Tabernacles. See John vii. 37 and Lev. xxiii. 36. In these, and other instances, the *eighth day* is singled out for especial honour. It was thus honoured in type, because it was to be honoured by the great fact of the resurrection of our Substitute. *That* marked it especially as the day of *result*—a day that following on and springing out of the series of days that had preceded, embodied in itself and made manifest the consequences of the agencies that had in those days operated. In relation to the past, it was an *eighth day*: in relation to that which was to succeed, a *first day*. But it could not have been that which it was as the *first day*, except it had been, as the *eighth day*, connected with the days that had preceded. What would resurrection have brought to us if there had not been previous *redemption*?

Little reason, therefore, was there that a special ordinance for the transference of the day of rest from the seventh to the first day should be formally given.

Who, that pondered on and understood the facts, could doubt the absolute necessity of the change? If the redeemed were to be carried back to a paradisiacal rest in the old creation, then, no doubt, the seventh day would have been continued as the Sabbath: but if the rest was to be in a new creation, of which the resurrection of Jesus into glory was the indication and the pledge, then it behoved that the day of rest should be *new*. The passing away of the old Sabbath was as necessary, as was the dissolution of the Levitical order of priesthood, as soon as a new Priest arose after the order of Melchizedek. Respecting this great change, no formal ordinance was given; yet it was carried into effect and acted on, years before the Apostle in the Hebrews vindicated and explained its necessity. Nor can the Scripture be said to be silent respecting the sanctification of the new day; for habitual Apostolic action is equivalent to Apostolic commandment.

“This day,” says Bishop Pearson, “did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes, and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own: for *the same day*, saith the Evangelist, (that is the day on which Christ rose from the dead) *at evening, being the first day of the week, the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews*. The second observation was performed voluntarily, *for after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them*. The first day of the week, when Christ rose, by

the providence of God the disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week, they were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again, *when the day of Pentecost was fully come*, which was also the first day of the week, *they were all with one accord in one place*; and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost they spake with tongues, preached the Gospel, and the *same day were added unto them about three thousand souls*. The same practice of convening we find continued in the following years; for *upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them*; and the same Apostle gave express command concerning the collection for the saints both of the Churches of *Galatia* and of *Corinth*; *upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him*.

“From this resurrection of our Saviour, and the constant practice of the Apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the Lord's day, and is so called by St. John, who says of himself in the Revelation, *I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day*. And thus the observation of that day, which the Jews did sanctify, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour; and in the stead of it, the religious observation of that day on which the Son of God rose from the dead, by the constant practice of the blessed Apostles, was transmitted to the Church of God, and so continued in all ages.

“This day thus consecrated by the resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge and cognisance of

His Church. As God spake by Moses to the Israelites, *Verily my sabbath shall ye keep, for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you*; thereby leaving a mark of distinction upon the Jews who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was Jehovah, who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of Pharoah; so we must conceive that He hath given us this day as a sign between Him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised His eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought than that of Egypt: as the Mahomedans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, whom they esteem a greater Prophet than our Saviour: as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct days in the worship of God; so all which profess the Christian religion are known publicly to belong unto the Church of Christ by observing the first day of the week upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly separated from all other professions." *Pearson on the Creed. Art. v. § 265.**

* "The first day of the week, which is now changed into the Sabbath, or Lord's day, the Talmudists call יום נוצרי, the Nazarenes' day. On the Nazarenes' (i.e. Christians') day it is always forbidden to a Jew to traffic with a Nazarene (or Christian).

The commandment to observe the Lord's day may, therefore, be said to be co-extensive with the command to repent and believe the Gospel. Christendom *professes* to have done this. It professes to have been baptized in the name of Jesus and to belong to His kingdom, and all who belong to that kingdom have pledged themselves to observe the Lord's-day. And although none can keep it, so as to please God, who recognise not in truth that rest in the new creation into which the resurrection of Christ brings, and how that rest is founded on His perfected redemption; yet to refuse to keep it, is virtually to renounce God, both as the Creator and as the Redeemer. The mere outward observance of it does not make any one a true subject of His kingdom; but the refusal to keep it, is an avowed and rebellious rejection of God both as the Creator and as the Redeemer.

And as the blessings typically pledged by the Aaronic priesthood were not lost when the priesthood passed on into the higher order of Melchisedek, but were carried forward into its more comprehensive scope, so when the old Sabbath expired, its characteristics were not lost, but were carried on into the greater fulness of the new Sabbath that succeeded. The observance of the old

Where the Gloss saith thus: A Nazarene or Christian is he, who followeth the error of that man, *who commanded them to make the first day of the week a festival-day to him*: and according to the word of Ismael, it is always unlawful to traffic with them three days before that day and three days after; that is, not at all, all the week through."—*Lightfoot*, Vol. xi. 357.

Sabbath was a recognition of God as the Creator of the Adamic creation. The observance of the new Sabbath (whilst primarily the recognition of God as the Author of that new and yet unmanifested creation of which Christ in resurrection is the head) is also the recognition of God as the Creator of the first creation; for the redeemed, who are to form the highest and living portion of that new creation, are taken out of the old creation of which they formed a part. Unless they had been creatures of God in the first creation, they never would have been His creatures in the new. In a double sense, therefore, the redeemed own Him as God their Creator. And as the old Sabbath was a memorial of God's love and power in redemption, so the new Sabbath is, in a far higher sense, a memorial thereof; inasmuch as ~~that~~ on that day the completion of the *true* redemption was declared, and its results began to be manifested, by the resurrection of the Redeemer. "He was delivered because of our offences, and raised again because of (*δια* with acc.) our justification." And as the former Sabbath was a day in which men were privileged to rest from those toils and that sweat of the brow which sin had entailed, so on our Sabbath we are commanded to rest from all such toils, though at the same time our Sabbath is not *merely* a day of rest, but is also a day of life towards God—rest as regards human toil—activity as regards the service of God. Otherwise it could not fitly shadow forth the Sabbatism reserved for the people of God. In Heaven, we shall know no more the toils of earth, yet our life will not be one of inactive passivity. It will be

a life of unceasing energy with powers that know no weariness, and that seek no rest. Seeing then, that none of the characteristic features of the former Sabbath are wanting to our Sabbatical day, and that, as the eighth, it is (as I have already shewn) the offspring of the former Sabbath, it would be strange indeed, if, being thus the representative of that expired Sabbath, it should not inherit the sanction attached to that Sabbath by the primeval ordinance of God, and by the commandment more fully given at Sinai and inscribed upon tables of stone. Though we keep not the Sabbath of the seventh day, yet we do keep a Sabbath day that on every seventh day recurs, and thus the *principle* of the commandment is preserved; and the practice of the Apostles is the sanction of the Holy Ghost to our doing this.*

Some, indeed, have thought that the day of the resurrection of our Lord as being a day of singular and pre-eminent dignity is to be regarded as standing isolated and alone, and so forming a day of separation between the old and the new order of time. Beginning, there-

* In Genesis it is said, "God rested on the seventh day from all the work that He had made, and God blessed the *seventh* day and sanctified it." When the Law was given, it is said, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the SABBATH day and hallowed it." This change of language shews that the seventh day was blessed, not on the mere ground of its being the *seventh* day, but because it was the *Sabbath* day. Therefore, when the Sabbatical character was transferred from the seventh day to the first, the blessing that had been pronounced on the *Sabbath* day was necessarily transferred with it.

fore, their renewed reckoning of six days on the day following the resurrection, they thus again make the Sabbath to fall on the seventh day of the series, and not on the eighth day. But if this were so, we should not find, as we uniformly do, the Lord's-day spoken of as the *first* day of the week. Moreover, one of the chief characteristics of our calling would in that case fail to be illustrated; for we as viewed in Christ risen, are brought into possession with Him of His heavenly rest. We are "seated in heavenly places in Him." Brought, not personally but *representatively*, by the resurrection of our Substitute, into the day of His heavenly rest, we commence our new life from it. As new creatures we act *from* a day of rest—commencing the days of our earthly militancy *from* it. The days of our service here, follow, and spring out of, a day of rest attained by our Head for us; so that *from* rest we labour *towards* rest. Our actual personal rest is future. As to that we say, "there remains a sabbatism for the people of God." But speaking of ourselves as viewed in our risen Representative and Forerunner, we say that our rest has been already gained. "Old things have passed away, behold all things have become new." We keep therefore our Sabbath both as a memorial of the rest which our God and Saviour has attained, and which we have attained in Him; and also as the pledge of a coming rest which is soon to be personally ours. *Personally* we are yet in the wilderness, moving onward towards our rest—*representatively* we have attained it, and that a rest in a *new* creation. Such a rest ought to be indicated not only

by a *new* day, but also by a day *first* in the new order of time.*

Some refuse to observe the Lord's-day as a Sabbath on the ground that every day should be to the believer a Sabbath. We might as well refuse to celebrate at stated periods the Lord's Supper, on the ground that we feed by faith every hour on His broken body and shed blood. Ordinances such as these, are designed, not merely to express certain hidden relations which faith alone can recognise, but are intended as signs that attest outwardly before God and before men the relations in which His grace has set us—the sign, on His part, indicating, and, as a seal, pledging, the blessing signified, whilst we by our acceptance of the sign, acknowledge before God and before men, our reciprocity of the mercy. As regards the Sabbath, there would be no sign in it—it would not be a symbolic day at all, unless it were kept as a day of rest. On its observance as a day of rest, its typical significancy depends. If we had no day appointed to be kept as a day of rest, we should have no

* The command to keep the Sabbath, which was the only *ceremonial* commandment written on the Tables of stone, would not have been written *there*, unless it had been a commandment given in perpetuity. The same reasons that existed of old for the appointment of a typical day like the Sabbath exist still; for as then, so now, we stand related to God as a Creator and as a Redeemer, and as One who hath promised a final perfect rest. To say that our dispensation, because distinctively spiritual, admits not of symbolic or typical ordinances, is to contradict facts; for Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ceremonial ordinances symbolic of mercies given, even as the Sabbath is a ceremonial ordinance typically pledging a rest to come.

day of *sign*. The sign and pledge that God has given of the rest that remaineth unto His people would be taken from us. We could in no sense apply to ourselves the words, "Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for IT IS A SIGN between me and you throughout your generations: that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Exodus xxxi. 13.

If every day is to be made a Sabbath, and therefore a day of rest, what would become of such of our daily duties as involve toil and sweat of the brow? Are those duties to be renounced? Are we never *to toil*? In that case, what would become of the words of the Apostle, "if any man will not work, neither let him eat?" Moreover, if the resurrection took place on a specific day, namely, the *first* day of the week, and if on that account *the first day* is made a day of memorial, how can we associate the other days of the week with that great fact which obviously pertains only to one? Again, suppose that we were servants, and that our master refused to allow us a day of rest—Scripture commands servants to obey their masters, and therefore it would be our duty to comply and to labour unremittingly every day, unless we were able to plead the superior authority of God as having sanctified a seventh day, and set it apart as a day of rest. Surely when we consider what our frame is, we shall not lightly esteem this wise provision of His love. Shall we then abandon this privilege, and place ourselves under the unrestricted dominance of the tyranny of man? It is not a little thing, in a world like this, to abandon privileges which

God has in mercy granted to lighten the burden under which humanity groans.

And now as to the manner in which we observe the Sabbath as a day of rest. It is manifest that there are in this fallen world certain necessary works which cannot even on the Sabbath be avoided. The ox or the ass must be led to watering. The sheep that has fallen into a pit must be taken out. That which we need for food must be prepared, and the like. Even under the law, as ministered on the rigid principles of Sinai, a certain latitude as to such things was permitted. But allowing full scope for this, it is not difficult to make the Sabbath very markedly a day of rest by abstention from those many forms of labour which make the other six days, days of toil and struggle, not of rest.

Yet although immunity is granted us from those toils that must be found more or less in our six days' course of labour in a groaning world, we must nevertheless remember that our Sabbath, as being the Lord's-day, is not a day of rest simply—it is a day of life towards God. That which the service of our heavenly Master *demand*s, is on that day not only permitted, but required. The interests of His Truth and of His people must be paramount to all other interests; and to them we have to devote ourselves. If freed on the Lord's-day from bonds which on other days bind us, our liberated energies are to be devoted unto Him. If we deem that He would have us rest, we rest: if He would have us act, we act. To use our ox or our ass for our own pleasure, or for the ordinary purposes of daily life,

would be a sin: to use them for the service of God is a duty. Minute prescription is in this case impossible. We are under a law of liberty—liberty that we have to use in responsibility to God. “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.” We have “to seek not only our own but others’ good.” He who regulates his conduct by these two rules, will find little difficulty in determining what the observance of the Lord’s-day demands.

And when the Apostle says, “One man esteemeth one day above another; and another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind”—it must be remembered that these words apply only to those days about which the Lord has not specifically legislated. Elsewhere the Apostle says, “*all* things are lawful for me,” but we do not hence infer that things that are in their own nature sinful (such as murder or theft), or things that it has pleased the Lord to forbid (such as the eating of blood) are lawful. Everything which He has positively forbidden must be unlawful. So in the case before us. That day which God has expressly called “the Lord’s Day”* is marked by its very name as different from other days. Apart from all the other reasons that have been given, the mere fact that God has marked it by this distinguishing name, shows that He has raised it above the level of other

* ‘*Ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*, not to be confounded with ‘*Ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου*—the day of the Lord. *Κυριακός* is a peculiar word applied only to “the Lord’s Supper” and “the Lord’s Day.”

days and sanctified it. Therefore it cannot come within the scope of the text that has been quoted: for that text applies only to things about which God has *not* legislated.*

A day is coming, and is probably drawing very nigh, when the observance of the Sabbath will become a far more distinctive mark of adhesion to Christ than it has, for many past ages, been. As the present godless system of Latitudinarianism, that seeks to separate human things from the control of God and of Truth, advances, we shall find the Sabbath more and more despised. God's chastisement on this Latitudinarianism will be the coming of "*The Antichrist.*" "Times and laws," (see Dan. vii. 25) will then be utterly changed; and the observance of the Lord's Day will then, of course, be utterly proscribed. Blessed are they who shall, *for Christ's sake*, cleave to it then. It will be a badge of true soldiership; and they who faithfully wear it will be numbered among those of whom it is said "They overcame, because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony;

* When it is said in Coloss. ii. 16, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day or of the new moon or of the Sabbaths" (*τα σαββατα*)—the Apostle is speaking not of "the Lord's day," but of Jewish festivals. They had in the course of the year many "Sabbaths" besides those of the *seventh* day. See Lev. xxiii. Many of the Jewish converts continued to observe these occasional Sabbaths as well as the regularly recurring *seventh-day Sabbath*; and they wished to compel all their brethren to do the same. This the Apostle forbids: but this involved no question about the observance of "the Lord's day."

and they loved not their lives unto death." Rev. xii. 11. The more believers learn to apprehend the nature of their heavenly calling, and their consequent separation unto God in the earth, the more they will estimate "the Sabbath" as the sign of mercies given, and as the pledge of mercies yet to come.*

* See succeeding paper.

The Feasts of Israel as appointed in Leviticus XXIII.

§ I.

THE SABBATH.

THIS fallen earth, however great the blessings introduced into it by God, can never be to His people a place of full, satisfying joy. As yet their sojourn in it has been marked unvaryingly by conflict and sorrow. "Few and evil," said Jacob, "have the days of the years of my life been." "If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable." It is true, indeed, that before the history of this Adamic earth closes, there will be a dispensation of blessedness, when (Satan being bound, and creation freed from its present groan) Truth shall flourish, because Christ shall reign. Yet even then, the hearts of God's people *in the earth* will not be *satisfied*. How can they be satisfied, whilst sin lurks not only around them but in them? They will still look onward to that promised hour, when "new heavens and a new earth" are to be created in which righteousness is "to dwell." In order, therefore, that we might carry with us through the hours of our militancy, certain tokens and pledges of God's faithful

mercies, these Feasts were appointed. They were early given to Israel as "shadows of good things to come."

When these Feasts were first appointed, the anti-typical accomplishment of them all was future. But now *three* (the Passover, the Sheaf of First-fruits, and the Consecration of the Pentecostal loaves) have received their fulfilment. For the anti-typical accomplishment of the remaining four we wait. Three of the four (the Feast of Trumpets, of Atonement, and of Tabernacles) will be fulfilled in the millennial earth. But the Sabbath will not receive its antitypical accomplishment until "all things" shall have been made "new." See Rev. xxi. 5.

"Feast" is a word which emphatically denotes the free provision of another's bounty. When bidden to a feast we come not to give, but to receive. And all the feasts were "*convocations*"—all Israel being assembled, the small and the great, the weak and the strong, to rejoice together in common mercies. In a day of grace the circle of comprehensiveness is widened—not narrowed. See 1 Sam. xxx. 22—25. It was appointed also that during the Feasts all servile work should be suspended, in token that all the joy *was recognised* as flowing from the provision of Another's goodness. Jehovah-Jireh is the motto of the family of faith. "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name give the glory."

Of the Feasts the first *in order of mention* is the Sabbath: yet the rest of which it is the sign and pledge is *in order of fulfilment*, last. The Sabbath points onward to that final hour when all the redeemed of every dispensation shall together enter into their perfect rest.

“There remaineth a sabbatism for the people of God.” It is true indeed, that the spirits of those who have departed to be with Christ, do, at this present moment, rest *consciously* in the Paradise of God; and in a yet fuller sense, they, and all who shall constitute with them “the Church of the first-born,” shall, at the time of “the first resurrection,” rest in heavenly life and glory. Nevertheless, when we read the words, “we according to his promise look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,” our minds are carried on, beyond the period of the first resurrection, to that final consummation of the dispensational workings of God, when the redeemed of the millennial dispensation also, shall be raised in glory, and join their brethren who have preceded, to rest with them in the everlasting sabbatism of the new creation.

The full perfect Sabbatism of the redeemed cannot be, whilst anything that comes within the scope of their affections and interests, remains in a condition short of perfectness. “The Church of the first-born”—a name that includes all who will rise in “the first resurrection,” will find in the millennial earth and those who dwell therein, one of the appointed spheres for the exercise of their thoughts and affections. From Heaven (themselves made kings and priests unto God in all heavenly perfectness) they will watch over the earth beneath. But to the millennial earth heavenly perfectness belongs *not*. It will be *Adamic—earthly*. Sin will lurk there. The last enemy, death, will not have been destroyed. It will not be an earth brought into har-

mony with the condition of those who know heavenly perfectness in the presence of God. It will not be an earth that can be "rested in." Therefore, whilst the millennial dispensation lasts, none of the redeemed—neither those glorified in the Heavens nor those yet militant on earth, will have attained their final Sabbathism. But when He who sitteth on the Throne shall say, "Behold, I make all things new," then *all* the redeemed, associated together in life and glory, shall not only find *themselves* perfect, but shall also behold all things around them perfect. None will any longer be called on to act in a sphere where joy can be supplanted by sorrow, or hope blighted by disappointment. Not till then, will the rest which the long continued observance of the Sabbath has in every dispensation foreshadowed, be attained. Therefore, though we hope for the grace that is to be brought unto us at the revelation of the Lord Jesus, and for the joy of the millennial reign, yet we also hope for "the dispensation of the fulness of times," when the last enemy shall have been destroyed, and nothing remain within the scope of the blessedness of the kingdom of God that shall not have been brought into full, willing, happy, subjection to His power. And these hopes we need whilst we move on through the scene of our present sorrowful militancy towards our rest. "We that have believed are entering (*i.e.* are in process of entering—*εισερχομεθα*) into the rest"—that rest which the Sabbath prefigures. Not that our souls do not already rest, by faith, in Him, who, as our Representa-

tive and Forerunner, has even now attained for us a rest in the heavenly places. "We are seated ('seated' is a word implying rest) in heavenly places in Him." But although *representatively* in heaven we are *personally* on the earth—still practically conversant with a moral wilderness—still needing the exhortation, "let us be diligent therefore (*σπουδασωμεν*) to enter into that rest." Nor are we in a wilderness merely. We are in a wilderness, surrounded, as Joshua and Caleb were, by a retiring throng, who, after having professedly placed themselves under the Captain of salvation to move Canaan-ward, have deliberately turned back toward Egypt, and renounced the Land. Is it not so with worldly, covetous, secularized, idolatrous Christendom? What truth touched by them have they not either prostituted or destroyed? What form of worldliness is there that they have not defended and sought to sanctify in the name of Christ? Therefore they shall fall in the wilderness. "So I swear in my wrath they shall not enter into my rest." Their very Sabbaths bear witness against them; for heavenly rest and heavenly separation they know not. In the midst of Christendom too, a vast infidel apostasy is arising. Men who have long perverted and prostituted Truth, are now beginning to charge on it the consequences of their own wicked perversions thereof. Antichrist is about to be revealed. And what are we? We are a feeble few—disunited, faltering, timorous, in the midst of the advancing compact strength of evil. We are worldly, ill-instructed in the word of God, ready to compromise, not having our

proper armour on. Is it well that we should hide from ourselves the truth of our condition, or shall we consider it in the fear of God? The knowledge of these things may cause us deep personal humiliation and sorrow, but it will endear to us the rest. None are so likely to value the rest as those who livingly appreciate the circumstances through which they are passing into it. Happy are they whose hopes brighten towards that sabbatism that remaineth for the people of God, whilst they read aright the lesson of the present hour. The lessons we learn in earth are intended to be lessons of contrast. Man coveted the knowledge of good *and of evil*, and he gained it. Joy is known in contrast with sorrow: rest in contrast with toil; peace in contrast with conflict and strife. But when the time of our sabbatism comes, these contrasts will cease. Then it shall be rest, and only rest; joy, and only joy; for the former things will have passed away. Not that our rest is to be a rest of inactivity. Man was not made for listless inertness, but for energy and life. There will be rest from toil, and sorrow, and evil, and all the bitterness that sin has infused into our cup below: but we shall live unto God, and that with adequate powers to serve and to love, and to glorify Him fully: for we shall be absolutely perfect then—perfect because changed into the likeness of our risen Lord. We are “to reign in life” through Him. Our Sabbatism is to be one of life, and strength, and power, and glory. Therefore, the typical day appointed to *us* as the sign and pledge of our coming rest, is the day marked by the resurrection

of our Lord when He rose as the first-begotten from the dead, to be the Head of the new creation of God. It is a day which does indeed speak to us of death (for there can be no resurrection where death has not been) but it speaks of death past, and made to become the pathway into eternal life. "In that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth he liveth unto God." And we live unto God in Him. The resurrection of the Lord is a pledge to all His believing people of that Sabbatism in glory that alike awaits them all. Although last in order of accomplishment, we are taught respecting it first, in order that our hearts might be cheered by the knowledge of the end before we hear respecting the path that we have previously to tread. That path cannot have the perfectness of the end. It has its sorrows ; yet it has by the prevision of God's grace been bespread with mercies. It is the object of the remaining part of this chapter to teach us what those mercies are.

§ II.

THE PASSOVER.

WE have seen how the commencing part of this chapter speaks to us of that final Sabbatism which shall be in the dispensation of the fulness of times, when the former things shall have passed away. But there are antecedent mercies; and these we have now to consider. The remaining Feasts are the signs and pledges of those mercies. They have been, or will be fulfilled in the order in which they are here recited.

First in the order of fulfilled mercy stands the Passover. It points to that primary action of God's mercy towards us as sinners, on which all the subsequent methods of His grace are founded. God, in His wisdom, has caused that the foundation on which all our expectancies rest, should be laid deep down on the low level of our sin. In redemption, He meets us as sinners whom sovereign grace saves, and over whom sovereign grace watches. The Passover is the memorial of that mercy which meets us whilst afar off, and forms for us the basis whereon ourselves and our mercies rest—established and made firm for ever. Redemption gives to us our meritorious title to all that we subsequently receive. Our worthiness is found in the Lamb *slain*. “He that spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give

us all things?" The last link in the chain of grace is bound to God's throne in glory, but its first link has descended low enough to reach us in the very extremity of the distance into which sin had brought us.

Accordingly, it was in Egypt that the Passover was first given to Israel. There, dwelling in that land of curse, they were found not only in bondage to Pharaoh, but in bondage to sin; for they had forsaken the God of their fathers, and had gone after idols. See Ezekiel xx. 8. The stroke, therefore, that fell upon Egypt might justly have fallen upon them; but God had mercy on them, and caused them to obey His voice, and to seek shelter under that blood, which, when it was found sprinkled on their doors, the destroying angel "passed over." Within their blood-sprinkled dwellings they fed on the flesh of the lamb roast with fire, their sandals on their feet, their staves in their hands, their loins girded. They ate in haste, and with bitter herbs; for it was a night of terror and of judgment. The land in which they were, was a land against which the hand of God was stretched out in vengeance. The wail of anguish was heard on every side. "There was a great cry in Egypt, for there was not a house in which there was not one dead." Thus darkness and terror surrounded Israel when they first kept the Passover in the land of Egypt. There could be no completeness of rest there. They might be protected; they might be and they were strengthened by feeding on "the Lamb roast with fire," but they were protected and sustained in the midst of darkness, and woe, and terror. They could not rest

therefore. They were to be hastened out of the land of Egypt, and though they were to feed and to be strengthened, yet they were to feed "in haste." They were commanded also to search out all the leaven that was in their houses, and to put it away. Such were the characteristics of the Passover as first kept in Egypt. It was a scene of darkness—not of light: of travail—not of rest.

But in the chapter before us none of these things are mentioned. Doubtless, whenever the Passover was kept, the blood was still sprinkled on the door, and leaven was put away, and every part of the original ordinance observed. Kept according to its original appointment, the Passover continued to be a memorial throughout all generations of the relation in which they had once stood to death and judgment: but by the new ordinance recorded in this chapter, it was further made to indicate the relation of favour and acceptance into which they were brought before God. They had been delivered *from* Egypt and Egypt's doom in order that they might be brought *unto* God. A new commandment, therefore, of which we hear nothing in Egypt (for no altar unto the Lord could be builded there) was here given. On each of the seven days of the Paschal feast an offering made by fire was to be offered. "Ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days." It ascended gratefully before Him, and Israel stood under its acceptableness. Its preciousness was imputed to them. It was not now a question of deliverance merely. There was indeed the joy of deliverance; but

there was likewise the joy of acceptance according to the preciousness of that whereby they had been delivered. Thus a circle of heavenly light was drawn around them. The darkness and terror of the night of Egypt's judgment encompassed them no longer. The light of a day of peace had visited them. They were rescued *from* Egypt, and rescued *unto* God. In Egypt, they had been commanded to put away from them leavened things: now they were commanded to gather around them unleavened things, and on them to feed. Separation from evil is the principle in Egypt: communion with good was the great principle here. To Israel these things were taught in shadows: to us they are everlasting verities in Christ. It is ours to say, "Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the Feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

Separated, through Christ's grace, from the bitter and corrupting leaven on which the world feeds, we are not on that account condemned to pine in inactivity and listlessness. If the wine of the old creation be taken from us, the wine of the new creation is given. In being brought into the kingdom of God, we have new spheres, new interests, new employments provided, in things that pertain to God, His people and His Truth. The interests of eternity become to the redeemed interests with which they are already associated, and for which they already live. Him whom they will worship and serve in eternity, they worship and serve now; and

that in the power of the same Truth—taught by the same Spirit. The walls of the heavenly city are founded on the Truth that the Apostles of the Lamb ministered; and that Truth we have. Happy are they who taking their stand by their one Altar, the Cross, do, under the shelter and hallowment of that offering whose fragrance has thence ascended, seek with wise discrimination, to put from them all that savours of the old leaven, and to gather around them things new and unleavened. Persons, systems, principles, writings, occupations, that come under the comprehensive name of leaven, we have to renounce; but there are other principles, systems, and things, with which fellowship is to be sought. There are things against which we have to set our faces as a flint: there are other things that we have to love, cherish, and sustain.

Although, in the other Feasts that follow the Passover, fuller and more extended views of the blessings *resulting from* redemption are given, yet the Passover has a pre-eminence and preciousness peculiarly its own. It attests the great primary truth of redemption, and so guides us to the basis on which the superstructure of all subsequent blessing is reared. The month in which it was given to Israel in Egypt became the first month of a new year to them. Before this their order of time was reckoned from Creation. But Creation had been marred. Sin had entered. The link which had bound the creature to God the Creator in blessing, had been snapped. A new relation, therefore, was needed. The year of Creation was now to give place to a more blessed

year—the year of Redemption. A new order of things was to be unfolded: new blessings were to meet them: they were to be placed in a new relation to God. Israel would never have been brought into their Land, nor would any Feast, or any blessing have been granted to them in that Land, unless they had first stood under the protection of the Passover and the acceptableness of the offering from the Passover-altar. There they found their title to stand before God as His redeemed and accepted people. The resulting blessings might be and were great; but because of the greatness of the results they were not to forget the meritorious procuring cause. It was found in the Passover. The lesson is precious. It was typical to Israel—it is real to us.

§ III.

THE SHEAF OF FIRST-FRUITS IN ITS RELATION TO THE PASSOVER.

ALL the blessings received by the redeemed are *earned* blessings—earned for them by that sacrificial service which their Surety commenced and finished in the earth. The great object of the concluding part of the fifth chapter of the Romans is to show that as Adam's transgression brought on all those of whom he was the representative (that is, on all his natural descendants) the ascription of the guilt of that transgression, so likewise the obedience of Christ has brought on all those of whom He is the Representative (that is, on all believers) the ascription of the value of that obedience. His obedience was voluntary, and therefore *meritorious*; and as being the obedience of Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh, it was *infinitely* meritorious. The ascription to the redeemed of that infinite meritoriousness is the alone ground on which they receive any of the blessings which they do, or will, receive, in time or in eternity. The resurrection of Christ, the gift of the Holy Ghost—and other like things, were needful as means to bring the redeemed into their appointed condition of life and glory: but these effectuating means, as well as the blessings effectuated by them, are them-

selves results of the finished satisfaction. They are provided for us because we stand under the imputation of the meritoriousness of the sacrificial service of our Substitute. The resurrection of Christ as our First-fruits is not, therefore, the meritorious cause but an effectuating means, appointed because of His meritorious obedience and death, in order that we might be brought into the actual fruition of the blessings awarded as our portion.*

Accordingly, the Passover-feast did not pass without a typical pledge of this great result of redemption, being given. On its third day, a sheaf of the early harvest was taken and waved before the Lord as a first fruits. We are left in no doubt as to the meaning of this type, because the Apostle authoritatively explains it of the resurrection of Christ. Speaking of the order of the resurrection unto life, he says, "Christ, the first-fruits:" and again, "He rose the first-fruits of them that had fallen asleep."—*των κεκοιμημενων*. See 1 Cor. xv. Having, on the first day of the Passover, presented

* It is most important to keep clearly before our minds, that Adam in Paradise, as being our appointed Representative, supplied by his one transgression the ground on which the action of God towards us in judgment is founded. "By means of one offence judgment came unto all men unto condemnation." In that "one offence" we find the spring-head of human woe in time and in eternity. On the other hand Christ as soon as He had completed His obedience unto death, did thereby supply that "one righteousness" on which the action of God in grace toward His believing people is altogether founded. In that "one righteousness" believers find the appointed spring-head of all the blessings that grace has given or shall give.

Himself as the anti-typical Lamb to be slain, so, on the third day, rising from the dead, He presented Himself as the anti-typical First-fruits. God had so appointed. It betokened that all of whom He is the First-fruits (and He is the First-fruits of the whole family of faith) are by means of His resurrection avowedly associated with a condition of life and glory analogous to that into which He, as their Fore-runner, has entered. "Because I live ye shall live also." The day on which the first-fruits were waved, was also the day on which the offering made by fire was commanded to be made. See verse 8. And on that day and the days that followed, sacrifices "*from the herd*" as well as the flock (see Deut. xvi. 2,) were commanded to be made; and these were sometimes so numerous that we read of Josiah providing three thousand bullocks for the sacrifice on the Passover days. See 2 Chron. xxxv. 7. Let us place ourselves in the midst of that typical scene. If, whilst viewing the sweet-smelling savour of that plentitude of sacrifice ascending gratefully into heaven, our thoughts ascend with it, and we recognise how God because of it rests in satisfied well-pleas'dness with His people, do we not necessarily ask ourselves the question, What is the blessing, what the glory that awaits those for whom such an offering has been presented? The answer is given in the presentation and acceptance of the First-fruits. There we learn that which is bestowed upon them for whom the offering on the altar had been made. "If the first-fruits be holy," that of which it is the first-fruits "is also holy." The second-fruits (so

to speak) follow into a condition of blessing analogous to that into which the first-fruits has preceded. If our first-fruits be rejected, we are rejected: if our first-fruits be received, we are received into a condition analogous to that accorded to our first-fruits. But lest it should be imagined that our claim to be thus received is founded on any identity of condition with Him who is our First-fruits, or on any personal likeness unto Him, it was appointed that in addition to the sacrifices already referred to, there should also be offered in immediate connexion with the waving of the first-fruits certain specified sacrifices; (see verses 12 and 13) to indicate that our title to be regarded as one in blessing with our First-fruits is founded exclusively on the relation which He had previously assumed towards us, when, as our Substitute, He had taken upon Himself our unworthiness and sacrificially presented to God His worthiness in our stead. Great care, therefore, is taken that we should not dissociate the *results* of the sacrificial work of Jesus from that sacrificial work itself, seeing that it alone enables us to prefer a claim to participation in those results. Remembering this, we thankfully say that He who was our Representative on earth continues to be our Representative in heaven; and is, in all that He is for us and does for us there, "accepted for us." Great and manifold are the results of our having an accepted Representative in the heavens. The specific result to which our thoughts are, in this chapter, directed, we shall have to consider in the next section.

§ IV.

THE SHEAF OF FIRST-FRUITS AND PENTECOSTAL LOAVES.

THE sheaf of the first-fruits was gathered from *Israel's land*. "When ye be come into the land which I give unto you . . . then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest." Its presentation was the evidence of their land's fruitfulness and inaugurated its harvest-time. Israel were not to abide in the wilderness any more than they were to remain in Egypt. Their high destiny was to be wrought out in the midst of a land that the Lord their God had given them—a land that shall yet be the joy of all lands and a blessing in the midst of the earth. "The Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive, and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass." Deut. viii. 7—9. But the harvest of their land they were not to gather, nor were they to feed on any part thereof, until they had first brought an offering unto their God. God's claims were first to be remembered.

“Ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, until the self-same day that ye have brought an offering unto your God.” That offering was the sheaf of first-fruits.

Israel entered on their Land. They reaped its harvests, and from time to time offered the sheaf of first-fruits as had been commanded. But they understood not the meaning of their act. They knew not what the harvests—the true riches of the land of Israel were. They thought of their harvests of wheat and of barley: but other harvests were before the mind of God. He thought of men—quickenened men made meet for His service in the earth as well as for His garners above: even as did Jesus, when He spoke to His disciples and said: “say not ye, there are yet four months and then cometh the harvest? Behold, I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.” He spoke of those whom He saw before Him ready to be gathered through the gospel into the garner of God.

Israel’s land does not *here* represent to us heaven. It represents to us *a sphere on earth brought into connexion with heaven*—a place in which the heavenly power of God operates, drawing into association with itself. “Bethel” was not heaven, but it was associated with heaven. It was the place where the foot of that ladder rested whose top reached unto heaven, and above which Jehovah stood, and on which His angels ascended and descended. It was a spot on earth brought into association and connexion with heaven—a spot that Heaven

had appropriated to itself in earth for the operation of its grace and its power. Such has been, and such will be yet more abundantly, Israel's land.

For it is Immanuel's land. He hath already connected Himself therewith. He whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, humbled Himself and took on Himself the form of a servant, and was born a man, and an Israelite. Of Israel "according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." "Salvation is of the Jews." And it was because the Heavenly One thus connected Himself with the earth and with Israel, that Israel's land became able to supply the appointed first-fruits unto God. He who had presented Himself to be the Lamb slain, presented Himself also as the First-fruits of Israel's land. He was the one fruit of heavenly perfectness that could be presented without the accompaniment of atoning sacrifice, and was in its own native excellency accepted as meet for the garner of heaven.*

He was indeed to be removed from the earth, and for a season to be hidden with God. "Immanuel's land" was not yet to shine, as by and by it shall shine, with glory. The heavenly riches, the anti-typical brass and

* When the wave-loaves representing the Pentecostal Church were presented, it is said, "Ye shall offer WITH (literally "over") the bread seven lambs &c. &c." The loaves, having leaven in them, could not be accepted except they were *accompanied by* atoning sacrifice. The loaves, therefore, and the sacrifices were presented *together*, and this is expressed by the word "WITH." But the sheaf of the first-fruits was *not* presented WITH sacrifice. The commandment is given thus. "Ye shall offer *that day when*

iron, and water springs and brooks—things that nourish and strengthen in the power of eternal life, were not yet to be developed in all their full results. Nevertheless, seed had been sown in Israel's land that was to yield a wondrous harvest, and that immediately. It was to supply both seed to the sower, and bread to the eater—bread that could be presented as holy before the Lord. This harvest-time of Israel commenced when Jesus rose as the accepted First-fruits and presented Himself before God. This was its first and great result. The other was, the manifestation in the midst of Israel of some who, by the power of the Holy Ghost sent down from Jesus risen, were constituted *in the earth* a new meat-offering to God.

It would be a sorrowful and bitter thing, if, after having been quickened in Christ and brought into union and association with Him in the heavens, we had no capacity—no power, to make manifest in the earth the fact of our having been thus associated with Him above. He who has redeemed His people and brought them in Himself into the glory of the new creation, teaching them to say, "old things have passed away, behold all things have become new"—He who has thus

ye wave the sheaf an he lamb &c." A sacrifice was to be offered on the same day in connexion with the presentation of the first-fruits: but the sacrifices and it were offered separately. The first-fruits did not need like the loaves the consecration of sacrifice. The reason why sacrifice was offered in *connexion with* the sheaf, though not over or with it, was that *our* claim to be associated with the acceptance of the first-fruits must be grounded on sacrifice.

associated His people with Himself in glory, has not left them powerless to apprehend and to make manifest among men their high and heavenly calling. Though He stands, as it were, at the top of the mystical ladder of blessing and they at its foot beneath, He intends that they should there find Bethel*—an abiding place of association with heaven and with God: and they do find it. If He, as the true Meat-offering, has exhibited in the earth the habits and ways of heaven, His people also are constituted a *new* meat-offering unto God, that in them too, traits of heavenly character might be found; and that so, the earth, sown with seed from the harvest-field of Israel, might never be destitute of some fruit meet for the garner of heaven.

Accordingly, in the next of these feasts, the typical pledge of this new mercy was given. "Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave-loaves of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with leaven; they are the first-fruits unto the Lord." Seven *seventh-day* sabbaths were to pass between the presentation of the sheaf of the first-fruits and the presentation of this "new meat-offering." "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven sabbaths shall be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer A NEW MEAT-OFFERING unto the Lord." This "new meat-offering," therefore, was

* Bethel means the house of God.

to be presented on the *fiftieth* day, reckoning from the presentation of the sheaf of the first-fruits. And as Jesus had honoured the ordinance of the Passover by dying on the day on which the typical lamb was slain, and had honoured the ordinance of the sheaf of the first-fruits by rising from the dead on the day on which it was presented, so, he honoured also the day appointed for the presentation of the new meat-offering, by sending down on that fiftieth or pentecostal day, the power of the Holy Ghost—thus constituting His people a “new meat-offering” unto God. When the day of Pentecost had fully come, (see Acts ii.) and when they were all with one accord in one place, they for the first time received, through the baptism of the Holy Ghost, power of gift and grace to make manifest in the earth their heavenly association with Christ, and to become living expressions of His thoughts, and habits, and ways among men. Then first the Church received power to act as belonging to the new creation.*

Accordingly, the Pentecostal day, on which this power was bestowed, was not a *seventh-day* sabbath: it was the day of *our* Sabbath—an eighth day, the first

* Then too, they received power really to appreciate and to feed on those fruits which Israel's land had in former ages supplied. Israel's land had never been wholly devoid of fruitfulness; and sometimes there had been seasons of peculiar abundance, as when Moses, and David, and the Prophets taught: and the result of that abundance remained in that which they were commissioned to WRITE. There was, however, a lack of ability to feed on that which had been thus graciously provided. When the disciples said, “Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us

day of a new week—that which we keep as the memorial of our Lord's entrance, and of our entrance *in Him*, into the rest and glory of a new creation. Seven *seventh-day* sabbaths had passed since the day of the resurrection of the Lord. The *seventh-day* sabbath was a day magnified by Israel; and before it expired (giving birth to a greater sabbath) the Lord Himself honoured it, by making it the day of His rest in death. Great was the honour placed on the *seventh-day* sabbath by its being made the day of the death-rest of the Holy One: but when that death-rest terminated, the sabbatic character of the *seventh* day terminated also. A new day became sabbatic.* Accordingly, as if to enforce on Israel this truth, seven of their *seventh-day* sabbaths were allowed to pass, yet none of them brought *the power* of the new-creation-life from above. That honour was reserved for the first day of a new week, and that an *eighth* week—a day therefore, that doubly witnessed that the seventh-day order of the old creation was superseded by that order of the new creation which the day of the resurrection of the Lord inaugurated. Seven

by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures," they were conscious of having fed on that on which they had not fed before. Yet Jesus did not then create the food on which He fed them. It had long been before them in the Scripture; but they had lacked ability to feed thereon. After His resurrection, by the mission of the Holy Ghost as the Paraclete, full ability was given; and thus, the stores which had long been accumulating in the land of Israel, were made available. The preciousness of the fruits it had long supplied was recognised; and they were fed on.

* See preceding paper.

seventh-day sabbaths passed and brought not the blessing; but with *our* seventh sabbatical day (reckoning from the day of resurrection) the blessing came. On that day, by the coming of the Holy Ghost as the Paraclete, the Church was constituted, in the earth, "a new meat-offering" unto God. It received, for the first time, the power of concurrent associated action, so as to act together as members of that one body, whose head is Christ.

It was a great honour to the Church to be called in any sense "a meat-offering;" for thereby is ascribed to it, a certain likeness to Christ in its character and ways. Yet dissimilarity is also marked by the use of the word "*new*." The Church is called "a *new* meat-offering." The "meat-offering" proper, was exclusively a type of Christ in respect of *His* character and ways. Salt was to be in it; and frankincense (the type of perfect purity) was to be offered with it: but there was to be no leaven in it nor any honey. Nothing of bitterness or corruption, and nothing of mere natural sweetness was found in the character of Christ; but the savour and incorruptibility of "salt," and the fragrance and purity of "frankincense" was there. It was, therefore, an offering meet for the altar of God; and, as having an intrinsic excellency and perfectness of its own, it was there presented and burned. But "the new meat-offering" could not be burned, for it had leaven in it; leaven denoting the presence of that which is corrupt and corrupting, and therefore, nothing leavened could be offered on the altar. The holy fire that there

burned, repudiated all leaven. The new meat-offering, therefore, so far from being fit to be burned on the altar, could not even have been presented for acceptance there, unless it had been sanctified by the sacrifices presented WITH it. "Ye shall offer WITH * the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams : they shall be for a burnt-offering unto the Lord, with their meat-offering, and their drink-offerings, even an offering made by fire, of sweet savour unto the Lord. Then ye shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of peace-offerings. And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the first-fruits for a wave-offering before the Lord, with the two lambs : they shall be holy to the Lord for the priest." The reason of this will instantly be apprehended by every heart that knows what sin is. The servants of God, whatsoever their gift, or whatsoever their grace, do nevertheless bring with them, into the presence of God corruption ; for sin dwelleth in them. And whether it be, through grace, restrained ; or whether, as once in the Pentecostal Church, it work out into open manifestation ; (Acts vi. 1), in either case, corruption is present, and is, by the eye of God, discerned. The Church, therefore, though called and qualified by the power of the Holy Ghost to serve, does, nevertheless, need at every moment of its service, the protection of sacrifice. Its title to

* Or more literally "over"—*by*—as if the sacrifice brought a protection or sanctifying power on that which was under it.

serve rests altogether on sacrifice—even that once offered sacrifice in which the virtue and efficacy of all the offerings here enumerated were combined, and under the shelter of which, the Church, presented as the new meat-offering in the earth, abides. In the one oblation presented on the Cross, it has provided for it a fragrance and acceptableness which it can never find in its own leavened self.

Two loaves, presented and waved before the Lord, was the emblem of the Church, as constituted a new meat-offering on the Pentecostal day. The reason of this *duplicate* emblem, it is not, I think, difficult to discern. What could be more marked than the distinctness of those *two* companies who were, nevertheless, on the day of Pentecost, combined in perfect unity of blessing before the Lord? They, who *first* received the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the Pentecostal day, were men who had confessed and honoured the Lord Jesus in the time of His humiliation and sorrow. They had, more or less markedly, shared His rejection and reproach: they had loved and served Him. Great, therefore, was their honour in the sight of God. To some among them, Jesus had already said, “Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations and I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me.” How different was the condition of that other company who later, on the self-same day, received likewise the gift of that one Spirit. Instead of having been the friends and servants of Christ, they had been, not only His enemies, but His betrayers and

murderers. They had mocked at His sufferings, and found their joy in adding bitterness to the cup of His agony. Nevertheless, when the Holy Ghost, through the lips of the Apostle, convicted them of their sin, and bore witness also to the grace and pardoning mercy which was opened to them through the blood of Jesus, they repented and believed. But could they be brought into perfect unity and fellowship of blessing with those who had, not only preceded them in the faith and been made the instrumental means of their conversion, but who, also, stood utterly contrasted with them in every practical relation which they had respectively held towards Christ? If it had been the purpose of God ever to draw a line of abiding separation between two classes of the redeemed, this surely would have been the occasion on which it would have been drawn. But was it? Was not the power of the same baptizing Spirit that had been poured out on Peter and John and those who were with them, poured out, in like manner, on the betrayers and murderers who heard and bowed to the Apostles' testimony? All that Christ was as the Sacrifice, all that He was as the First-fruits, all the power of gift and grace that the bestowment of the Spirit had brought, was shared in alike by them all. They were all made members of one body; and they shared the results of that power of concurrent action that was now, for the first time, given to the Church. The Spirit was sent to them as the Spirit of communion; it gave them fellowship in the same hopes, the same joys, and the same sorrows. No wonder, therefore, that they should

be symbolized by *two* wave loaves, presented *together*, for like acceptance before the Lord. "Loaves" may seem an humble emblem to be applied to the Church, and that too, at the time when it first entered, in the power of the Holy Ghost, on its collective mission of blessing in the earth. Yet even the Lord Himself, at the moment when He rose from the grave to enter into His glory, is typified by a sheaf reaped from the harvest field. In the parables, also, of the Lord Jesus, He calls the children of the kingdom, "good seed" and "wheat," which He had Himself sown in the harvest field. Shall we then despise the harvest field, and that which springeth therefrom? Does it not supply the need of the perishing? What if the fields of Israel had never whitened with the Pentecostal harvest? Those precious stores of spiritual food, opened by the ministry of the Apostles, would, in that case, never have been ours. If *they* had never preached the gospel of salvation as recorded in the Acts, or ministered to the Churches those truths which we find in their Epistles, what would have become of us? Where would have been our food? First, indeed, the riches of Israel's harvest field was devoted to the supply of Israel itself. The early preaching of the Apostles, and all the early action of the Pentecostal Church was directed toward Israel. Samaria, indeed, was visited by Peter and John; and Peter was caused (though he did it with slow and hesitating hand) to open to the Gentiles the door of fellowship in Israel's blessings. Nevertheless, Peter and John are distinctively described as ministers to the

circumcision. (See Gal. ii. 7.) They avowedly devoted themselves to the service of Israel. To Israel, seeing that the Pentecostal harvest was from their land reaped, the fulness of the resulting plenty was first presented. Yet there was an ordinance appointed to Israel, when gathering in their harvest, forbidding them to forget the poor and the distant stranger. "When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I am the Lord your God." This ordinance was not disobeyed. The watchful care of the great Head of Israel secured its observance. The poor exiled Israelite and the distant Gentile stranger were not forgotten. The Pentecostal harvest was well nigh ended in the land of Israel, when a late outstanding ear was gathered, and not appropriated to Israel, but devoted to the need of the dark Gentile world. The Apostle Paul was that outstanding ear late gathered. He was to be for a seed of blessing to the whole Gentile world. It might almost be said that he carried with him the power of that promise yet to be fulfilled to Israel, "*I will sow her unto me in the earth.*" Hosea ii. 23. Under his ministry, fields that ripened for a new harvest unto God, sprang up everywhere among the Gentiles, where formerly no fruit had been; and thus, even they who had been out-cast and unclean became an offering—another new meat-offering consecrated unto the Lord. This was the thought in which the Apostle's soul rejoiced when he

spake of himself as the minister of Jesus Christ unto the Gentiles ministering the Gospel of God, that "the offering up (*ἡ προσφορα*) of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." To us that blessing descends: we too, through God's marvellous grace, become partakers of Israel's blessing, and are made, like them, a new meat-offering unto God. Through him, the fountains of blessing that had been opened in Israel's land, were caused to flow down into the dark Gentile world. The Apostle's soul appreciated the blessing of his calling. It was his joy to say, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people."

I have already observed that there had been long previous to Pentecost, periods of fruitfulness in Israel's land. There had been found there those of whom the world was not worthy—men who as pilgrims and strangers looked for a heavenly country. See Heb. xi. In this, as in other ways, God fore-acted on the redemption that was in Christ, and sowed in the earth seed that never would have been sown if Christ had not been "the Lamb fore-ordained." But although all those ancient and honoured servants of God might be described as corn destined for the garner of heaven, they could not have applied to them the type by which the Pentecostal body is here denoted. Never before was it applied to any in the earth—and for this obvious reason; that never before did any in the earth occupy such a position as is denoted by it. Loaves consecrated by sacrifice and waved as first-fruits "holy unto the Lord for the priest," is a description that can only be applied to those who

have been caused to apprehend the nature of that blessed and holy separation in which the death and resurrection of the Lord has placed them, and that unitedly. To be chosen in Christ before all worlds, to be washed in His blood and finally to receive all fulness of grace and glory, is the common heritage of all the elect : but their practical position in the earth as respects their service and the character of their testimony, has, in different dispensations, varied. The practical power of believers in serving, as well as the character of their service, must depend upon their *apprehension* of the blessings that redemption has secured ; and until redemption was perfected, the results of redemption were not unfolded. But when Christ had died and been raised and glorified, the Holy Ghost was sent, not to give, but to *make known* to God's people the things that had been freely given them of God. (See 1 Cor. ii. 12). He came as the Paraclete to glorify not Himself but Jesus. By the lips of accredited witnesses such as the Apostles, He made known the everlasting peace which Jesus had by His one oblation secured in the Holiest of all for all His believing people, past, present, and to come. He made known also the fulness of love unto which they had been gathered, for Jesus had brought them unto the fulness of the Father's love. "Thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me." He had brought them also into the sure inheritance of glory. "The glory which thou hast given me, I have given them." Fulness of reconciliation, of peace, and of love, and of glory, and full power of heavenly life given in and secured in

Christ—these and other like blessings were the subjects of the testimony of the Holy Ghost as sent to bear witness in the lips of the Apostles and other of Christ's accredited servants. He acted also in the hearts of God's people, opening their understandings, and giving them grace to carry out into practical development, the truths that they received. Nor did He give the power of individual action merely: He gave also the power of *concurrent* action; that Christ's people might act in association together, as fellow members of one mystical body under Christ their one Head. This knowledge and this power of action was not given to the people of God until Jesus had been raised and glorified; and therefore, till then, they were not denoted by a type that marked them as thus unitedly consecrated unto God—holy unto Him for the priest.* None but those who belong to the sanctuary and have the priestly anointing belonging thereunto, will find joy in, or strength from, Christ's people as thus consecrated unto God. All believers are priests, and have the priestly anointing; yet if nature be uppermost in them, even they will have (like Peter when Christ rebuked him) more fellowship with unconsecrated than with consecrated ways. But it is otherwise with those in whom the Spirit maintains that savour which is not of earth. They are able to appreciate the comfort and the joy supplied by the holy

* There is some difficulty in interpreting the words "holy unto the Lord for the priest." They appear to comprehend the sacrifices with which the loaves were presented as well as the loaves themselves.

united service and testimony of Christ's people as found at Pentecost, and in the Apostolic Churches. They crave after the comfort and strength of that united fellowship which was once found in the Church whilst it continued in its holy separateness, as "the pillar and ground of truth." The craving may be right, but it will not now be satisfied. Many when they find it so, faint or become fretful, and pine; or else seek to satisfy their craving by turning to some false combination—some pretended association devised by men to imitate the fellowship of the unfallen Church. But all such imitations have ever been ashes under the teeth.

But although the wave-loaves of Pentecost have disappeared, though the Church as to its condition in the earth, no longer answers to that or any other emblem of corporate unity, yet we have the joy of knowing that all fruit that springs from the seed of Israel's harvest field, is essentially the same as that from which the wave-loaves of Pentecost were formed. The seed sown amongst us Gentiles has not been in vain. By means thereof, fruit has been, and is being, gathered into the garner of God: and although we shall never again, in this Dispensation, see any thing that answers to the type of the Pentecostal loaves, yet we have thankfully to remember that those loaves are called "first-fruits." First-fruits is a word that implies succession; and in the coming millennial age, that succession shall be seen. There shall be a fresh out-pouring of the Spirit then; and thereby, Israel as a people, shall be constituted a new meat-offering unto God. And then, blessing shall

remain. No enemy shall scatter tares in the harvest-field : no outward violence shall destroy or scatter that which God shall have consecrated. Jezreel—the name of Israel as the seed of God, shall be sown by Him in the earth : fruitfulness shall be where barrenness was, and in more senses than one, the wilderness shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.

To be, D. V., continued.

In reading Scripture, especially its typical or symbolic parts, we must remember that persons or things are often described, not with reference to that which they in themselves are, but with reference to some office or relation which they hold. Thus, when Christ is spoken of under the emblem of a stone that finally becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth (Dan. ii. 35), we say that this Stone represents Christ, not in respect of that which He is *personally*, but in respect of that which He is *officially* as to the extension of His kingdom ; for His kingdom shall increase and fill the whole earth. On a similar principle, John the Baptist said, when speaking of the Lord and himself in regard to their respective ministries, “He must increase, but I must decrease.” Thus also when the Church, as in the passage before us, is represented by the emblem of loaves or bread, it is in respect of a relation which they hold to others, as being the means of comfort and strength to souls seeking comfort and strength through the knowledge of and fellowship in the Truth. See the words of the Apostle in Rom. i. 12. “That I may be comforted together with you through the mutual faith both of you and me.”

It should be observed also, that the same emblems are not unfrequently applied diversely. Thus in Matt. xiii., “seed” is first used as the emblem of Truth ministered—“he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word and anon with joy receiveth it.” Afterward the same emblem is used not of the word but of those who rightly receive it. “The

good seed are the children of the kingdom." So, in the passage before us, seed gathered from the harvest field of Israel is capable of being used both of the Truth ministered, and of the persons who minister or receive it. Thus too, the Tabernacle or Temple is sometimes used as the type of the body of our Lord: at other times, it represents *the place* of His present priestly ministration. (see Heb. ix. 11.) Thus too, the word "altar," when viewed as *the place appointed for the offering of atoning sacrifice*, or as *the place whence (εξ οὗ) sacrificial food was supplied to the offerer*, indicates a relation held by the Cross: but there are *other* relations of the altar in which it would not represent the Cross. We must also remember that we can predicate certain things of the "altar," when viewed in association with the sacrifice offered thereon, which we cannot predicate of it when it is viewed by itself, apart from its sacrifice. In types, as in parables, we have to limit the application to the particular relations that are, in each several case, intended to be illustrated.

Note on Hebrews XIII. 10.

“ We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle.”

We have an altar.] There have been few things about which there has been more controversy, than about the meaning of the word “altar,” as used in this passage.

Some (especially among the justly valued Puritan writers, including Bunyan) teach that “altar” here denotes the *Divine* nature of Christ, on which, they say, He presented, as on an Altar, His *human* nature as a sacrifice to God. Now, apart from all the other objections that might be urged, most conclusively, against such a notion as this, it is sufficient to say, that when the Scripture says that Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh offered up *HIMSELF*, we cannot say that the word *HIMSELF* can be *restricted* to His *human* nature.

Others say, that “altar” denotes the “Table of the Lord.” This was a view early put forward, and it has always had many advocates. Even Scott favours it. So far from the “Table of the Lord” being an altar, it stands in designed contrast with the altar. Its very existence as a Table depends on its connection with an altar on which sacrifice had, *previously*, been presented

to God and accepted. The aspect of the altar is *towards God*; and it is therefore called "the Table of Jehovah." See Malachi i. 12. After the altar had first been provided with acceptable sacrifice, a Table in connexion with that altar was spread—and the aspect of that Table is towards us. The Altar is provided for God: the Table for us. What relations can be more contrasted? So of old, the Pagans, having first offered sacrifice on the altar of their Idol (that is, says the Apostle, on the altar of a Devil) afterwards spread a Table, at which they themselves fed on part of that which had been previously dedicated to the Idol on the Idol's altar. Nor was it otherwise in Israel. The worshippers, having first brought the appointed sacrifice to the Altar of Jehovah, afterwards spread a Table in connexion with that Altar, at which they themselves fed. Here again, the Table was contrasted with the Altar. Thus the Lord's Table, from the very fact of being connected with an Altar on which sacrifice has been offered to God (that altar being the Cross) is proved not to be an Altar, but a Table, spread in order that *we* might feed thereat. Its aspect is towards us, not towards God. To invest the Lord's Table with the characteristics of an altar, not only destroys *its* character, but invalidates also, all that the Scripture teaches respecting the efficacy of the one oblation finished on the Cross.

Others maintain that the "Altar" is Christ Himself. This is the doctrine of very many, and is of early date. Thus, we find Chrysostom saying; "*Above*, we have a victim; *above*, a Priest; *above*, a Sacrifice. Therefore,

let us offer such sacrifice as can be offered on that altar” —meaning Christ in Heaven. Cyril of Alexandria says, “He Himself (*i.e.* Christ) is Altar; He, incense; He, High Priest.” Such passages as these (and others to the like effect might be quoted) shew the tendency that early prevailed, of confounding the *present heavenly ministrations and offices of Christ* (all founded on the completion of the one atoning sacrifice on the Cross) with that one past offering at the Cross which *alone* supplies us with sacrificial food. The Apostle, in the Hebrews, in speaking of the altar *whereof* or *whence* ($\epsilon\acute{\sigma}\ \omicron\upsilon$) *we eat*, (a *local* thought being by these words conveyed) is not referring to any altar in Heaven, or to any ministration or office of Christ *there*. Without at all denying that there are *certain relations* in which both the Altar of Burnt-offering and the golden Altar within the veil may typify *Christ*, yet there are *other relations* of the Burnt-offering altar which cannot be regarded as typifying Him, because they refer to a *relation in which the Altar stood to Him*, as affording the place and the instrument, at and by which He *sacrificially* presented Himself, in the appointed manner, unto God. As the typical sacrifice could only be offered in a prescribed place, and after a prescribed manner (the altar being necessary as *an instrument* to the offering up of the sacrifice in the appointed way), so the offering of the one great sacrifice was, as to place, manner, and instrumentality, determined by the wisdom of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, before the world was. *As to this*, the Cross stands to the Lord in a relation similar

to that in which the altar stood to the typical priest who offered thereat; for the Cross certainly was, to the Lord Jesus, the place and instrument, at and by which, in a manner afore appointed, He presented Himself as the one atoning oblation unto God.

Another doctrine early taught is, that the Church itself is the altar. "A second altar," says Suicer, "which the ancients recognised, is the whole Church, taken in its totality. Ignatius, in his epistle *ad Trallenses*, says, 'He that comes within the Altar is pure, wherefore also he obeys the Bishops and Presbyters. But the man who is without is he who does what he does apart from the Bishops and Presbyters and deacons. Such an one has become defiled in conscience, and is worse than an infidel.' Clement of Alexandria also calls this altar (*i.e.* the Church) an altar on the earth, to distinguish it no doubt from the altar which is above the Heavens, that is, Christ. Clement says 'That altar which is with us here in the earth, is the assembly of those who are intent on prayer and worship, having as it were, one common voice and one mind.' This altar Chrysostom calls an animated or living altar, whereon is offered 'thanksgiving, praise and continual supplication.' And he subjoins the exhortation, let us then, beloved, daily sacrifice on such altars." (*See Suicer, word θυσιαστηριον.*)

Such interpretations are only worthy of notice as showing the early tendency that well nigh universally prevailed, to ignore the one finished atoning altar-oblation on the Cross, and to fix attention exclusively on

certain results (some true, others supposed) of that sacrifice. Thus it became convenient to speak of Christ in Heaven as an Altar *there* appointed to sanctify us as well as our services; and to speak of the Church in the earth as another altar *here* appointed to sanctify us and our services. In the meanwhile, they cast utterly into the shade that one finished atoning altar-oblation whence the priestly family (see Exodus xxix. 33) receive that on which rests their consecration and sanctification unto God.

Another interpretation is, that the word "altar," as used in this passage, is a *metonym*—that is, that it is intended to direct our thoughts, not to the altar itself, but only to the sacrifice offered thereon. In other words, the passage is to be read as if the Apostle had written, "We have a *sacrifice* whereof" &c. This interpretation is not open to the grave objections that may be urged against most of the interpretations above given. There can be no doubt that the marrow, so to speak, of the truth taught in this passage is comprised in the fact that our food is found in Christ, as once sacrificially given for us unto God. Nevertheless, it may be asked, Why, if the word "sacrifice" would adequately have expressed the Apostle's meaning, did he not use the word "*sacrifice*?" Why did he use the word "*altar*" at all? The answer obviously is: The word sacrifice would not have expressed *all* his meaning. If he had used the words, "We have a sacrifice" whereon believers only have a right to feed, he would, indeed, have directed our minds to a *continuous* act of

God's mercy in feeding us, but he would not (as he desired) have given prominence to the thought that that continuous act was founded on another act—a past completed act of altar-oblation performed for us unto God. We may welcome the streams of a fountain as they flow down to us; but we may also desire to know where, and when, and under what circumstances, the fountain was first opened for us. The moment the word "altar" is introduced, the thought of the one atoning oblation that has been presented once and for ever for us unto God is made prominent; so that we are not taught to consider the effects without also considering the source whence those effects flow. We are taken back, so to speak, to the fountain-head. And when we reflect on the fatal tendency that has ever been to ignore or to obscure the character of the one great finished altar-oblation presented by Christ to God, we can see the importance of that truth being made prominent in a passage like that which we are considering. If the altar-work of Christ had not been referred to, there would have been an incompleteness of statement which the use of the word "altar" removes.

And as our saying that the Tabernacle or Temple typified that holy body of our Lord in which God dwelt as in a Temple, does not prevent us from saying *also*, that the Tabernacle and its courts foreshadowed likewise the *place* of our Lord's priestly ministration (see Hebrews ix. 11 and 24), so the fact that the altar may, in certain of its relations, typify Christ Himself, does not prevent us from saying that, in other of its

relations, it represents the place where Christ offered Himself unto God. And, inasmuch as it is one object of the Epistle to the Hebrews to shew that Christ, being a Priest, had also an unseen Tabernacle in which to minister, so it is to be expected that *the place*, the one only place where He could and did offer once and for ever His atoning oblation, should not be passed over, in speaking of this Tabernacle.

The priestly family (and believers are the antitypical priestly family) were consecrated and sanctified by the sacrifice presented at the Burnt-offering altar, and on those sacrifices they fed. "They shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate and to sanctify them; but a stranger shall not eat thereof, because they are holy." Ex. xxix. 33. Few, I suppose, will question that this verse was present to the mind of the Apostle when he wrote the passage we are considering in the Hebrews. Is it not at the Cross that we find that wherewith atonement has been made, that we might thereby be supplied with sacrificial food to consecrate and to sanctify us? If altar-service was rendered by Christ on the Cross to God, (and will any one deny this?) then, surely, we must say that the Cross was unto Christ an altar. It stood to Christ in the same relation in which the typical altar stood to the typical priest; that is, it afforded the place and the instrument, at and by which, He, in a manner afore prescribed and appointed, presented Himself sacrificially unto God. His altar-service was not separated from the Cross, but it was performed on and by means of the

Cross. It was by a death of crucifixion, and not by any other kind of death that He provided for us the offering of a sweet-smelling savour, and supplied that which we eat, (even those things wherewith atonement hath been made) to consecrate and to sanctify us.

Thus too, by regarding the Cross as the *place* of Christ's atoning altar-service, we have a fitting contrast between the Cross and the Table of the Lord. The Table is *a place* at which we are fed; and therefore, as being *a place*, should be contrasted with a place, and not with a person. Unless there had been *a place* where atoning altar-oblation had been presented unto God, *no place*, no Table, could be appointed unto us, at which to feed. Where then can we find our finished *altar-oblation*, except at the Cross? If we own this, we own that the Cross was, *in one of its aspects*, an altar. Why then should we hesitate to adopt the words of Bengel, who, commenting on this verse in the Hebrews, says, "Our Altar is the Cross of Christ on which His body was sacrificed."* Whenever we speak of the one atoning oblation being offered on the Cross, we virtually call the Cross an Altar. The eye of faith, indeed, alone

* Bengel does not say, that *in every respect* the altar resembles the Cross, or the Cross the altar. What he means is, that the typical altar, in respect of its being the place where atoning oblation was made by the priest, and sacrificial food supplied to the worshipper, stood in a relation similar to that which the Cross occupied towards Christ as the Priest who offered, and towards us as the persons who feed.

In speaking as we do of the Cross, we do not mean that the oblation offered thereon conveyed any virtue to the material

so recognises it. Faith only discerns all that was involved in the one great sacrificial act accomplished on Calvary. Men saw no altar there. But when we speak of feeding by faith on Christ crucified as on our consecration offering wherewith atonement has been made, (see Exodus xxix. 33,) we virtually recognise the Cross as an Altar. Whenever we say that, on Calvary, God, mindful of His covenant name (Jehovah-Jireh) did there provide for Himself a lamb as a Burnt-offering, we virtually call the Cross an altar. Whenever we gather around the Lord's Table, we virtually recognise the Cross as an altar; for we feed on the memorial of that which had previously, on the Cross, been given sacrificially unto God. The Cross therefore stood in a twofold relation to the Lord Jesus. It was a place of dishonour, curse, and judicial death under wrath. It was *also* a place where He performed His great *altar-act* of atoning oblation, and gave Himself for us "an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."

The Lord Jesus advanced to the Cross as knowing that there, as our Surety, He had to meet God in a manner in which He had never before met Him, and in

wood; or that sanctifying efficacy was imparted to Calvary, because it was the place of the great Sacrifice. In that case, we should have to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and must join with the Papists in honouring wood, and so become idolaters. The Cross was the outward instrument whereby the appointed death under curse was brought on the Holy One in the manner appointed—which death, because of what He unchangeably was as the Holy One, became (so to speak) an *altar-death*, in which the preciousness of a sweet-smelling savour was necessarily found.

which He would never meet Him again. There, as One who had taken upon Himself the punishableness of *our* guilt, He had to meet God in the power of unmitigated wrath. The appointed cup of penal suffering was there to be drunk to the very dregs. It was appointed—it was necessary, because of the holiness of God: otherwise atonement could not be made. Therefore, when the Lord Jesus submitted to be led “without the gate” to a place like unto that where the sin-offering or part thereof was to be “*burned up*,” He understood,—His soul appreciated, all that He had to meet in meeting the unmitigated wrath of the living God, that burned against Him more fiercely than did the consuming fire that “burned up” the sin-offering in its devouring flame. “I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and THOU hast brought me into the dust of earth.” None, save the adversaries of Christ, will question that the Cross was the place appointed to Him in which to meet all that power of fiery consuming wrath which is expressed in the word שָׂרַף —*to burn up*. The fire that burned up devouringly was kindled in a place without the gate, and there Jesus went to meet it. He went to be “made a curse for us.” But in doing this, He did it as the Obedient One, fulfilling His Father’s will. His giving Himself over to the fulness of that curse was the crowning act of His obedience—the act whereby He glorified God, even as in the fires. It had ever been His meat

and His drink to do His Father's will. And was not God conscious of this, unvaryingly and always? Did He ever cease to see in Jesus the Son of His love? Did He ever cease to estimate the completeness and perfectness of His service as the "Obedient One"? And as these were characteristics that *essentially* pertained to the Son, and could not be separated from His holy Person and service, so it was impossible that they should ever cease to be recognised by the Father: though He might, for a season, withhold the expression of the recognition. The Father bruised Him; for *our* sakes He bruised Him; for *our* sakes He spared not the Son of His bosom. Yet whilst He bruised Him, His soul delighted in Him. The Father failed not to discern and to appreciate the excellency of the Person and service of Him who was bearing that load of wrath on the accursed Tree. He might be bruised, but it was incense that was being bruised: He might be burned, but it was incense that was being burned. Ages before the great sacrifice was really offered, God had expressed His sense of the excellency thereof: for He had appointed the service of Israel's Burnt-offering altar; and every sacrifice of sweet savour that had ever been offered at that altar had been an attestation to the value that God attached to the One Sacrifice. The sweet savour of those typical sacrifices foreshadowed that fragrance of heavenly perfectness that was inseparable from the Person of the Lord Jesus, and which ascended into Heaven from His Cross. It ascended gratefully into the heavenly places not made with hands. And there

God accepted and welcomed it. It was necessary to atonement that the "fat of the sin-offering" should be "burned for fragrance,"* and this fragrance was found in the one sacrifice offered on the Cross.

And if the Lord Jesus was conscious that in going to the Cross He was going to the place of curse, was He not equally conscious that He was going there "to give Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour? Had He no consciousness that the Cross was to be the place of His altar-service? Did He think only of the fire that "burned up:" did He not also think of the altar-fire that fed gratefully on that which was presented to it? The Lord Jesus in going to the Cross knew indeed that He was going to the appointed place to meet the appointed curse in the appointed manner: but He knew also that in going to the Cross, He was going to the appointed place to present the appointed offering of sweet-smelling savour in the appointed manner. It was needful to atonement that both these relations to God should be sustained: and at the Cross both were sustained. The moment therefore the Lord Jesus advanced to the Cross as to the place where the oblation of Himself was to be made, He recognised it as standing to Him in the relation of an altar. And when on the Cross, He presented the one

* This is expressed by the word קָטַר, *to burn as fragrance*—see Lev. xvi. 25, as contrasted with שָׂרַף *to burn up or consume*. This last word was applied to the "burning up" of the sin-offering without the camp.

perfect oblation unto God, He imparted unto the Cross the character of an altar. And when God recognised the sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour there presented, and accepted it, He recognised the Cross as standing to Him in the relation of an altar. And when we, in faith, turn to it as the place where the priestly family find their food—for they are commanded “to eat those things wherewith atonement was made to consecrate and to sanctify them,” then we too recognise the Cross as an altar whence we feed. Do not our souls know that we daily, hourly turn to the Cross as the place where God has supplied us with sacrificial food, whereby we have been “consecrated and sanctified” unto Him?

The atoning *altar*-service of Jesus, therefore, was performed, not in a place of honour, but in a place of reproach. It was performed “without the gate.” By His priestly act in presenting there His one oblation, He imparted to the Cross (whilst it still remained the place of curse) the character *also* of an altar; and thus, the earthly court of our Tabernacle was set “without the gate.” Heaven, indeed, was opened over it, and into the unseen heavenly courts not made with hands, the sweet-smelling savour of the accepted sacrifice ascended. But faith only could recognise this. To the outward eye, all that was associated with the one oblation and with the place thereof, was dishonour and reproach; and none who loved the praise of men would come there to seek for sacrificial food. So it was then; and so it continues still. Men have sought to have their visible altars, and temples, and priests, and sacri-

fices, and have struggled to dissociate the place of the altar where Atonement was made, from that of the Cross. They have sought to destroy the contrast between the place of our altar and man's city. But the contrast cannot be destroyed. It is essential and everlasting; and he who refuses to come without the gate will not find the place whence the food that "consecrates and sanctifies" comes. But into this subject I will not now further enter. My object in the present note has been to show that the Cross stood to the Lord in a relation similar to that in which the altar of burnt-offering stood to the typical priest who offered thereat—that Jesus found in the Cross the *appointed place* for His one oblation, and that on that atoning oblation, once and for ever offered, we feed. I do not profess to give *every* aspect of the Altar or *every* aspect of the Cross. I speak here of *some* of their relations only; but they are not the least important.

Note on the Lord's Supper.*

THERE is nothing, perhaps, that more distinctly shows how Christendom has lost the Truth respecting the sacrifice of the Cross than their doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper. I speak not merely of those grosser corruptions to which Romanists and Anglo-Romanists resign themselves, defying alike reason, fact, and Scripture. They who deem it faith to recognise as fact that which is proved both by our senses and by Scripture not to be fact, cannot be reasoned with. God's mercy alone can deliver them from the Satanic delusion that has fallen on their souls. Certainly in the history of Paganism we read of no more terrible debasement of the understanding than is found among those who maintain, that that which God declares to be "bread," (see 1 Cor. ~~xiv.~~ 16) and which is proved by our senses to be "bread," is not "bread," but God; and as God to be worshipped. If men seek a proof of the agency and power of Satan, they may find it in the fact that a debasing falsehood like this is welcomed by the majority of educated Christendom. However, at present, I refer not to apostasy like this. We have sorrowfully to ask

* This and the succeeding note on page 85 are intended to be read in connexion with the preceding paper.

whether the Protestant section of Christendom has not, in the doctrine it has taught respecting the Lord's Supper, widely departed from the Truth. Dangerous error lurks in any statement that implies that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper were intended to direct our minds to a "REAL PRESENCE" of the body of the Lord. See, for example, the following words of Hooker. "The REAL PRESENCE of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." *Hooker. Eccl. Polity, Ch. 67, p. 450. Oxford. 1836.*

Now if Hooker had said that the real presence of *the value* of Christ's most blessed body and blood is to be found in the worthy receiver of the sacrament, his statement might be accepted; though, even then, it should be qualified by adding that that value did not attach to the receiver in virtue of his taking the elements, because it attached to him previously, from the moment he first believed. To show forth what we *have received* is a different thing from receiving.

However, this is not what Hooker states. He says that a REAL PRESENCE is to be sought for in the worthy recipient. It is very evident that a large section of Protestants who receive neither the doctrine of Transubstantiation, nor of Consubstantiation, do nevertheless believe that there is a real presence of the body of Christ when the elements are received in faith; and they imagine that some quality or virtue is imparted from that body to him who receives the elements rightly.

Now, if there were in any sense a real presence of His

body, is it not evident that it must be the presence of that spiritual, glorified body which He now hath above the heavens? He was "received up in glory." (*ενδοξη*). His body is indeed the same body in which He died; but as to its condition and circumstances, it is altogether changed. We once "knew Christ after the flesh" (*κατα σαρκα*), but now henceforth know we Him so no more. We know Him now in a condition of being that is according to the Spirit (*κατα πνευμα*). He has now a body no longer mortal—no longer capable of death or weakness, but glorious according to His glory as God. Now, in the Lord's Supper, not only are our minds *not* directed to His glorified body as present, but they are not even directed to it as absent. Our thoughts are carefully directed away from His spiritual body, to "the body of His flesh" (Col. i. 22) in which sacrificially He gave Himself for us on the Cross. The sacrificial act of Christ is not a continued act; it is a past and completed act. It was an act performed for us *towards God*, to satisfy the claims of His holiness; and it is that act, and not any present relation of the body of Christ to us, that is brought before us in the Lord's Supper.

The bread does not refer to the body of the Lord *simply*: it refers to that body *in a certain relation which it once temporarily held*. It refers to His body as "*given for us*;"—the word "given" including two thoughts. It was given to be broken for us under wrath: it was given also to be "an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour." So likewise the wine: it

refers to His blood as shed for us—shed under the curse; and also to His blood as presented in acknowledged preciousness, as worthy to be poured out as a drink offering, or of being sprinkled for acceptance on God's altar. Now, inasmuch as the elements in the Lord's Supper point to His body as holding that past sacrificial relation to God *in death*, which it now no longer holds, it is impossible that there can be any real presence thereof. The *death-condition* which the elements symbolize is past; and faith has to recognise it as past, and therefore cannot recognise it as present. We shew forth "the Lord's *death*" in the Supper: we do not shew forth (and it would be disobedience and sin to attempt to shew forth) any *present* condition of His body. "In that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth he liveth unto God."

Suppose that with our present knowledge of what redemption is, we had actually stood by the side of the Cross whilst the great sacrificial act was being accomplished—we might truly, in that case, have spoken of the real presence of the body of Christ. But even then, the benefit to our souls would not have resulted from any virtue or quality communicated or imparted from that body to us. The strength received would have resulted from our faith apprehending what was being sacrificially effected for us *towards God*. According to the simplicity and comprehensiveness of our faith would be the degree of our blessing. There would have been no impartation or infusion of the virtue or qualities of that body which was being offered for us to God. Our

strength and joy would have resulted entirely from knowing that the value of that great *sacrificial* work was made ours by IMPUTATION. If our thoughts respecting the Lord's Supper will not bear the test of that word IMPUTATION,—if we would wish to set that word aside and to substitute for it IMPARTATION, we virtually destroy the Gospel, and nullify that which the Lord's Supper was specially appointed to teach. The strength *imparted* flows from our recognition of that which has been *imputed*; and the degree of that strength will depend on the simplicity of our faith in recognising, not only the fact of the imputation, but also the preciousness of that *sacrificial* excellency which is imputed.

Note on Certain Statements of Dean Goode on the Eucharist. Atonement Finished at the Cross.

It is with much regret that I transcribe the following extracts from the works of the late Dean Goode. My attention was first directed to them by a pamphlet written and sent to me by a clergyman, who has commented on them with much severity. The extracts, as given in this pamphlet, are as follows :

“It will be said, ‘Do you then deny that the service of
“the Eucharist is in any sense propitiatory in behalf of
“the Church?’ *Goode’s Divine Rule of Faith*. Vol. ii.
p. 392.

“I would observe, that it is strictly true, in a sense,
“that the real sacrifice of the Cross, the true body and
“blood of Christ, are offered up in the Eucharist—nay
“more, that remission of sins can only be obtained by
“the offering up of the true sacrifice of the Cross.”
Goode. Id. p. 404.*

* These extracts should not be read apart from their context. I have quoted, therefore, the passages in full at the close of this paper. Dr. Goode has not taught that the Eucharist is *in itself* “propitiatory,” but says that it becomes so in virtue of the intercessory prayers with which it is accompanied. But to speak of

It is very obvious that these words are incapable of being interpreted in any sense that would bring them into conformity with Heb. viii., ix., x. Dr. Goode's statements, though altogether differing from those of Bellarmine, do nevertheless, decidedly contravene the teaching of the Apostle in the Hebrews.* In that Epistle, we are taught that the New Covenant of grace

prayer, or any thing else, save the one finished sacrifice of Calvary, being propitiatory, or expiatory, or atoning, or satisfying, is dangerous error that cannot be too earnestly withstood.

* Bellarmine is wonderfully cautious in some of his statements. Thus in speaking of the Mass, after stating that it is nothing more than a "continued commemoration of the Cross," he adds: "We confess that the sacrifice of the Cross has an infinite and everlasting efficacy, and we grant that it thence follows that there is no need of another sacrifice on the Cross, nor any need of the repetition of the same sacrifice—that is, that there is no need that another Christ should die for us, or that the same Christ should repeatedly die. But we deny that it hence follows, that sacrifices representing the sacrifice of the Cross and applicatory of its benefits to us, cannot be multiplied without injury to the Cross of Christ." *Bellarmino de Missâ, lib. i.*

There may be a certain cleverness shown in making modified statements like these; but it is the cleverness of deceit. Compare what Bellarmine says, with the more outspoken statements of the Catechism of the Council of Trent—a work not deficient in caution. We there read as follows; "We, therefore, confess that the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross: the victim is one and the same, Christ Jesus, who offered, himself, once only, a bloody sacrifice on the altar of the Cross. The bloody and unbloody victim is still one and the same, and the oblation of the Cross is daily renewed in the eucharistic sacrifice, in obedience to the command of our Lord: 'This do, for a commemoration of me.' The Priest is also the same, Christ our Lord: the ministers who offer this sacrifice,

has brought to all believers such complete remission of sins that "there remaineth no more offering for sin." God has said of those who are under the new covenant, "their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." The Apostle adds, "NOW WHERE REMISSION OF THESE IS, THERE REMAINETH NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN."

Cardinal Bellarmine, fully aware that the doctrinal

consecrate the holy mysteries not in their own but in the person of Christ. This the words of consecration declare: the priest does not say: 'This is the body of Christ,' but, 'This is my body;' and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of his real body and blood. [And yet he pretends that he offers an 'unbloody' sacrifice—which certainly must be worthless for 'without shedding of blood is no remission.'] That the holy sacrifice of the Mass, therefore, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross; [here there is a direct contradiction of the words of Bellarmine who says, speaking of the Mass—'quæ nihil ferme est aliud nisi continua commemoratio Crucis'] but also a sacrifice of propitiation [how ought Protestants to have avoided the least approach towards a statement of this kind] by which God is appeased and rendered propitious, the pastor will teach as a dogma defined by the unerring authority of a General Council of the Church. If, therefore, with pure hearts and a lively faith, and with a sincere sorrow for past transgressions, we immolate and offer in sacrifice this most holy victim, we shall, no doubt, receive from the Lord, 'mercy and grace in seasonable aid.' So acceptable to God is the sweet odour of this sacrifice, that through its oblation he pardons our sins, bestowing on us the gifts of grace and of repentance. This is the solemn prayer of the Church: as often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, so often is the work of our salvation promoted, and the plenteous fruits of that bloody victim flow in upon us abundantly, through this unbloody sacrifice." *Catechism of Council of Trent, Donovan, p. 249.*

system of Rome falls if this verse be taken in its natural meaning, endeavours to evade its force by saying, that wherever remission of sins is, *there*, there remaineth no more offering for sin : but he argues that since believers are taught to say, "forgive us our trespasses," it is evident that there is not remission, and therefore offering for sin remains—a strange argument, nullifying all that the Apostle had said in the ninth and tenth of Hebrews ; and which, if true, would make it impossible for any living man to be brought under the new COVENANT of grace at all. Dr. Goode, though following quite a different line of thought from Bellarmine, yet maintains that *propitiatory offering* for sin remains. Nor is he singular in this. Protestants, when they have dwelt much among the mists which the traditions of Christendom (whether Patristic, or Roman, or Anglican) have raised around Truth, will be in danger of finding their power of understanding Scripture paralysed, if not destroyed.

The one offering once offered, brings those who are under it (that is, believers) into a relation to God altogether different from that in which they before stood. Their relation to God is avowedly and abidingly changed. *Before*, they stood in the presence of God's unpropitiated holiness with all their criminality resting upon them—exposed, consequently, to that fulness of wrath which must be the portion of those who, when God demands perfectness, present corruption. But the moment we are brought, through faith, under the efficacy of the one oblation, our relation to God is

changed—and that, for ever. We quit Sinai, and stand before Zion ; not, however, without the claims of Sinai having been met for us by our Substitute—met by His having presented sacrificially His own perfectness, and by His having borne the appointed penalties ; whereby the ascription of our criminality gives place to the ascription of our Substitute's meritoriousness ; so that the normal governmental relation of God to us becomes one of favour according to the meritoriousness of our Substitute, instead of one of wrath according to the criminality of our sin. And this new relation is held under a covenant ; and that covenant, a covenant of grace ; and that grace founded on the perpetuity of the SATISFACTION (*ἰλασμος*) made to all the claims of God's holiness by the one atoning oblation (*προσφορα*). To stand, therefore, as children in the presence of a reconciled Father and to say (as we continually have to say), "Forgive us our trespasses," is a very different thing from standing as unpardoned rebels in the presence of the unsatisfied claims of holiness. The intercession of Christ for His believing people always assumes the perfectness and perpetuity of the reconciliation into which His one oblation has brought them. Whatever forgiveness, whatever blessing He asks for them, He asks on the ground of their having been once and for ever reconciled through the offering once made ; so that there is never in any sense, a repetition of the offering, or a repetition of the reconciliation into which (because of that offering) each believing sinner is brought the moment he believes. These things Bellarmine, of

course, could not be expected to acknowledge; yet surely, Protestants should have guarded them as the apple of their eye. But have they? If they had, Dr. Goode's statements, as above given, would never have received the acceptance that has been widely accorded to them. Nor would other more modified statements, proceeding from other schools of Protestantism, have been received.

When the Scripture saith, "THERE REMAINETH NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN," it excludes all further offering, whether in earth or heaven. Consequently, the proper force of these words is evaded by all who say that Christ, *in interceding* for His people, may, in a certain sense, be said "to offer again." Such language (however innocent may be the intention of those who use it) utterly misleads. Not only does it afford an apparent sanction to those who teach that in the intercessory prayers of the Church on earth, Christ may be said to be offered afresh, but it also destroys that great foundation truth, that the legal status and relation of believers to God under the New Covenant, is altogether different from, and contrasted with, that which they held under the Old. Under the Old, there was a perpetual recurrence of exposure to wrath, and therefore there was need of recurring offering to avert the consequences of recurring wrath: whereas, under the New Covenant there is no such re-awakening of wrath, because of the efficacy of the one offering. Accordingly, Christ always intercedes for His people on the ground of their *having been placed* under the abiding

efficacy of that one offering. In the courts of Heaven it is fully recognised that that offering does, in perpetuity, free them from all liability to *wrath*. Believers are regarded not as unpardoned rebels, but as reconciled children; still, however, though *children*, needing forgiveness, and preservation, and guidance, and grace; and for them, in this relation, Christ intercedes and asks. But He never does in any sense "*offer*" for them afresh.* Nor does He "*offer*" afresh for any at the moment when they are brought to repentance and faith, and gathered into His fold. He asks that they should, like all those who had believed before, be recognised as brought under the continuous efficacy of His offering once made: and they are so recognised. Christ's act towards God in these cases is not one of repeated oblation in any sense. He pleads the value of a completed oblation; but that is very different from "*offering*" afresh.

Again, there are some who (whilst admitting that Christ after He had taken His seat at the right hand of God, never offers for sin afresh,) do, nevertheless, teach that the atoning oblation was not formally and finally completed on the Cross. They maintain, to use the words of a pamphlet now before me, that "the formal, priestly, and atoning oblation of our Lord was made by Him in heaven after His ascension," and that it was not finished on the Cross.

* For further remarks on this subject, see Tract entitled, "Jesus washing His disciples' feet," as advertised at end of this volume.

Now, indeed, it is true that Christ as the great Melchizedek-Priest of His believing people, did, in order to secure for them in the appointed manner the results of His finished atonement, ascend into heaven *in glory*, and there "appear in the presence of God" for them. He presented Himself as One who *had finished* His atoning work, and therefore had a title instantly to take (as He did take) His seat at the right hand of God, as One who *had finished* it. "This man HAVING OFFERED (^{ἡ προσε}~~αυ~~νεγκας) one sacrifice for sins, for ever took His seat (εκαθισεν) at the right hand of God." To say this, is a very different thing from saying, that He entered "to complete an unfinished atoning oblation."

Nothing can be more express than the declaration of Scripture on this subject. One text is sufficient. "He [Christ] entered once into the holy places HAVING OBTAINED (εὔραμενος) eternal redemption."

Surely, nothing but the power of inveterate theological bias could have caused so mature a scholar as Dean Alford to seek to destroy, as he has done, the force of this text. He wishes to make it mean that Christ obtained redemption "by entering." But if this had been the intended meaning of the Apostle, he would have written εἰσελθων εὔρατο: and this is proved by the very citation made by Dean Alford himself, for he cites αποκριθεις ειπε, which certainly does not mean, "he spoke in order to answer," but, "he after he had taken the place of an answerer, spake." The past participle in such combinations with a finite verb, invariably expresses an action antecedent to that expressed by the

verb. This text, therefore, rightly interpreted, is of itself sufficient to decide the question. There are many other passages to the same effect. He [the Father] reconciled you "in the body of his [Christ's] flesh through death to present you holy and without blemish and uncharged in his sight." How could we be described as thus reconciled, if the atoning oblation had not been completed and accepted when Jesus died? The reconciliation was effected not by any thing He did in His resurrection-body, but "*in the body of His flesh through death.*"

It is indeed difficult to conceive how any one with the Epistle of the Hebrews before him, could bring himself to assert that all that was required for the putting away sin (*αθετησις*, see Heb. ix. 26) was not fully and finally accomplished as soon as Jesus had "offered up himself in death." Let any one write out all the passages in the Hebrews where the words "offer" (*προσφερειν*), and "offer up," as applied to Christ occur, and say whether they do not in every case belong exclusively to His act in death. The typical high priest in making atonement had first to present the victim, then to slay it, and then to pour out the blood before God, or else to sprinkle it within the veil; but all this, and every thing else that typically indicated what was required for atonement to God, was included in the one act of the Lord in "offering up Himself." When the Scripture says, "THIS he did once when he offered up himself," the word "this" virtually includes every ceremony (whether performed by the *typical* Priest *within* or

without the veil) which was appointed for the effectuation of atoning oblation to God. Otherwise, we must deny what all Scripture teaches, that the atoning offering was finished on the Cross. "He hath been manifested:" (that surely is a word which indicates exhibition before the eyes of men)—"He hath been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Few Protestants, except they be Neologians or Socinians, would like expressly to deny that atonement was accomplished on the Cross; yet many so qualify their assent to this truth by subsequent statements as to make it no assent at all. Thus Outram, not content with saying (what would be true) that Christ has "presented himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary in such a manner as constantly to commend to Him both our persons and services," adds, that *there* (i.e. in Heaven) "*He OFFERED Himself*" unto God, and that with a view to render Him perfectly propitious to us; and he then refers to Heb. ix. 14, and to Heb. x. 12, as proofs that He so in Heaven "offered Himself unto God."* The first of these texts is, "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience" &c. The second is, "this man having offered up (^{προσε}~~δρα~~χευεγκας) one sacrifice for sins for ever took his seat at the right hand of God." It is idle to say that any one who hesitates not to affirm that the *offering* and *offering up* spoken of in these passages took place in heaven, can

* Outram. Book II. Ch. vii., § 3.

hold that atonement was accomplished on the Cross. According to Outram, the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross could not render God "*perfectly propitious* to us." Although Immanuel there presented unto God for us all His own excellency, and also bore every appointed penalty, yet, according to Outram, propitiation was not completed; for something yet remained to be done in order to make God "*perfectly propitious*" to His believing people, and that something was, offering for sin.

It is obvious that unless the work of propitiation, or atonement, or expiation, or appeasement, or satisfaction (these words being used to denote a work performed by Christ *toward God* for His believing people) had been completed at the Cross, Christ by the sacrifice there made, could not have brought to them either the imputation of righteousness, or the non-imputation of guilt. He must still have been, even after His resurrection, the Representative of a guilty, unatoned-for people. How, in that case, could He, as their Representative, have entered heaven in glory? This is admitted to be a difficulty; and therefore some of the more ardent upholders of this system boldly cut the Gordian knot by affirming that He did *not* ascend in glory. I have now before me a pamphlet, the author of which says:

"It is common to think of His glorification as commencing with His ascension into heaven. The circumstances of His ascension join, I think, with the studied simplicity of attire in which the High Priest as the minister of hitherto incomplete atonement, was to go within the veil, to remind us that this is a mistake.

“ ‘This man WHEN he had offered one sacrifice for sins
 “ for ever sat down at the right hand of the throne
 “ of God.’ His glorification awaited that ‘oblation’ of
 “ Himself in heaven in which His atonement and con-
 “ secration culminated, and till this oblation was first
 “ made, ‘Jesus’ was not yet ‘glorified.’” *

These statements, standing as they do in direct antagonism to the words, “received up IN GLORY” (*εἰς δόξην*) may seem very extravagant, yet, though not made by Outram, they are necessary to his system. Nor are they more extravagant or more antagonistic to Scripture than the statement that the words “offer” and “offer up,” as used of Christ in the Hebrews, belong to an act performed by Him in heaven, and that that act was necessary to make God “perfectly propitious.” The Scripture says that “God reconciled us” (and reconciliation is the *result* of propitiation) “in the body of Christ’s flesh through death.” His death did not take place in heaven, though its efficacy penetrated heaven.

The unseen heavenly Courts of an unseen Tabernacle were opened over the Cross, and into those heavenly Courts the sweet-smelling savour of the sacrifice ascended with incense-like fragrance. As soon as God

* I find another influential writer saying—“He (Christ) was in your sins when He was buried. They were still around Him and upon Him as He lay in the dark tomb. He had not got rid of them; for He was still, in the soul’s separation from the body and the body’s occupancy of the grave, suffering their penalty; He was still bearing their doom.”

accepted the one oblation (and He accepted it as soon as it had been perfected in death) His relation instantly became one of peace and reconciliation to all those who stood under it—that is, all who had believed. His relation to such was (to use typical language) from a sprinkled mercy-seat. All that gave to John and James sacrificial sanctification and spotlessness had been accomplished: for “Jesus that He might *sanctify* the people by His own blood, suffered without the gate.” When therefore Christ entered *personally* into Heaven, He entered in garments “of glory and of beauty,” as One who had acquired a title to present before God the names of His believing people in all that radiancy of lustre which the precious stones on the breast-plate betokened. So, He appeared in the presence of God for us. His so appearing was necessary in order to work out the *results* of atonement; but the atonement itself *had been* completed. His intercession for His people is grounded on the fact of His accomplished atonement. All those who have believed are regarded as standing under the full *applied* value of its satisfying efficacy; and He intercedes for them accordingly. In the case of others of His elect, who have not yet believed, He asks that they should be regarded as standing under the full applied value of His sacrifice, as soon as they have believed. “Neither pray I for these alone but for them also who shall believe on me through their word.” Such intercession derogates not from the completeness of the offering on the Cross. It is in no sense an offering afresh.

It would be scarcely right to admit that any thing could justly be pleaded in extenuation of such statements as those to which I have above referred. Yet I suppose a certain perplexity of mind is occasioned to some in consequence of not distinguishing between the act of atonement as performed towards God, and the application of its results to those for whom that act was performed. It is sufficient, however, here to observe that our present question is simply this—whether the atoning offering to God which made Him perfectly propitious to Peter, and John, and all others of His believing people was *accomplished* on the Cross, or in heaven? We do not wish to obscure the all-important fact that Jesus rose to appear in the presence of God as the priestly Representative and Advocate of His people; but to enter as One who *had* offered, is something very different from saying that He entered *to* offer.

Another cause of perplexity to many is the habit of interpreting the Levitical types without due regard to the restrictions imposed by the Epistle to the Hebrews as to the extent of correspondency between type and antitype. If Aaron as a priest be typical of Christ as a priest, that which is essential to the office of priesthood will be found both in Aaron and in Christ: and therefore, seeing that (to use the words of the Apostle) “every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices,” it is “of necessity that this man [Jesus] should have somewhat also to offer.” Heb. viii. 3. But it is not hereby implied that strict similarity would be found either in that which was offered, or in the manner of

the offering. As to these things, we have to draw, not parallelisms, but contrasts between him "who was priest after the law of a carnal commandment, and Him who was Priest after the power of an endless life." Aaron could not be recognised as even typically clean without washing himself. Christ assumed the place of recognised, absolute cleanness without washing. Aaron offered for his own sins: Christ had no sins for which to offer. Aaron brought many sacrifices, and he offered them at various times: Christ offered Himself once. Aaron might be the priest, but he could not be the sacrifice: Christ was both. In these, and many other instances, we are under the necessity of drawing marked contrasts between the type and the anti-type. Indeed, we had better not read Leviticus at all, unless we read it in strict subjection to the Epistle to the Hebrews. The texts, "THIS HE DID ONCE WHEN HE OFFERED UP HIMSELF:" and, "WHERE REMISSION OF THESE IS THERE REMAINETH NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN," supply to us two fixed and certain canons to which all our interpretations of typical Scripture must be made to bow. On the ground of these, and like declarations in the New Testament, we are bound to say that every Levitical type that refers to offering made for sin unto God, was fully and finally accomplished when the great Substitute bowed His head in death, saying, "It is finished." Leviticus, rightly explained, will not be found to be in discord with the two great principles to which I have referred. On this, however, I hope to remark further on another occasion.

It is impossible that our thoughts respecting the Lord's Supper can be according to truth if we hold that propitiatory sacrifice was not finally accomplished at the Cross. Our Lord's reference to "the new covenant" at the institution of the Supper makes that ordinance the sign and the pledge of that great truth, "their sins and iniquities will I remember no more:" and "where remission of these is, there remaineth no more offering for sin."

The relation of the Peace-offering table to the altar is the illustration which Scripture itself supplies of the relation of the Lord's Table to the sacrifice antecedently finished on the Cross. After the Peace-sacrifice had been presented at the altar of Jehovah, and the appointed parts had been burned, the worshipper in Israel was allowed to spread a table for himself and his friends, and to furnish it with part of the sacrifice that had been thus presented. The table thus spread, therefore, was not an altar. It stood contrasted with the altar. Yet it was connected with the altar, and could not have been spread or furnished apart from the sacrifice that had been antecedently accomplished at the altar. There was no atonement at the table. No propitiatory sacrifice was offered there. All this had been completed before: and the flesh of the Peace-offering there fed on, was fed on in attestation that the sacrifice which brought as its results this fellowship in peace, *had been* completed. So in respect of the Lord's Table. It is a table—not an altar. If it had been an altar, its aspect would have been towards God. It would have been the place of

our ministration and offering to God: whereas, it is not this, but the place of God's gracious ministration to us. The one sacrificial oblation having been accomplished at the Cross, God can now act towards us as reconciled and brought under a covenant of everlasting peace. And as the worshipper in Israel, by feeding at a table supplied from the altar of Jehovah with part of the sacrifice that had been offered thereon, did thereby express fellowship with the altar, and with Him whose altar it was, so at the Lord's Table they who feed thereat do thereby declare that they have fellowship with Him whose altar the Cross is. On the part of God (seeing that He has appointed the Table to be spread) it is the sign that He has fellowship in everlasting peace with us—peace founded exclusively on the once finished sacrifice. It is as an olive branch (a sign and pledge of amity and love) from our Salem—our city of everlasting peace. It is an evidence that we belong to that city of peace—a city over which our great Melchizedek reigns, and which He has founded for us on the title of His own righteousness—that righteousness which He has wrought out for us, and sacrificially presented for us unto God.

I have thought it right to give in full the context of the two extracts from Dean Goode's works, quoted on a preceding page.

“ But it will be said, Do you then deny, that the service of the eucharist is, in any sense, propitiatory on behalf of the Church? “ To such a question I must reply more at length than by a mere

“ affirmative or negative, for both would be open to serious mis-
 “ construction. I deny altogether, that the mere offering up of
 “ the consecrated elements as a sacrifice to God is a propitiation
 “ for the sins of the Church, which is what our opponents main-
 “ tain. I deny, also, that the mere celebration of the eucharist is
 “ necessarily thus propitiatory, because it might be celebrated
 “ without any intercessory prayers for the whole Church, and
 “ still be valid to the communicants. Its propitiatory nature
 “ depends upon the prayers offered in it. And I am far from
 “ denying, that the intercessory prayers offered upon such an
 “ occasion may have a propitiatory effect with God in behalf of
 “ those for whom they are offered. But it is very far from being
 “ a consequence of this, that the celebration of the eucharist
 “ with intercessory prayers for the Church, and the remission of
 “ sins to the Church, are like *cause* (call it *mediate*, or *instru-*
 “ *mental*, or what you will, but still *cause*), and *effect*, so that
 “ where one takes place the other follows as a necessary effect.
 “ The propitiatory effect to be expected in this case is of the same
 “ kind as that which may be expected from intercessory prayer
 “ generally. And hence to make remission of sins for the Church
 “ a necessary effect and consequence of the celebration of the
 “ eucharist, (even though we substitute for the notion of the
 “ priest’s sacerdotal prayers the prayers of the whole body of
 “ communicants,) is most unwarrantable, and directly leading
 “ men to a neglect of this sacred ordinance in their own persons,
 “ when they suppose that remission of sins is obtained for them
 “ by the acts or prayers of others. This is necessarily, and is
 “ proved by experience to be, the practical effect.” *Divine rule*
of faith and practice. Vol. II., p. 392.

In page 404 of same work we find the following :

“ The Fathers, as a body, while they speak (and justly) of the
 “ offering up of the real body and blood of Christ in the eucharist,
 “ and attribute the impetration of remission of sins to such a
 “ sacrifice alone, not only show their total dissent from the
 “ doctrine of transubstantiation, by speaking of the bread and
 “ wine as being still bread and wine after consecration, but,
 “ though some of them may maintain the propriety of an offering

“ up of the bread and wine to God *after consecration*, as symbolically the body and blood of Christ, disconnect themselves from the notion that the act of the priest in doing this is, even instrumentally, the procuring cause of any remission of sins, by speaking of the sacrifice as consisting principally in that *mental offering* of Christ's sacrifice in the prayers and praises of the hearts of the worshippers, which no one can offer for another.

. “ I would observe, then, upon this head, lastly, that it is strictly true, in a sense, that the real sacrifice of the cross, the true body and blood of Christ, are offered up in the eucharist, not by iteration, but *in the prayers of the faithful*. Nay more, remission of sins can only be obtained by offering up of the true sacrifice of the cross. And how can this be offered up? Confessedly not in the external offering up of the consecrated bread and wine, unless we maintain the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is only, and can only be, offered spiritually in the prayers and thanksgivings of the faithful. And hence, again, it follows, that no remission of sins can be obtained by any external symbolical offering of consecrated bread and wine, or by any one individual for another.”

Instead of saying with Dr. Goode, that it is “ strictly true,” that “ the real sacrifice of the Cross, the true body and blood of Christ, are offered up in the eucharist, not by iteration, but *in the prayers of the faithful*,” we are obliged to say that it is *strictly untrue*. And when he adds, that remission of sins is thereby attained, we can only say that nothing that Bellarmine himself has written to nullify the results of the one oblation on the Cross, cancels the ninth and tenth chapters of Hebrews more effectually than does this statement. The Apostle declares that the sins of believers are so entirely remitted that there remains no more offering for them. Dr. Goode maintains that they are not *so* remitted, and that there does remain offering for them.

There is not an expression in Scripture that would justify our saying that *we* offer up Christ in any sense whatsoever. We never "offer him," either in our prayers around the Lord's Table, or at any other time. Nor does Christ in His intercession for us offer Himself again. He pleads for His believing people as standing confessedly and for ever, under the value of the one atoning oblation completed on the Cross. If *our* prayers are not offered in conformity with this truth, we pray amiss.

Compare with the statements of Dr. Goode the following words of Calvin: "The cross of Christ is overthrown the moment an altar is erected. For if, on the cross, He offered Himself in sacrifice that He might sanctify us for ever, and purchase eternal redemption for us, undoubtedly the power and efficacy of His sacrifice continues without end. Otherwise, we should not think more honourably of Christ than of the oxen and calves which were sacrificed under the law, the offering of which is proved to have been weak and inefficacious because often repeated. Wherefore, it must be admitted, either that the sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross wanted the power of eternal cleansing, or that He performed this once for ever by His one sacrifice. Accordingly, the Apostle says, "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Again: "By the which ^{will} ~~act~~ we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Again: "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are

sanctified." To this he subjoins the celebrated passage: "Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." The same thing Christ intimated by His latest voice, when, on giving up the ghost, He exclaimed, "It is finished."

Remarks on a Tract entitled “Justification in the Risen Christ.”*

THE doctrine of Justification is the great test, whereby the fidelity both of individuals and of bodies to Christ's Truth must be tried. Wherever that doctrine is maintained in its integrity—that is to say, wherever it is taught in its simplicity, and at the same time, protected against being neutralised by the appendage of other doctrines inconsistent therewith, there will be blessing: wherever it is otherwise, the foundations of our holy faith are undermined.

It has commonly been supposed that they who hold the doctrine of this Tract, differ from the Scripture only in this, that they refuse to the believer the ascription of the *active* righteousness of his Substitute. Now, if this were all, the error would be sufficiently serious.

For in order for our Substitute to constitute us

* The full title is, “Justification in the risen Christ, or the faith which was once delivered to the saints,” by C. S. The first part of this title closely resembles that prefixed by Dr. Newman to one of his celebrated sermons, preached just at the moment when he was finally abandoning Protestantism for Rome. Dr. Newman entitles his sermon, “Christ's resurrection the source of Justification.”

righteous, it was needful, not only that He should bear the appointed penalties, but also that He should render an appointed obedience. It was determined in the councils of eternity before the world was, what our Surety should do, and what He should suffer. To reject therefore His active obedience, seeing that it has been made by God an essential element in His method of justification, is a serious error indeed. The doctrine, however, of the tract before us (thousands of which have of late years been circulated) is chargeable with error on points more important even than this.

On the eleventh page of this tract we find the following passage :

“ I must confess I do not see how God could be righteous in reckoning the breaker of the law righteous, because another kept it ; nor do I see this taught in Scripture. Far from it.” *Tract, page 11.*

Now if it would be unrighteous in God to accept the substitutional service of Another in respect of *obeying* in our stead, it would be equally unrighteous for Him to accept the substitutional service of Another in respect of *bearing penalties* in our stead. The sentiment of this passage is against vicariousness in every form. It supposes the principle of imputation to be an unrighteous principle ; and yet, by imputation, and imputation only, we are justified : for how, except by imputation, could the value of Another's service (whatsoever may be the nature of that service) become ours ?

The great doctrine of the Reformation, for which Luther and the Reformers were willing to jeopardise

their lives, was that Justification was a *forensic* act on the part of God towards the believing sinner—God pronouncing him righteous, not on the ground of any personal change, moral or otherwise, wrought either *in* him or *on* him; but solely on the ground of the ascription to him of the merits of another. “ONLY on account of the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, through faith, not on account of our own works and merits, are we reputed righteous before God.” “Tantum propter meritum Domini et Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo, reputamur.” *Article XI*. “The Evangelical Protestant Church,” says a recent writer, “has always maintained, with an overwhelming weight of Scriptural evidence, that that justification which God effects, of which Christ’s sacrifice is the meritorious ground, and the people of Christ the subjects, is not an infusion of grace effecting a subjective change in moral condition, [nor, it may be added, a *subjective* change of any sort] but a declarative act, pronouncing the believer to be forensically just [on the ground of what Another has done and suffered in his stead] and thus effecting a change of legal relation and not a change of moral character [though a change of moral character follows]. This principle was the precise truth, the distinct and forceful enunciation of which made the great Reformation of the sixteenth century what it was to the men of that and all subsequent generations.” *Hodge on the Atonement, page 197*.

For this principle, the Reformers were ready to die;

but this is that which the Tract before us rejects. It maintains that Justification is the result of our being brought into a condition of "actual righteousness"; so that we are justified, not as ungodly, but *after* we have been made, and *on the ground of* having been made actually righteous in Christ risen.* Thus, on page 4 we read as follows :

" Jesus crucified and Jesus risen was what the Holy Ghost did set before lost sinners : His death for atonement, His resurrection for righteousness or justification. ' Who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification.' (Rom. iv. 25.) Thus whilst His precious blood clears from all sin, His resurrection brings me into a state of absolute righteousness in Him risen, and therefore complete justification. And it is on this positive righteousness for justification that ancient and modern teaching so widely differ." (p. 4.)

Again, on page 6 :

" I am not taken back to Christ under it [the law] for righteousness, but taken forward to Christ in resurrection ; and there I am made the positive righteousness of God in Him, as surely as He was made sin for me. . . . Thus as our fall in the first Adam not only brought condemnation but the actual death-state of sin, much more resurrection in Christ not only brings acquittal from condemnation, but an everlasting state of life and actual righteousness."

* The moment we make the attainment of an actual condition of righteousness *the ground of* justification, it matters little in what way we suppose that state to be attained. The Romanist says it is attained in one way ; the Tract in another. But the Truth is destroyed the moment we detach justification from the Cross. Scripture says, " Justified by His blood," Rom. v. The Tract says, " NOTHING but His resurrection can justify." page 15. What two assertions can be more opposed ?

The writer quotes, but entirely misunderstands the words of the Apostle in Rom. iv. 25. That passage rightly taken entirely destroys the author's system, for it reads thus: "Who was delivered in consequence of our offences, and raised again in consequence of our justification." For the present, however, I pass this point.* I pass over also his reference to Adam's sin. It is evident that he has altogether overlooked the all-important distinction between the imputation of Adam's first sin, which is *the ground of* our condemnation, and the transmitted corruption of our nature which, though the concomitant and consequence, is *not* the ground of our condemnation. "By ONE OFFENCE (see margin) judgment came upon all men to condemnation." Rom. v. 18. For the present, however, I pass this question and confine myself to two points. First, the writer asserts that the vicarious oblation of our great Substitute on the Cross brings only pardon, or "negative justification," as he elsewhere calls it. See page 3. Secondly, he teaches that our justification depends, not on the imputation of the merits of our Substitute, but on our being brought into a state of absolute righteousness in Him risen. His words are very express:

"His [Christ's] resurrection brings me into a state of absolute righteousness in Him risen, and therefore complete justification."

And again:

"I am not taken back to Christ under it [the law] for righteousness, but taken forward to Christ in resurrection, and there I am made the positive righteousness of God in Him."

* See this considered in the following paper.

And again :

“ God cannot justify anything short of righteousness.”

In order to nullify this most extraordinary statement (which, be it remembered, is the key-stone of the doctrinal system of this Tract), we have only to refer to the words of the Apostle in Romans iv. 5. The Scripture says :

God “justifieth the ungodly.”

The Tract says :

“ God cannot justify anything short of righteousness.” page 3.

Now, these two statements cannot both be true, for they are contradictories. The Scripture builds its system of justification on a statement which the writer of the Tract meets by direct contradiction ; and then proceeds to build *his* system of justification on that contradiction. Which then shall we follow—the writer of the Tract, or the Scripture ?

It is, indeed, true that an inward change takes place in the justified. They are quickened in the power of a new life, and are no longer under the *dominance* of indwelling sin, though it still struggles in them. They are also, through the Spirit, united to their risen Head, even Christ, who is their Representative in heaven. Their “life is hid with Him in God.” It is true, also, that they shall finally be raised in His likeness, and be brought into a state of absolute personal righteousness. But none of these things are *the ground* of justification ; they are the *results*. No sound Protestant denies that all believers will be finally brought into a state of absolute

righteousness as the *result* of justification. The question is whether we are justified or accounted righteous before God on the ground of being brought into a state of absolute righteousness, or whether we are justified when *sinners*, solely on the ground of what Another has done and suffered in our room. The Tract before us and Rome teach the former—the Scripture, the latter. The Reformation was the result of coming back to the light of Scripture on this very point.

The writer of the Tract says :

“His [*i.e.* Christ’s] resurrection brings me into a state of absolute righteousness, and THEREFORE complete justification.” page 4.

And again :

“God cannot justify anything short of righteousness.” page 3.

And again :

“God is only righteous in justifying me as a new creature.”

Compare these statements with the passage I have already quoted from Rom. iv., and also with Rom. iii. 24. “All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” The Apostle tells me that justification meets us as those “who have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God :” the Tract tells me that it meets us when brought into a state of absolute righteousness by Christ’s resurrection. The Apostle tells me that it is “*redemption*,”—a work perfected by Christ on earth, and finished on the Cross, that enables God

to justify: the Tract tells me that justification is not the result of the redemption-work of Christ, but that it is the result of His resurrection. "NOTHING," says the Tract, "but His resurrection can justify the believer." page 15. Shall we follow the Tract or Scripture? The paths are widely divergent into which they respectively lead.

There is one other text in Romans v. to which I would briefly refer. "As by the disobedience of one man the many were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of The One shall the many be constituted righteous." "*Constitute righteous*" is a forensic term, just as much as "*justify*." It pertains to Christ *to constitute righteous*: to God *to justify*. God justifies or pronounces righteous those who have been constituted righteous by Christ. It would be correct and scriptural to say that we are constituted righteous by Christ's *righteousness*; and the word "*righteousness*" is used in Rom. v. 18 in an immediately preceding verse, where it is said that by means of "one righteousness" * (*δι' ἑνος δικαιοματος*) we are brought "unto justification of life." But lest any one should say that the righteousness here spoken of is that eternal essential righteousness which pertained to Him as God before He was incarnate, and pertained to Him on earth, and which now and for ever pertains to Him in resurrection, the following verse defines the righteousness which brings us unto justifica-

* Christ's service in life and in death is here regarded as one prolonged, unbroken act of righteousness.

tion of life as being an "*obedience*."* "By the *obedience* of The One shall the many be constituted righteous." Therefore, when we speak of the justifying righteousness of Christ, we mean that obedience which He commenced and finished in the earth. He commenced it when He said, "Lo, I come to do thy will O God:" He completed it when He said upon the Cross, "It is finished." This obedience includes the shedding of His most precious blood; and therefore, the Puritan divines were accustomed to say that the value of the obedience is included in the blood. Now, it is obvious that this obedience by which we are constituted righteous, is something altogether external to ourselves, and consequently, can only become ours by ascription or imputation. None to whom it is not imputed can be saved. Our blessedness is the blessedness of those to whom God imputeth righteousness without works." † Rom. iv. 6. Such is the doctrine of Scripture; but very different is the

* "He (Christ) has, therefore, another righteousness, which standeth in performance or obedience to a revealed will; and that is it that He puts upon sinners, and that by which their sins are covered. Wherefore He saith, 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One, shall many be made righteous.'"—*Bunyan, Pilg. Progress*.

† It is very strange that any should venture to say that the words, "impute righteousness," are not found in Scripture, when they have this text before them. I am aware that an attempt has been made to evade the force of the words, "impute righteousness," by saying, that the Apostle is speaking of faith being "imputed for" righteousness. It is true that in other parts of this chapter, he does speak of this; and when this is his *sole* subject, he avoids the use of the words "impute righteousness,"

doctrine of the Tract. The writer of the Tract illustrates his doctrine thus :

“As I was saying the other day in Leeds, a mill-owner passes a law, that any person proved guilty of stealing a pound of wool, shall be immediately discharged the premises. A young man is proved guilty. The wool is found in his pocket. Now, tell me how the mill-owner can not only spare him, forgive him, but *justify* him? What would you think of such a master? Why you would say that he is as bad as the thief.” page 3.

One greatly shrinks from the language here used; especially when we remember that God has so expressly said that He *does*, not only pardon, but “*justify* the ungodly.” It is His great prerogative to do this; and if He did not do it, none would ever be justified at all. The fact is, that the writer has never apprehended what “justification,” as thus used, means. When we speak

(λογιζεσθαι δικαιοσυνην) and carefully uses the expression, “impute FOR righteousness” (λογιζεσθαι εις δικαιοσυνην). For the force of the expression “impute FOR,” compare Romans ii. 26 : “Shall not his uncircumcision be counted FOR (λογισθησεται εις) circumcision.”

Faith is not in itself righteousness. It has, like a bank-note, only an attributed, not an intrinsic value. But Christ’s “obedience,” by which we are “constituted righteous,” has an intrinsic value, for it answers fully Heaven’s test of perfectness. It, therefore, is the true gold, with which faith is the appointed link of connexion, and whose value it represents. Christ’s “obedience” on my behalf is not, like faith, “imputed” to me “FOR” righteousness: it is imputed to me AS righteousness. It has the value of absolute perfectness.

If a service toward my Sovereign, which I could not myself perform was performed for me by another, and accepted on my behalf, it would have a real value, and be ascribed to me as

of God "justifying the ungodly," the author of the Tract imagines that we represent God as deliberately obliterating the distinctions between right and wrong ; as refusing to recognise evil as evil ; and as ascribing personal innocency to those who have no innocency. But this is just the very thing that God in justifying does *not* do. He fully recognises the personal guilt and ill-desert of those whom He justifies. He declares that they have all sinned and fallen short of His glory, and that they merit eternal death. Yet, in His grace, He has provided a way by which those whose personal deserts are those of sinners, may yet become possessed of a title to be recognised as righteous in His courts ; not on the ground of being personally righteous (it is fully recognised by themselves and by all, that they are personally sinners) but on the ground of the ascription

having a real value. But if a document were given me, to connect me legally with that service, and to entitle me to plead the value of that service as mine by imputation, such a document would have a most important *attributed* value (for it would entitle me to claim the results of the service performed on my behalf) but the *real* value would be found, not in it, but in the service itself.

The subject of the greater part of the fourth of Romans is "faith imputed FOR righteousness:" but the subject of the concluding part of the fifth of Romans is that substitutional obedience of our Surety by which we are "constituted righteous." In order to be saved, it is necessary that faith should be reckoned to us FOR righteousness ; and also, that the value of Christ's obedience should be set down to our account as ours by imputation.

To say that God could have imputed faith "FOR" righteousness, without a full and perfect and real righteousness having been provided in the "obedience" of Christ, is equivalent to saying that He could have saved us without a propitiation.

of Another's righteousness that had been formally and lawfully provided unto that end; so that they who, on the ground of personal desert, could not be recognised as righteous, can, on the ground of the ascription of the value of the service of Another who has obeyed and suffered in their stead, be recognised as righteous by *imputation*. "By the obedience of THE ONE shall many be constituted righteous." Thus God is just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

Does the writer of this Tract really imagine that there is any parallel between the case instanced by him and that of a sinner brought through the Gospel in faith to Jesus? In the case supposed, every principle which should have been recognised is outraged, and remains outraged. The original ordinances of the factory have been broken, and other ordinances—ordinances of grace, such as could meet the need of the guilty, exist not. The factory has no ordinances of grace. It has no Courts in which the repentant sinner is formally authorised to plead the transference to himself of the value of another's righteousness, and another's suffering. It knows of no expiatory victim, which, whilst it meets the appointed stroke of wrath, presents at the same time, its own unblemished perfectness; that so, he who personally merits wrath, might receive, because of the value of the substituted victim, not only pardon, but acceptance—acceptance according to the preciousness of the provided victim. How then can there be any parallel drawn between the methods of God and the methods of man in dealing with sin?

“My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”*

And now, observe further, how the *result* of the great sacrificial work effected on the Cross is, by the writer of this Tract, set aside. He finds it needful to his system (and Dr. Newman does the same thing) to assert, that

* “The Scriptures plainly teach, that all the guilt or obligation to punishment incurred by the sins of His people was imputed or charged to the account of Christ, as the legal ground of the execution upon Him of the penalty involved in the case. Yet, notwithstanding that the *guilt* of all our sins is thus charged to Christ, and expiated in Him, all their blame, shame, pollution, and power, as inherent personal habits or principles, remain all the while inalienably ours. These sins are none the less ours, after their imputation to Him, than they were before. (a) The very force of the imputation is to make Him ‘*alienæ culpæ reus*’—that is, penally responsible for another’s sin. They must remain ours, in order that they may be to Him the sins of another. (b) Because personal moral qualities, and the pollution inherent in sinful ones, are inalienable and cannot be transferred by imputation. (c) Because, as Owen pointed out long ago, to be *alienæ culpæ reus* makes no man a sinner, subjectively considered, unless he did unwisely or irregularly undertake the responsibility. (d) Because our blessed Lord was a Divine Person, and therefore absolutely incapable of personal sin in any sense or degree. While, therefore, He bore our sins, and consequently suffered the penalty involved, and hence was both regarded and treated by the Father, during the time and for the purpose of expiation, as vicariously guilty and worthy of wrath [amenable to wrath would perhaps be a preferable expression], He was all the while, not one iota less personally immaculate and glorious in holiness, and all the more the well-beloved Son of the Father, in whom He was well pleased.”—*Hodge on Atonement*, page 161.

the work of Christ on the Cross brings to the believer *pardon* only. He will not admit that the work of Christ on the Cross supplies to us the ground of our justification. He says on page 4 that "His [Christ's] death was for atonement: His resurrection for righteousness or justification." Now let any one, with the Scripture in his hand, test the statement, that the Cross brings only *pardon*, or "negative justification," as the writer is pleased to call it. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, we read, "sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once." Is the being sanctified, so that we may draw nigh as a "holy priesthood" "perfected for ever" even "into the holiest of all," nothing more than *pardon*? In the Colossians, we read that the Father hath reconciled us "in the body of his [Christ's] flesh through death" to present us "holy and without blemish and uncharged in his sight."* Is the being thus reconciled, and thus presented, nothing more than *pardon*? In the Revelation, we read of the saints in glory, saying, "Thou hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood" &c. Is the being redeemed unto God in glory nothing more than *pardon*? The Scripture knows nothing of what the writer terms "*negative justification*." If righteousness be not reckoned unto us, guilt is. We either stand under the ascription of the one perfect satisfying oblation that Immanuel presented for us on the Cross, or else if we have not that, we are left in unatoned for, unremoved guilt. Wherever there is *pardon* there is also acceptance according to the meri-

* Ἁγίους καὶ ἀμωμους καὶ ἀνεγκλητους κατενωπιον αὐτου.

toriousness of Christ. Nor can atonement be effected by suffering merely. He who was made a curse for us, did also give Himself for us "an offering and sacrifice unto God for a sweet-smelling savour." The burnt-offering was as much required for the effectuation of atonement as the sin-offering. See Lev. xvi. 5: and although part of the sin-offering was burned up (שָׂרַף) without the gate, yet the fat thereof was burned for fragrance (קָטַר) on the altar. He who stands under the ascription of the value of the one finished oblation of Calvary, must be more than pardoned. He is accepted according to the preciousness of that which hath ascended for him into the heavens. Accordingly, we are expressly taught in Scripture that we are not merely pardoned, but "justified by His blood." Rom. v. 9. "Justified," in Scripture, never means anything less than "being accounted righteous." Justification includes pardon: but pardon and justification are not identical, though in the methods of God they are never separated. The Cross, therefore, does by itself supply the ground of complete, full, everlasting justification. The holy blood shed thereon, is at once the token of wrath borne, and of acceptable obedience presented; for "He was obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross." On the Cross He bore the appointed curse; but on the Cross He also "offered up himself spotless to God." By the obedience thus sacrificially consummated, we are not only pardoned, but "constituted righteous." Nor apart from the oblation of a sweet-smelling savour, could there have been atonement.

Atonement could not have been effected by penal suffering merely. To take, therefore, from the work of Jesus on the Cross, that which is absolutely needful to the effectuation of atonement, is a serious error indeed.

Yet the doctrinal system advocated in this Tract requires that we should exclude from the Cross everything that had the character of a sweet-smelling savour; and that we should regard it as the place of judgment and penal death *merely*. The Law is recognised as there inflicting its curse; but the thought of the Law as being *also* glorified by the perfected obedience of the Holy One presented in death, is carefully excluded. It is impossible to assail with effect the doctrine of imputed righteousness, if the true doctrine respecting the acceptableness of the one oblation offered on the Cross be duly maintained. Moreover, when it is falsely assumed that we are justified on the ground of being brought "into an actual state of righteousness," it becomes necessary, in order to maintain the correspondency, to say that Christ when the sin-bearer, was brought into an actual condition of sin, or as some have expressed it, into the actual condition of the sinner. In that case, there could, of course, have been no offering of a sweet-smelling savour. The writer speaks of our "being made the positive righteousness of God in Him [Christ] as surely as He was made sin for us."

Now it is quite true that there is a correspondency between the condition of Christ as the Sin-bearer, and our condition as the justified; but the correspondency is this: He, whilst *personally recognised as righteous*, had

attributed unto Him our guilt, and received the award appointed because thereof: we, whilst *personally recognised as guilty*, have ascribed unto us the value of His obedience, and receive the award appointed because thereof. There was, by imputation, the transference to Him of *our* guilt; and therefore, He was smitten: there is, by imputation, the transference to us of His righteousness; and therefore, we are pronounced righteous. But in order that He might be smitten, He was not brought into our actual condition of sin; neither are we, *in order that we might be justified*, brought into His state of absolute righteousness. When He was the Sin-bearer, His *personal* condition was recognised as being one of righteousness: when we are justified, our *personal* condition is recognised as being one of guilt.

Moreover, the Tract further says, that "in Him our dying Substitute, the life once forfeited by us has been given up." page 6. Now, what do these words imply? I read in Scripture, that the Son of God was pleased to assume humanity, sinless, pure, holy humanity; but I do not read of His assuming *our forfeited life*; for, in that case, He would have assumed a life to which sin attached. Does the author indeed mean that the Lord assumed the guilty life once forfeited by us; and that by giving it up, He freed us? As this is the doctrine taught by other writers of the school to which he belongs, I suppose that this must be his meaning. Thus Mr. Mackintosh in his work on Genesis writes:

"Now He gave up His life on the Cross; and to that life, sin was, by imputation, attached, when the blessed One was nailed to

the cursed tree. Hence, in giving up His life, He gave up, also, the sin attached thereto, so that it is effectually put away, having been left in His grave from which He rose triumphant, in the power of a new life, to which righteousness as distinctly attaches itself as did sin to that life which He gave up on the Cross.”—*Notes on Genesis*, p. 64.

In this passage a contrast is drawn between the life which our Lord laid down, and that which He resumed in resurrection; and of the latter, it is said, that to it, “righteousness as distinctly attaches itself, as did sin to that life which he gave up on the Cross.”

It is indeed most true that righteousness attaches itself to the life which He resumed in resurrection and now hath in glory. But did not righteousness equally attach to the life that He had on earth and laid down on the Cross? Christ had life as God. He was essentially “the Living One”—the “I AM.” He had also life as man. And to the life that He took when He became man righteousness attached as necessarily and unchangeably as to the life that He had as God. The life which the Lord Jesus had as man was as pure and holy as that which He had as God. It was a part of His sacred Person. Righteousness attaches to it now, and righteousness equally attached to it when He hung on the accursed tree.

It is not true—on the contrary it is utterly untrue to say, that He took “a new life,” or another life when He arose from the grave. The Lord’s own words are express, “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life (*ψυχην*, *the life that He had as man*) that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me,

but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." John x. 17. It is therefore utterly untrue that He took "a new life." He took *the same life in new circumstances*. He rose with the same body in which He suffered. "Having," says the Confession of the Church of Scotland, "the very same body in which He suffered, with the *essential* properties thereof (but without mortality and other common infirmities belonging to the life) really united to His soul, He rose again from the dead the third day by His own power." The life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) which the Lord had as man (and it is of this that the passage just quoted from John speaks) is an *essential* part of His humanity. To say therefore that He laid down that life and took another or "new life," is *virtually* to say that He laid down the humanity which He had whilst serving here, and took another humanity. But the statement goes even beyond this. Mr. Mackintosh affirms not only that Christ took in resurrection a new life, but he says likewise that sin attached to the life that He laid down just as righteousness attaches to the life that He now has. Now if this were so, if righteousness did not attach to the life that He laid down on the Cross as truly as it now attaches to the life that He has in glory, there could have been no substitution—no atonement. In substitution it was needful that the unblemished condition of the substituted victim should be recognised throughout. Its life was given up not because it was tainted. On the contrary it was given

up as a life to which avowedly purity attached, in contradistinction to the life of those in whose stead it suffered—to whose life impurity attached. Moreover, as I have already said, there could be no atonement without “the offering of a sacrifice of sweet-smelling savour.” This Christ presented when He offered up Himself. But He could not have done this, if sin in any sense attached to the life that He laid down. The life that He laid down and which He took again, was essentially pure and holy, and was so recognised by God. Christ, when He offered up Himself, presented it in all the power of its recognised purity unto God; at the same time bearing the judgment due to our defiled nature and to all our guilt, and thus atonement was made. This is something very different from having a life to which sin attached, and freeing us and Himself from it by laying it down and not taking it again. The Scripture knows nothing of such salvation; nor could salvation by such means be brought to any.*

* Sin did not and could not, in any way whatsoever, attach either to the life which Christ had as God (which life is denoted by ζωη in that high and Divine sense in which we speak of Christ as ο ζων—the Living One—the Ι ΔΝ): nor did it attach to the life which He had as man and laid down on the Cross (which life is denoted by ψυχη, or by ζωη in that second sense in which we use it of men) nor did it attach to the course, condition, or circumstances of the life that He lived on earth (which is expressed by βιος). It is true, indeed, seeing that He came to make SATISFACTION for His people’s sin, certain penal consequences of sin, attached to the condition in which He lived here; but *such* consequences of sin were not sin. They were consequences vicariously borne by a Sinless One instead of the guilty. Though His people’s

We cannot wonder that false views respecting the Cross should lead to false views respecting the condition of the justified. I have already referred to the extraordinary statement of the writer on page 3:

“God cannot justify anything short of righteousness.”

Again, on page 11 we find him saying:

“And now though He [God] could not be righteous in any way
“in justifying my old man, yet He is everlastingly gloriously
“righteous in justifying me as a new creature in Christ risen
“from the dead.”

And again, page 12:

“My old self could not be justified: my new self in Christ
“cannot be condemned.”

And again on the same page:

“It is on this blessed principle of resurrection I am justified
“and have a justified life.”

Here then we again find added evidence that the writer has never even apprehended God's method of justification as revealed in Scripture: or if he has apprehended it, that he has apprehended only to reject.

guilt was imputed to Him, and because of that imputed guilt penalties were exacted, yet righteousness was regarded throughout, as attaching inseparably to His ζωη, ψυχη, and βιος. The inseparable attachment of righteousness to Him in the integrity of His personal condition was not affected by the imputed guilt or by the penalties. To say that because He entered on a different condition of life (βιος) at His resurrection, He did not take again the very life (ψυχη) that He laid down is a serious error indeed. To be accepted as One meet to bear substitutionally the imputed guilt of others, implies the recognition of personal perfectness in the Person so accepted.

His statements are most strange. He objects to the thought of our "old man" being justified. And well he may. But who ever thought of our "old man" being justified? It is an absurdity. No one ever imagined it. It would be the justification of sin. We in whom sin is may be justified, but sin cannot. Nor does the Scripture ever speak of the justification either of our "old man," or of our "new." It never speaks of a "justified life," or of a justified *nature*. It speaks of justified PERSONS. Peter and Paul were *persons*; and as *persons*, they were justified as soon as they believed. But though the sin that was in them was not justified, *they were justified whilst sin was in them*. If sin had not been in Paul, a messenger of Satan would not have been sent to buffet him, "lest he should be exalted above measure." The fact that a messenger of Satan was thus sent, was an evidence, not only that Paul was justified while sin was yet in him, but it also proved that the continued working of that sin was so *recognised* by God, that His course of action towards Paul was founded on the recognition. God did not say, I know Paul only as to that which he is in the new man, and regard not any longer that which he is in the old. On the contrary, God appointed that he should be buffeted with reference to that which he was in the old. Whenever God disciplines and chastens His people, it is an evidence that He recognises in them the existence of the old man. The very fact of these chastenings proves that God has not justified His people on the ground of their being brought into an absolute condition of righteousness;

and that while He does recognise what they are *representatively* in Christ above, He also recognises what they are *practically* in relation to good, and in relation to evil below.

The writer, however, seems to think that our old man was so buried with Christ, that our relation to it may be regarded as having absolutely ceased. His words are :

“As to sin [observe he does not say, as to the non-imputation of sin]—as to sin, righteousness, and life, he [the believer] is in Christ exactly what he will be when the day of the redemption of the body has actually taken place.” page 10.

In another place he speaks of believers as being now the “children of the resurrection,” a description which the Lord expressly confines to that future condition of glory when we shall be, as respects all earthly association, like the angels in heaven. “They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage : neither can they die any more : for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.” Luke xx. 35. “Children of the resurrection,” therefore, is a title which we could not now apply to ourselves, except we were to say with Hymenæus and Philetus, “that the resurrection was passed already.”

Now I by no means accuse the author of this Tract of holding the heresy of Hymenæus and Philetus ; yet, certainly, he approximates one of the results of their doctrine, when he affirms that “as to sin he [the believer] is in Christ exactly what he will be when the

day of redemption of the body has actually taken place." It is true, indeed, that from the condemnation and wrath due to our sin as well as from the *dominance* thereof, grace has completely freed us. It is true, also, that *representatively* we are in heaven, for Christ is our risen head and Representative there. In the judicial estimate of God we are as Christ "is." But are we, because of this, to forget that we have also a personal practical existence on the earth, distinct from, and contrasted with our representative condition above? Whilst we are militant on earth, our relation to sin in us and around us never will be, or can be the same as it shall be when we awake in the likeness of our risen Lord. God does not regard it as the same. The time is not yet come for us to be brought to those living fountains of waters where God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes. Rev. vii.17. We have still to watch and to fight against sin in us as well as around us. Gal. v. 17. It is an utter mistake to say that God views us, either as respects sin or holiness, or life, as being in Christ *exactly* what we shall be when the day of the redemption of the body has actually taken place: for He views us at present as those whose life is "*hidden with Christ*" in Himself (see Col. iii. 3), whereas when Christ returns, it will be no longer hidden but manifested, so that we shall be like Him and see Him as He is. We shall still be in Christ and be viewed by God as being in Him, but having relations as respects sin, righteousness and life altogether new.

It is very evident that thoughts like these confound that line of distinction which the Scripture draws

between our *representative* condition in Christ and our *personal* condition here. The writer seems to think that the relations to God and to sin which believers will finally hold in resurrection, are the only relations that God *recognises* as held by them now. He imagines that all other relations, however actual and subsisting, are by God ignored, and that faith ought to ignore them likewise. Our present personality, according to this view, does not include our "old man:" that is regarded as absolutely gone, and our personality is found only in that which we are as "new." Hence he speaks of God's justifying us as new creatures. His doctrine on justification requires that he should assert all this; for if he allowed that God in any way *recognised* the presence of the old man in us when we are justified, then he could no longer maintain that we are justified on the ground of being brought into a state of absolute righteousness. He must, in that case, consent to say with the Scripture that God "justifieth the ungodly." That God does recognise the continued presence of the old man in the justified, is, as I have already said, proved by His warnings, and rebukes, and chastisements, as also by our own daily experiences. The personal names Peter, Paul, John, applied by God to His justified servants, indicate persons in whom the old man and the new co-exist. We should not be commanded to resist or to mortify that which had ceased to exist: nor should we need to confess, or to ask forgiveness; nor should we require the intercession of our Priest and Advocate. The old man is recognised quite as much

as the new, as forming a part of the personality of those whom He justifies. He justifies them, not on the ground of being brought into an actual condition of righteousness, nor on the ground of their being in Christ *as to sin* exactly what they will be when the day of the redemption of the body has actually taken place: but He justifies them, simply and only on the ground of their having been constituted righteous by the obedience of Another. "By the obedience of **THE ONE** shall the many be constituted righteous."

It would be well if the Christians of England would consider the lesson taught by the history of Protestantism in Germany. There, at the commencement of the present century, many finding themselves surrounded by a worldly, lifeless orthodoxy, and desiring a better way, sought it, not by setting themselves against the misuse of God's truths and against the *persons* who misused or corrupted them, but by setting themselves against *the truths themselves*. Without being themselves infidels, they assisted (in some cases, no doubt, unintentionally) the philosophic sceptics of Germany in their attack on the doctrines of the Reformation. Jesuits were sent from Rome to assist in the assault, but were instructed not openly to attack Protestantism, but to direct their chief efforts to the encouragement of mysticism, and such other forms of religious speculation as would undermine true Pauline doctrine. If the doctrines taught in the Epistles to the Romans, and Galatians, and Hebrews, be obscured by mysticism, or otherwise, so as to be no longer apprehended in their

true significance, the work of Rome is done. Accordingly, Neologians and disguised Romanists, and some of whom it may be hoped that they truly feared God, united (though with different motives and by different methods) in assailing the great fortresses of our faith. The doctrine of Justification, as taught in the great Protestant Confessions, was an especial object of their enmity. How well their efforts succeeded, the present condition of Germany too truly attests.

The same thing is taking place amongst ourselves. Many a Romanist and many a Neologian would read the Tract before us and rejoice: whilst they who love and cleave to the Truth revealed by the Apostles of our God and Saviour, weep.

Romans IV. 25, considered in connexion with the preceding Paper.

“Who was delivered because of our offences, and raised again
because of our justification.”

ALTHOUGH in the preceding paper enough, I trust, has been said to show that the doctrine of those who seek to detach Justification from the Cross, is at utter variance with the teaching of Holy Scripture, yet, as there are some texts to which the advocates of this system appeal, it may be desirable to consider what the meaning of those texts really is.

The passage which they most frequently cite is the concluding verse of Romans iv. “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.”

This verse, rightly understood, is of itself sufficient to destroy the system which it is quoted to sustain. What the Apostle states is, that our Surety was raised, not *in order to effect* our justification, but as a consequence of our justification *having been effected*. He was delivered “because of,” or in consequence of our offences (*δια τα παραπτώματα ἡμῶν*), and was raised again because of, or in consequence of our justification (*δια την δικαιοσιν*

ἡμῶν). Such is the force of the proposition *δια* as here used. When the Apostle states that the Lord Jesus was “delivered *for* our offences,” no one imagines that He was delivered in order to produce our offences. Our offences existed: and He was delivered because of, or in consequence of their existence; in order that they might, by His expiatory offering, be removed. The meaning that *δια* bears in the first clause of this verse, it bears also in the second. “As,” says Bishop Horsley, “the death of Christ had no tendency to produce those offences for which He was delivered, but on the contrary, our offences were the reason of His humiliation (and it were unreasonable to suppose that similar expressions should be used in opposite senses in different parts of the same sentence) our justification for which Christ rose, must be something, which, in the order of things, led to the Redeemer’s resurrection. The original words are without ambiguity, and clearly represent our Lord’s resurrection as an event which took place in consequence of man’s [believing man’s] justification in the same manner as His death took place in consequence of man’s sins.” *Bishop Horsley’s Sermons on Resurrection of Christ*, p. 262. “Christ’s resurrection,” says Dr. Gill, “did not procure the justification of His people; that was done by His obedience and death; but was for the testification of it, that it might fully appear that sin was atoned for, and an everlasting righteousness was brought in.” *Gill in locum*.

Our translators continually use “*for*,” in the sense of, “because of;” and very naturally, seeing that this is a

meaning it frequently bears, especially in older English. In the enumeration of the various meanings of "for," as given by Johnson, this is the first; and he gives no less than twenty-eight examples of its use in this sense. One is from Hooker, who virtually quotes the Prayer Book: "that which we *for* our unworthiness [*i.e.* in consequence of our unworthiness] are afraid to crave, our prayer is that God *for* [in consequence of] the worthiness of His Son, would notwithstanding vouchsafe to grant." *Hooker*. See also the eleventh of our English Articles: "We are accounted righteous before God, only *FOR* the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not *FOR* our own works and deservings." In this sense, it is frequently employed in our version of the Scriptures, as in Matt. xxvii. 18. "He knew that *for* envy (*δια φθονου*) they had delivered Him:" and John xvi. 21. "She remembereth no more the anguish *for* joy." Also Acts xxi. ³⁵. "He was borne of the soldiers *for the violence* (*δια την βιαν*) of the people." *

* The normal use of *δια* with the accusative in the New Testament, is to mark the word with which it is connected as denoting the antecedent cause or reason of the result spoken of. The word which *δια* governs in the accusative, indicates something that is regarded as already in existence—such existence supplying the ground or motive of the action. "*Δια* with the accusative," says Winer, "specially indicates the ground (ratio) *not* the aim; and signifies *on account of*; or when the motive of an action is meant, *out of, from*, as Matt. xxvii. 18; *δια φθονου*, out of envy, or from envy." Winer, § 49. So also *Donaldson*. "With the accusative, *δια* signifies *on account of*."

Δια with the accusative is used more than 250 times in the New Testament, but I know of no instance in which it is used to denote

As, therefore, our Surety was delivered in consequence of our offences, so He was raised again in consequence of our justification. The Father reconciled us (*not* by any thing that Christ is, or has done, in His resurrection body but) “in the body of His flesh through death, to present us holy, and unblemished, and uncharged (*ἀγίους και αμωμους και ανεγκλητους*) in his sight.” Col. i. 22. It was appointed in the councils of eternity before the world was, what the great Surety should do and suffer, in order to “constitute” righteous God’s believing people. As soon as He had completed in death the oblation of Himself as the one Sacrifice, they were “constituted

agency employed to effect the attainment of a proposed end : nor have I seen any satisfactory example of its being so used in any *classical* writer, though in Patristic Greek some examples in which it *seems* to bear such a meaning may be found. When future things are viewed according to the fixity of the Divine purpose, and therefore regarded as existent, *δια* in such cases, retains its normal meaning, and expresses a result from something *regarded* as being existent, though not actually existent.

Dr. Jelf, indeed, whilst giving numerous instances of the use of *δια* with accusative to denote the antecedent cause (in consequence of) thinks that it sometimes denotes also the final cause. In support of this thought he quotes three, and only three passages—all from Thucydides. If, however, he had examined these passages a little more closely, he would have found that in all of them *δια* is used in its normal sense to denote the antecedent cause. The first of the passages cited by Dr. Jelf is Thucydides iv. 102, *Δια το περιεχειν αυτην*, which means that *in consequence of* the river (Strymon) surrounding the city (Amphipolis) on certain sides, all that Agnon found it needful to do in order to enclose the city, was to build a wall to complete the encompassment. *Δια το περιεχειν* does not refer to any thing that Agnon did *in order to surround* the city, but rather to that which Agnon did *not*

righteous." The moment God accepted that Sacrifice (and He did accept it as soon as it had been offered), He *recognised* all who were "of faith" as constituted righteous, and such recognition was their justification on the part of God. The resurrection of the Surety was the manifested evidence of this recognition. It was the proof of the justification. God, in raising up our Surety, "did *actually* absolve and apparently acquit Him from the whole obligation to which He had bound Himself, and in discharging Him, acknowledged full satisfaction made for us." *Bishop Pearson, Art. V.* The resurrection of the Surety was neither the satisfaction,

do, *in consequence* of the fact that the Strymon did on the other sides already surround the city. The Greek Scholiast gives this interpretation. Quoting the words *δια το περιεχειν αυτην* the Scholiast adds, *τον Στρυμωνα.*

The next instance, *δι' ακθηδονα*, is cited from a passage in Thucyd. iv. 40, in which it is stated that one of the allies of the Athenians *in consequence of being vexed* (*δι' ακθηδονα*) at the ill-success of the Lacedæmonians, asked one of the Lacedæmonian captives a taunting question. This also is noted by the Greek Scholiast, who after quoting the words *δι' ακθηδονα*, adds,—*δια λυπην*—*from sorrow or vexation.* The Scholiast then proceeds to explain the passage thus: "The meaning is—One of the allies of the Athenians being annoyed by the oppressive government of the Athenians, or else vexed at the disaster that had befallen the Lacedæmonians, put the question referred to." *Ἡ διανοια. Αθηναιων συμμαχος τις ακθομενος, ητοι τοις Αθηναιοις ως φορτικως αρχουσιν, η ακθομενος επι τη των Δακεδαιμονιων συμφορα ηρετο, &c.*

The third instance is from Thucydides v. 53. *Δια του θυματος την εισπραξιν*, which means that the Argives made an incursion into the territory of the Epidaurians *in consequence of undertaking the exaction* (*δια την εισπραξιν*) of a certain tributary sacrifice which the latter had neglected to send.

nor the acceptance of the satisfaction, but the manifested evidence of the acceptance thereof.

This verse, therefore, rightly interpreted, distinctly negatives the views of those who would sever Justification from the work finished by the Lord Jesus on the Cross.

Another passage not unfrequently quoted is 1 Cor. xv. 17. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins." This text is supposed to teach that the removal of our sins was effected by the resurrection of our Lord. But it does *not* teach this. If the context be examined, it will be found that the Apostle maintains, that if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; and if Christ has not been raised, all the testimony of the Apostles must be false; inasmuch as they, in testifying to His death as bringing redemption, did also testify to His resurrection as a certain and necessary consequence of His redeeming death. If therefore, they had spoken falsely as to this, all the rest of their testimony would be invalidated. They would be convicted of being false witnesses, "because we testified against God (*κατα Θεου*) that He raised up Christ, whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead are not raised." (verse 15) If the Apostles could thus be convicted of falsehood, all their testimony to the great fact of the atonement must be rejected, and therefore we should be yet in our sins. Such is the statement in this passage; but it is not taught that the work finished on the Cross was an insufficient ground of justification. It is indeed quite

true that in order to effect *the consequences* of justification, and to bring the redeemed into their appointed sphere of life and glory, the resurrection and glorification of their Surety was needful. Our salvation when wrought out into all its developed results will be one of glory above the Heavens. His resurrection, His ascension in glory, His Priesthood, His Advocacy, and all that He is for us above the Heavens, are needful to bring us to the appointed end of salvation. But whatever the bestowments of Divine grace on the redeemed, they are all *the consequents* of the work completed by our Substitute on the Cross. The *title* to all these resulting blessings is found in the meritoriousness attaching to those who stand under the imputation of the value of the one oblation there presented. We do not despise or depreciate the vast resulting blessings because we magnify that work which alone gives us our title thereunto.

There is also another text to which the advocates of this system frequently appeal. It is Romans iii. 21. "But now the righteousness of God without, or apart from (*χωρίς*) the Law is manifested &c." They refer to these words as affording demonstrative evidence that our Substitute could not have kept the Law for us: because, say they, we could not in that case be said to be justified "apart from the Law."

Now it is obvious that on this principle our Surety would have been precluded from holding for us any relation whatsoever to the Law. If obedience to the Law by the Lord Jesus as our Surety, is precluded by

Romans iii.21, then His being "made under the Law" (Gal. iv. 4) and His bearing "the curse of the Law" (Gal. iii. 13) must be equally forbidden by it. To have been "made under the Law," and to have borne its curse, must have certainly brought our Surety into a relation to the Law, as distinct as did His obedience unto it for our sakes. If all relation to the Law be forbidden in Romans iii.21 to our Surety, then He could not have borne its penalties, any more than fulfilled its righteousness. In a word, there could have been no Suretyship, and therefore no salvation; for the Scripture knows of no salvation apart from the claims of God's Law having been substitutionally met, both in respect of penalties borne and obedience rendered.

In Romans iv. 5, we read of the blessedness of the man to whom "the Lord imputeth righteousness without (or apart from) works." (*χωρίς έργων*) Suppose we were to treat this verse in the same way that Rom. iii.21 has been treated. We should then have to say that our Surety was, by this verse, precluded from DOING any thing whatsoever on our behalf. He could not have said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God," because such DOING (having for its object our sanctification by the offering of His body once) would, according to this theory, be incompatible with the truth that we are saved "apart from works." He could not have given Himself for us "an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour," because such giving Himself would have been a work on His part; and in that case it could not be said of us that we are justified "apart

from works." Such a statement false and foolish as it is, is not more so than that founded on the words, "without the Law" in Romans iii.21. Those words refer to us *the saved*, not to Christ the Saviour. They refer solely and exclusively to the great and blessed fact, that justifying righteousness is brought to us apart from our *personal* obedience to God's holy Law, seeing that such obedience, we have it not in our power to render. If expressions which are necessarily restricted to us in the helplessness of our sin, are so perverted by us as to be made to include our Substitute in the strength of His holiness, we shall soon find our light turned into darkness. Must it not be so, if we cannot distinguish between the place and service of our Substitute, and our own place as sinners?

In the Scripture we find these words, "By the obedience of The One shall the many be constituted righteous." Romans v. 19. We also read that Christ was "made under the Law." Galatians iv. 4. Are we to suppose that He who was "made under the Law," did not obey the Law? Or, are we to say that He did indeed obey the Law, but that nevertheless His obedience to the Law, *because it was obedience to the Law*, is to be excluded from that obedience whereby we are constituted righteous? Why is obedience to the Law to be thus depreciated and degraded? Is not the Law "holy, just and good?"

The Lord Jesus did not despise the Law. The words in which He announces His mission in the earth are, "Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of

me, I delight to do thy will, O my God : yea, THY LAW is within my heart." Ps. xl. 8. Thus, in describing His own heavenly perfectness, His own delight in doing the will of God, He sums up all by saying, " Yea, THY LAW is within my heart." What can magnify the Law more than this? See also how He speaks of the Law in His own teaching: " Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets : I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled." Matt. v. 17. And again, " It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the Law to fail." Luke xvi. 17. I suppose no one will say that any one could perfectly fulfil the Law save the Lord Jesus. Is then such fulfilment to be excluded from that obedience whereby we are constituted righteous? It must be, if this novel interpretation of Romans iii. 21 be adopted. Does obedience lose its acceptableness because it is obedience to the Law? The great prohibitory commandment of the Law is, " Thou shalt not be concupiscent," *i.e.* thou shalt not have a desire, or a tendency towards any thing that is not good : could any one save the Holy One meet the claim of such a commandment as this? Observance of it implies the perfectness of Heaven. Again the great mandatory precept is : " Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." Mark xii. 30. No obedience which the Holy One rendered on earth, no obedience that shall ever be rendered in Heaven, can

exceed the scope of this commandment. Ability to fulfil it implies the possession of absolute perfectness. Even the great final act of our Lord's obédience in dying (for He was "obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross") is included within the scope of a commandment like this, inculcating, as it does, unreserved devotedness to the will of God. The Eternal Son, being co-equal with the Father and the Holy Ghost, acted under no constraint in taking upon Himself the form of a servant and being "made under the Law." His subjection was voluntary throughout, and therefore meritorious. But having voluntarily taken this place, He voluntarily undertook, as the Surety of His people, to fulfil all that was appointed to be fulfilled: and hence His relation to the Law. Was it a relation unworthy of the Lord? Was it unworthy of Him to become man and to place Himself under the Law that He might fulfil it for His people and prove that He loved God perfectly by accomplishing perfectly His will? Or shall we say that, abstractedly, it would not have been unworthy of Him; but that *it* became unworthy because that commandment having been given to Israel at Sinai, became thereby *Jewish* and earthy? Was it then unworthy of the Lord to become according to the flesh a Jew? Is that which He did and suffered as "made under the Law," something unworthy of the Church's high dignity? Is the salvation of the Church independent of His being "made under the Law," and of His obeying the Law, and of His dying under its curse? Is there one way of salvation for Abraham and David, and those who have

believed and shall believe in Israel, and another way and end of salvation for those who are supposed to be the Church? This I am aware, is becoming the faith of thousands. It may be Marcionism:* but it is not the doctrine of the Apostles of our God and Saviour. "It is a different gospel, which is not another." Christ is one, and His work is one, and all His redeemed will finally be one. They alike need, and will alike share the benefit of all that He did, all that He suffered, and all that He is. They will alike say, "Out of His fulness have all we received." They will alike "be filled to the full (*πεπληρωμενοι*) in Him."

* See the doctrines of Marcion considered in "Thoughts on Isaiah" page 187, as advertised at the end of this volume.

On Isaiah LIII.

THERE are few chapters to which the heart, when conscious of the sin within it and the sin around it, more instinctively turns for comfort than to the fifty-third of Isaiah. It is a chapter that should peculiarly abide in our remembrance. No plainer, no more simple attestation to the vicarious obedience and vicarious suffering of our holy Substitute is any where given. "By acquaintance with himself shall the Righteous One, my Servant bring [or cause] righteousness unto the many, and He shall bear their iniquities,"—words few and simple, but words of salvation to them that believe. The Righteous Servant of Jehovah is at once the bringer to us of righteousness, and the taker away of our guilt. The Spirit of God sent Philip to explain this chapter to the eunuch in the wilderness : he heard, believed, and went on his way rejoicing. So shall it be with the feeblest who truly cast themselves on Jesus as testified of in this chapter. There are, indeed, many now who spurn its testimony. They talk of Jeremiah, or of a righteous remnant in Israel being the lamb of whom the Prophet speaks ; but they reject the true Lamb, and trample under foot the blood of the covenant. Better had it been for such that they had never been born. For

them, unless they repent and turn to the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness in the blood of Jesus, there surely remains that "fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries."

In reading the fifty-third of Isaiah, we must not dissociate it from the two chapters which precede; for it forms their sequel. The subject of the preceding chapters is, the woe, and after the woe, the blessing and the glory reserved for Israel and Jerusalem in the latter days. A time of evil and calamity and woe await Israel, deeper and more terrible far than any they have yet known; and until that is passed, the long promised period of their blessing cannot come. The morning of Israel's millennial joy is to spring out of a night of blackest darkness. A time of tribulation is to come on them "such as never was from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be." Mark xiii. 19. "Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it." Jeremiah xxx. 7. The iniquity they will manifest when, *in unbelief*, they re-gather themselves to their own land, will be sevenfold greater than any they have yet exhibited; and sevenfold shall be their chastisement. Antichristianism will find in Israel one of the chief spheres of its development. Yet, seeing they are beloved for the fathers' sake, a remnant shall be spared amongst them—a remnant that shall be made "a strong nation," through whom righteousness and praise shall "spring forth before all the nations." In the midst of the calamities of Israel, the

hearts of this remnant shall be softened—they shall remember the God of their fathers—they shall turn to Him from whom the children of Israel have deeply revolted, and shall say (grace shall put the cry into their lips), “Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord: awake, as in the ancient days, in the generations of old. Art thou not it that hath cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon? Art thou not it which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over?” Is. li. 9. The appeal will not be in vain. It shall reach an ear ready to hear. The Lord will awake “as one out of sleep, as a mighty man refreshed by reason of wine,” and He will call on *them* also to awake—to awake to the dawning light of the long hoped for morning. “Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury: Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: shake thyself from the dust; arise, and sit down, O Jerusalem: loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion.” Is. li. 17, and lii. 1. Yet see the depths of affliction out of which she shall be called. “These two things are come unto thee; who shall be sorry for thee? desolation, and destruction, and the famine, and the sword: by whom shall I comfort thee? Thy sons have fainted, they lie at the head of all the streets, as a wild bull in a net: they are full of the fury of the Lord, the rebuke of thy God.” Such is the abyss of pollution and of misery out

of which Jerusalem shall awaken unto the morning of her millennial glory. As was her defilement, so shall be her cleanness: as was her shame, so shall be her honour. She shall arise in priestly garments, pure and holy: and the testimony of grace shall go forth from her as a lamp that burneth. Nor shall it be a testimony any longer scorned. No longer shall they who bear it be deemed "the filth of the world; the off-scouring of all things." On the contrary, the feet of them that preach it (and they shall be many) shall be welcomed, and had in honour. They shall be counted beautiful. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace: that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!" It had been said of her in the day of her desolation, "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth; neither is there any that taketh her by the hand of all the sons that she hath brought up." All is widowhood, bereavement, abandonment and desolation. But in a moment the scene changes. There is one hidden in the heavens who is the Son of David, and the King of Israel. Suddenly He shall rend the heavens and come down. Israel shall find that they are not childless. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the Throne of David, and upon his kingdom,

to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever." Is. ix. 6. He it is who is the root and the meritorious cause of all the blessing that has been or that shall be given. As such He will be manifested; as such Israel and all nations are, in the concluding verses of the fifty-second chapter, called on to behold Him. "BEHOLD my servant shall cause [men] to understand, he shall be exalted and be extolled, and be high exceedingly." The chief words by which the Hebrew tongue is accustomed to express *exaltation* are here employed unitedly; and to them, taken in the combined force of their respective meanings, is appended the emphatic word "*exceedingly*." "He shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God for now shall He be great unto the ends of the earth." His humiliation was great, but great also and everlasting shall be His glory. "According as many marvelled at thee (so marred more than any man was his look, and his form more than the sons of men) so shall he sprinkle many nations: at him kings shall shut their mouths, because that which had not been told them they have seen, and that which they had not heard they have considered." As men once in ignorant and stupid wonder, gazed at His marred and stricken form, and were offended at Him, so in the coming day of His manifested glory, nations shall seek to Him for cleansing through the atoning efficacy of those very sufferings, because of which He had been despised. He shall sprinkle with His sanctifying blood, not individuals merely, but *nations*.

“So shall He sprinkle *many nations*.” The parenthetic clause—“so marred more than any man was His look” &c., gives the reason why He was marvelled at and loathed. The wasting effects of anguish had stamped on His humanity an aspect that pertained to none other amongst men. As amongst the glorified He shall be distinct in pre-eminence of glory, so amongst the sufferers of earth He was isolated in pre-eminence of suffering. The word translated “to marvel or be astonished,” (אֲמַשׁ) denotes the ignorant stolid gaze of those whose hearts are so devoid of right intelligence, as to be incapable of estimating any thing aright. The ordinary meaning of the word is “to be desolate;” and it is in this sense, in Lamentations and elsewhere, continually applied to the condition of Israel in the latter day, when they shall be brought under the power of the last great Desolator (אֲמַשׁ), and be made desolate because of their iniquities. The outward condition of Israel *then*, will fitly exemplify what their hearts morally were, when they gazed in stupid astonishment on the stricken form of their Messiah. God saw in them *inward desolation*. Their souls were a moral *waste*—utterly contrasted with their condition in that coming hour when their soul shall be “as a watered garden”—when they shall look on Him whom they once despised, and say, “Thou art fairer than the children of men; grace is poured into thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.” Ps. xlv. Many nations, like so many Naamans, owning their moral leprosy, shall gather themselves to the great Melchisedek of Israel—the Priest of the most High

God, and He shall sprinkle them, and they shall be clean. "Kings shall see and arise: princes also shall worship." They shall stand before Him mute with reverential awe to receive instruction from His lips—"to hear things kept secret from the foundation of the world." Job, when he drew the picture of the condition that had once been his, little knew that he had (feebly indeed, and imperfectly) foreshadowed a relation in which a greater than he, even God His redeemer, would Himself assume towards the sons of men. "The young men saw me, and hid themselves: and the aged arose, and stood up. The princes refrained talking, and laid their hand on their mouth. The nobles held their peace, and their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth. When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me: because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me: and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness, and it clothed me: and my judgment was as a robe and a diadem. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor: and the cause which I knew not I searched out. And I brake the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil out of his mouth. . . . Unto me men gave ear, and waited, and kept silence at my counsel. After my words they spake not again; and my speech dropped upon them. And they waited for me as for the rain: and they opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain. If

I laughed on them, they believed it not; and the light of my countenance they cast not down. I chose out their way, and sat chief, and dwelt as a king in the army, as one that comforteth the mourners." Job xxix.

Such is the picture drawn by Job of himself when unconsciously foreshadowing Another. It is a partial and imperfect picture of course, as every typical foreshadowment of Him in whom all fulness dwells, must be: but it throws an added light, clear and precious, on that coming hour when the Servant of Jehovah shall in this earth, which has hitherto despised Him, "be extolled, and exalted and high exceedingly;" when he shall "break the jaws of the wicked and pluck the spoil out of his mouth;" "when the blessing of him that was ready to perish shall come on him, and when He shall cause the widow's heart to sing for joy."

Such is the salvation in which redeemed Israel shall rejoice when they shall behold their King in His beauty. "Israel shall rejoice in him that made him: the children of Zion shall be joyful in their King." Ps. cxlix. 2. But hearts that rejoice before God must be instructed and humbled hearts. When the brethren of Joseph suddenly found themselves in the presence of him whom they had hated, but whom God (and that for their sake) had exalted and honoured, they were comforted indeed, but they were humbled. They could not but remember the past; and it was meet that they should remember it. There can be no due appreciation of *the present* where there is no right apprehension of *the past*. Accordingly, in the commencing verses of the fifty-third

chapter, we find the confession of repentant Israel touching the past. They look back over years long gone, and say, "Who believed our report? And to whom was the arm of Jehovah revealed?" They recognise "*the report*" or "*message*" of which they had now become the willing heralds, as being the very same message that had been promulgated of old when Jesus and His despised servants testified. But they say, Who believed it? Did it not meet with well nigh universal rejection? They recognise that "the arm of Jehovah," even that arm to whose strength they had just before appealed, saying, "Awake, awake O arm of Jehovah," and which had awaked in answer to their cry, and wrought wonders for them in the heaven above, and in the earth beneath—they recognise that the power of that same arm had been in Jesus of Nazareth, *hidden*—hidden also in that "foolishness of preaching whereby God saveth all them that believe." The power had been there, and had wrought salvation for all that had believed; and yet their blinded eyes had not discerned it. But now, the veil having been rent from their heart, they look back over all that Jesus afore had been, and say, "He grew up before Him [Jehovah] as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground." A tender plant may be found in a rude inclement clime. The earth may withhold from it nourishment; the sun may scorch it; drought may enfeeble it; so that when men behold it they may recognise it only as a parched and withered thing, and because of the circumstances of its condition, may

ignore its native excellency. Such was Jesus. He was a plant of heavenly beauty; but earth refused to Him her strength. He was as a root out of a dry ground—uncherished—withered. “There is not to him form, there is not to him majesty, and when we behold him there is no beauty that we should desire him.” Moral beauty in all heavenly perfectness was there, but *that*, man prized not. They looked upon His outward form, fair once and beautiful; they saw it marred; and they despised Him. “Despised was he, and ceasing from amongst men, a man of sorrow and acquainted with disease,* and there was, as it were a hiding of [his] face from us—despised was he, and we regarded him not.” Such had been Israel’s estimate of the Holy Substitute. Men are eagle-eyed to discern any thing that tends to advance or to hinder prosperity here. Ever ready to hold “men’s persons in admiration because of advantage,” those from whom they expect no advantage they will abandon and betray. Accordingly, they watched the course of Jesus. They saw that He withdrew from and discountenanced the ways of men. The things which society honoured and delighted in, He eschewed. No path that led to dignity or honour or glory was trodden by Him. His way was isolated and narrow: His acquaintance was with misery and disease. Nor was there any thing in His path that seemed to promise final results of happiness or peace. On the contrary,

* Acquainted, that is, with the disease, and misery, that prevailed around Him. See notes.

the clouds that had gathered round Him seemed every day to deepen. Obstacles were not overcome: enemies were not subdued. They saw His sorrows; they saw Him stricken, and they rushed to the conclusion (a conclusion to them not unwelcome) that He was stricken because of His own iniquities. In vain their consciences told them that no man ever spake or ever acted as He. It was their *wish* to reject Him, and they did reject Him, and that with contempt and bitter scorn. Such had been Israel's relation to the Holy One of God. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." But that hour of darkness had passed. They apprehended now the cause of all His bitter sufferings, and were enabled with understanding hearts to say, "He was wounded because of our transgressions; crushed because of our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we were healed." Blessed words, unfolding that truth on which rest the salvation, and joy and glory of all the redeemed, even of all who, in any dispensation, have been or shall be gathered through faith into the *one* Church of God. These words—words that repentant Israel shall by and by utter, we, forestalling their blessing, are at present permitted to use. The prophetic descriptions of Israel's future *spiritual* blessings supply to us the language of our present confidence. By faith we behold Him who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and we too say, Jehovah caused to light on Him our iniquity,—by His stripes we were healed.

It is not my intention here to examine the words of

this chapter in detail, though I hope to do so in the notes that follow. It should, however, be observed that this chapter, in speaking of Jesus as the vicarious sufferer, does not direct our minds *only* to that great and pre-eminent hour of His anguish when He drank in death the appointed cup of wrath. The earlier verses of this chapter give great prominence to His *precious* sufferings. They speak of the time when He began to grow up before Jehovah as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground. The ground around that tender sprout was soon discovered to be "dry." Israel did not for the first time begin to despise Him when they led Him away to be crucified. They did not then for the first time look on Him as One who had no form or comeliness in their sight. They had long watched Him as He trod His isolated path—they had long known Him as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and because of those sorrows, and because of that grief had despised Him. Yet say they, when repentant, the very griefs and sorrows for which we loathed Him, were griefs and sorrows that He was bearing for our sakes. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." No words can prove more clearly than these, that Jesus throughout the whole course of His service on earth was the vicarious Sufferer. He suffered when laid as a babe in the manger; He suffered when flying before Herod's sword; He suffered in the wilderness; He suffered when not having where to lay His head; He suffered in Gethsemane; He suffered when, under the infliction of the veritable wrath of God, He pre-

sented Himself as the offering of a sweet-smelling savour. His sufferings were manifold; various in kind, and differing in degree, but they had all one object—the rendering unto God for all His believing people the appointed substitutional SATISFACTION.

All that the Son had to do and to suffer as the Substitute was appointed by the wisdom of God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, before the world was. When once the appointment had been made, every thing that had been appointed became *necessary* to the effectuation of the work of redemption. If one thing that had been appointed had been omitted, the work of redemption could not have been completed. In the typical ordinance of the meat-offering of the first-fruits, it was commanded that the corn thereof should be *beaten out* of the ears and *scorched* at the fire, before it could be brought to the altar to be *burned*. When this had once been appointed, it would not have been received at the altar, unless it had first been beaten out and scorched. The *scorching* was as needful as the *burning* to the completion of the offering. So was it with Christ. All His sufferings were pre-appointed. His living sufferings, therefore, which were as the scorching, were as needful to the effectuation of redemption as His dying sufferings, which were as the burning. *The* expiatory act, indeed, was His death—death under wrath; but that act could not have been performed by one who had not first done and suffered all that was appointed to be done and suffered by Him who was to perform *the* expiatory act. Therefore, the living sufferings and service of

Christ were as needful to the accomplishment of His atoning work as were His sufferings and service in death. Hence the prominence given to His living sufferings in this chapter. We must receive or reject the testimony of this chapter as *a whole*. If we reject its testimony to the sufferings of our Substitute in life, we must, to be consistent, reject its testimony to His substitutional sufferings in death. The same person who was "led as a lamb to the slaughter," was also the "root out of a dry ground:" and the reason for both was the same, namely, that He might make for us SATISFACTION to God.*

* "When it is asked, says Calvin, how Christ, by abolishing sin, removed the enmity between God and us, and purchased a righteousness which made him favourable and kind to us, it may be answered generally, that he accomplished this by the whole course of his obedience. This is proved by the testimony of Paul, 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' And indeed he elsewhere extends the ground of pardon which exempts from the curse of the Law to the whole life of Christ, 'When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law.' Thus even at his baptism, he declared that a part of righteousness was fulfilled by his yielding obedience unto the command of the Father. In short, from the moment when he assumed the form of a servant, he began, in order to redeem us, to pay the price of deliverance." *Calvin's Institutes, Book II., ch. xvi., § 5.*

Turretine says, "The common and received doctrines in our Churches [the Reformed Churches] is, that the Satisfaction of Christ which is imputed unto us for righteousness before God, comprehends not only the sufferings of Christ which, whether in life, or whether in death, he bore; but that it comprehendeth also the obedience of His whole life; that is to say, those just and

I have already said, that it is not my intention *here* to consider all the verses of this chapter in detail. There is, however, one passage to which I wish especially to direct attention. It is the last clause of the eleventh verse—a passage sufficiently interesting in itself, but its importance is increased by its connexion with the conclusion of the fifth chapter of the Romans; for in the nineteenth verse of that chapter, the Apostle virtually quotes this clause. It was evidently present to the Apostle's mind as he wrote the whole of the concluding part of the fifth of Romans—teaching us that the methods of God's grace in Christ are not restricted to

holy actions whereby in our stead He fulfilled perfectly the commandments of the Law: that so from these two parts the full and perfect price of our redemption might spring." *Turretine concerning the mediatorial office of Christ. Question xiii., § 2.*

Again in the seventh section he says: "That the sufferings whereby Christ made satisfaction are to be extended to all those sufferings which were laid upon Christ, not only on the Cross, but also in the garden; yea, throughout the whole of His life. And here we cannot approve of the fiction of those who wish to restrict all the satisfying sufferings of Christ to those sufferings which He endured during the three hours of darkness whilst He was on the Cross, and before He expired, excluding the other sufferings from the satisfaction to *Justice*, although they might have pertained to a satisfying the Divine verity and the fulfilment of the types. For, however certain it be that those sufferings were the most grievous with which He conflicted during the hours of darkness, it is nevertheless clear that the others were directed to the same end, for the Scripture nowhere restricts the [satisfying] sufferings to the three hours on the Cross, but speaks of them generally without any limitation. See Isaiah liii. 4, 5; 1 Pet. ii. 21 and iii. 18; Matt. xvi. 21; Heb. v. 7 and x. 8, 9." *Turretine idem.* See also 2 Cor. viii. 9.

believing Israel merely, but are extended to "the many," that is, to mankind at large, when brought, through faith, to Jesus. The words of the Prophet are: "By acquaintance with Himself shall the Righteous One, my Servant, bring (or cause) righteousness unto the many." The words of the Apostle are: "By the obedience of the One, shall the many be constituted righteous."

The fifty-third of Isaiah is, for the most part, the prophetic record of the confessions of repentant Israel in the day when they shall "convert and be healed." In some of the verses, however, Jehovah Himself speaks, attesting and confirming the acknowledgments of His people. Thus, in the eighth verse, it is He who speaks, saying, "For the transgression of MY PEOPLE was He stricken." Israel are they whom Jehovah here calls *my people*: even as in the first chapter. "The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib, but Israel doth not know, MY PEOPLE doth not consider. Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity!" Israel are that "sinful nation," that "people laden with iniquity." Accordingly, great prominence is given in Scripture to the fact that Jesus died for Israel. The last testimony of the Holy Ghost in the lips of the expiring Levitical Priesthood was, that Jesus should "die for that nation." "Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself, but being High Priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and

not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad." John xi. 49. The words of Jehovah in the passage I have just quoted are to the same effect: "For the transgression of MY PEOPLE was He stricken."

But the travail of Christ's soul is to be rewarded not merely by the gathering and salvation of Israel. Jehovah had elsewhere said, "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth." Is. xlix. 6. So likewise in the chapter before us: after Jehovah had, in the words above quoted, confirmed the title of Israel to rejoice in Christ's salvation, He adds that the blessing thereof shall not be restricted to *them*, but that the Messiah of Israel should see in a wider sphere than Israel, the result of the travail of His soul: "by acquaintance with himself shall the Righteous One, my servant, bring [or cause] righteousness unto THE MANY, and [ו] and not כִּי *for*] he shall bear their iniquities." This is the clause virtually quoted by the Apostle in Rom. v. 19. "By the obedience of the One shall THE MANY be constituted righteous." The words, "the many" (הַרְבֵּי, οἱ πολλοί) are identical in meaning, as used by the Prophet and by the Apostle. They are used to denote mankind at large—"all men" (Romans v. 12, 18) as contrasted with a section of mankind, such as Israel. Salvation through the Messiah of Israel is brought not to Israel merely, but to "the many," or mankind at large;

that is to say, if by faith they become acquainted with Him. “*By the knowledge of himself* shall the Righteous One, my Servant, bring righteousness unto the many.” The commencing words, “by the knowledge of himself,” supply the limitation. These words, “by the knowledge of himself,” mean *not* that knowledge which Christ Himself hath, but that knowledge of Him, or acquaintance with Him, that we have through faith. They are words that denote that saving knowledge of faith into which God through the testimony of the Gospel seeks to bring. God preaches “peace through Jesus Christ.” “Men and brethren,” said the Apostle to a mingled multitude (of whom the greater part were rejectors)—“men and brethren, through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and through him all who believe are justified from all things.” Acts xiii. 38. “Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly of heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls.” Matt. xi. 28. “Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.” “He that believeth on Him shall never be confounded.” Such are the gracious invitations by which sinners are encouraged to come and lay hold on Jehovah’s strength as manifested in the Lamb led to the slaughter. They who, through grace, come even in the feeblest faith, and cast themselves on Him, have that acquaintance of faith of which this verse speaks. To all such, whether found among “the many,” or found in Israel, the Righteous One, Jehovah’s Servant, brings righteousness.

It is in the Hebrew language a rule, that the adjective should be placed *after* the substantive to which it belongs. But in the passage before us that rule is transgressed. "Righteous" is not placed after "Servant," but stands before it, and that without the article.

בְּרַעְיֵנו יִצְדִּיק יִצְדִּיק עַבְדִּי לְרַבִּים.

The omission of the article before words which are, nevertheless, definite, indicates both in Hebrew and Greek, that the person or thing denoted is to be regarded as standing in a sphere of its own—singular, isolated, or pre-eminent. So is it here. We must translate יִצְדִּיק, "One that is righteous," or "the Righteous One." The omission of the article indicates that the Person thus spoken of, held in earth a position of righteousness that was singular and isolated, and that there was none like it.* The peculiar position of the word "righteous" preceding, and not following its substantive, is intended to give especial prominence to the thought it expresses. Our minds are intended to rest on the righteousness of the Righteous One as the procuring cause of the blessing spoken of in this verse. In virtue of having been the Righteous One, He becomes the causer, or bringer of righteousness to His believing people.

Yet whilst prominence is thus given to the great fact of His righteousness, it is important also to observe that the words, "*my servant*," are added. The Son,

* See Remarks on the omission of the Greek Article before definite nouns in "Occasional Papers," No. I., page 27.

before He took on Himself our nature, was from everlasting (even as He shall be unto everlasting) He to whom righteousness essentially belongeth. Yet He was not then "the servant." It is not in virtue of that essential righteousness that pertains to Him as God—one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, that He brings to us righteousness. The righteousness by which we are constituted righteous is a *service*, an *obedience* which He became man in order to render; and which He commenced and finished *in the earth*. It commenced when He said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God:" it terminated when He had become obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, and said, "It is finished." It is true, indeed, that unless He had been One to whom righteousness essentially belonged, He could not have wrought out the righteousness which He did work out as the Servant. The service of that Servant had in it a superhuman excellency, for that Servant was Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh. To view Him in the sphere of His eternal glory, having a righteousness so absolute, so essential, that every thing willed by Him is right simply because He wills it, so as for rectitude to be nothing else than conformity with the principles of His own being—to view Him there, is something very different from seeing Him as the Servant of Jehovah in the earth after He had assumed another and an inferior nature, and entered a sphere utterly contrasted with that which pertained to Him above the heavens. Voluntarily He became man: voluntarily He entered and sojourned on this earth, and became obedient to a pre-

scribed rule of action in the midst of suffering and death, in order that thereby He might work out for others a righteousness by which they might be constituted righteous, and be justified. The righteousness wrought out and finished by Immanuel as Jehovah's Servant in the earth, is the righteousness which He brings unto, and puts upon His believing people. It is a righteousness which is the result of a fulfilled obedience, and therefore the Apostle after speaking of it as a righteousness (for he says that "*by one righteousness*" $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ "the free gift came unto all men unto justification of life,") uses in the following verse the word "*obedience*:" "*by the obedience* of the one shall the many be constituted righteous"—plainly teaching that we are constituted righteous, not by the essential righteousness of Christ as God being imparted to us (which indeed is impossible) but by a righteousness resulting from an obedience performed in our stead, and made ours in the only way in which such a righteousness could be made ours, namely, by ascription or imputation. What the Apostle teaches by using the word "*obedience*," is taught by the Prophet by his use of the word "*servant*." The Righteous One by His obedience as my Servant [it is Jehovah who speaks] shall bring righteousness unto the many.

"Shall cause, or bring righteousness unto," is the literal rendering of יִצְדִּיק , followed by ל . The Hiphil of צָדַק (and it is the only place in which it is so) is here followed by the preposition ל . It cannot, therefore, be rendered "*justify*." "*Justify*" ($\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega$) is the invari-

able meaning of צָדִיק in Hiphil when it is not followed by ל, and when it is used of God as a Judge. In this sense it is frequently used of God; *but always of God as a Judge* declaring His believing people to have been so “constituted righteous” as to be able to appear before Him, and to be justified, or authoritatively pronounced righteous. Such is the meaning of הַצְדִּיק simply, when used of God as a Judge, and when not followed by the preposition ל. But here it is followed by ל, and it is not used of God as a Judge. On the contrary, it is used of *Christ as the Servant of Jehovah* preparing Jehovah’s people to meet Him as a Judge. The Apostle was very conscious of this difference; and therefore in quoting (as virtually he does) this passage in Romans v. 19, he marks his sense of the distinction between צָדִיק and לַצְדִּיק—by using the expression, “*constituted righteous*” instead of “*justify*.” To “constitute righteous,” or “be the bringer of righteousness,” is the work of Christ as the Servant, and of Him this passage speaks: to “justify” or “pronounce righteous” those who have had righteousness brought to them by Christ’s service, is the work of God as the Judge. By the service of Christ in the earth believers are “*constituted righteous* :” by the judicial sentence of God already pronounced over them they are “justified.”

But the righteous Servant of Jehovah was to bring righteousness not to believing Israel only, but also to “the many” לְרַבִּים. That the words, “the many” (οἱ πολλοί, as they are rendered by the Apostle in Rom. v. 15, 19) denote in this place, *mankind at large* as contrasted

with a select few, such as Israel, can be doubted by none who carefully consider this passage and the verse that follows.* But if there were a doubt, it would certainly be removed by a reference to Romans v. Throughout the close of that chapter the Apostle uses the expression "the many," interchangeably with "all men" (compare verses 15 and 19 with verses 12 and 18); and it is from this verse in Isaiah that the expression, "*the many*," is derived. The Prophet and the Apostle both use this expression to denote the world at large, in contrast with Israel who were a select few standing in contrast with "the many."

The Apostles, and more especially St. Paul, were perpetually hindered in their ministry by the difficulty they found in persuading even converted Israelites to believe, that Gentiles *as Gentiles* could, on believing, be made partakers of the blessings which the Messiah of Israel brought. If the Gentiles would consent to be first incorporated with Israel by circumcision, and so to reach Christ through Israel, they were willing to receive them, but not otherwise. The strength of this feeling even among believing Israelites, may be judged of from the manner in which Peter and Barnabas yielded to it in Antioch. They quailed before the frown of the believing Jews, and consented to reject the be-

* Which should be rendered thus, "Therefore will I divide unto him a portion amongst the many, and the mighty he shall divide as spoil, because (or in return for that) He laid bare unto death His soul" &c. There is the same reference to the Gentile world here as in the preceding verse. See notes that follow.

lieving Gentiles as unclean, even though they knew that they had been sanctified by faith in Jesus, and had received the Holy Ghost as well as they.

We cannot wonder, therefore, at the earnestness with which the Apostle Paul insisted on the great truth that all the grace, and mercy, and blessing provided by God in Christ, was the portion not of believing Israel merely, but also of all who believed among "the many." There never was a question in the Apostolic Churches whether Christ was the Representative of, and had atoned for, "the many" who believed *not*. Isaiah does not say that the Righteous One, Jehovah's Servant, had brought righteousness unto "the many" who were not by faith acquainted with Him. "*By acquaintance with himself* shall the Righteous One, my Servant, bring righteousness unto the many." In like manner, the Apostle when he speaks of the life brought unto "the many," limits it to such of the many as had received "abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness." It was admitted, that as Adam's transgression affected all those of whom he was the Representative, and them alone, that so Christ's obedience affects those of whom He is the Representative, and them alone. None in the Apostolic Churches affirmed that Christ was the Representative, or Surety, or Priest of any except His people: but multitudes did question whether the Gentiles—whether "the many," could by faith *alone*, attain the right of being numbered among His people. They said; nay. They said that they must also come by circumcision within the circle of Israel. They denied that right-

eousness could be brought to them *as the many*. The Apostle, on the other hand, affirmed the contrary. He declared with authority from God, that righteousness was brought by Jesus as much to the believing many as to the believing Jews; and by tacit reference to the verse we are considering in Isaiah, he shows that Isaiah had testified the same thing.

The statement of the Apostle in the eighteenth verse of the fifth of Romans, is one of exceeding moment. Let us look well that we receive it in simplicity. "As by ONE OFFENCE (*δι' ἑνός παραπτώματος*) judgment came unto all men unto condemnation, so by ONE RIGHTEOUSNESS* (*δι' ἑνός δικαιώματος*) the free gift came unto all men unto justification of life." Here we are authoritatively taught that the whole action of the hand of God in judgment on men as men, was founded exclusively on the "ONE OFFENCE" committed by the first man whilst he stood as our Representative in Paradise. It was an act altogether external to ourselves. *Adam* committed it, not *we*. Yet, by committing it, he opened the fountain whence has flowed down to us all the condemnation and woe and misery that we have seen and known as men, and which will, to all who are not de-

* The verse in the original is elliptical—but the ellipsis is not inaccurately supplied by the italic words in our version. Literally the verse may be rendered thus: "According then as by means of one offence the result came unto all men unto condemnation, so by means of one righteousness the result came unto all men unto justification of life." For distinction between *δικαιωσις* and *δικαιωμα* and like verbal forms see Remarks on the Greek of Romans i., page 27, as advertised at the end of this volume.

livered, end in the second death. His "one offence" has entailed the "condemnation." The depravity is the necessary concomitant and consequence—the penal consequence of that condemnation, but it is not the cause. Its cause is found in the "ONE OFFENCE" committed by another whilst standing as our Representative—a terrible truth which the human heart ever frets and rebels against, and not unfrequently spurns. Refusing to wait until God has unfolded and explained the methods of His grace, it rages against the thought of representative action.* Yet for what do the instructed in heart bless God more? What principle in the government of God is more dear to them than this? For, if by the act of their first Representative they have been ruined, they know also that by the act of another Representative they have been made sure heirs of life and glory. Immanuel—the Second Man, taking His place in the midst of this world's sin and misery, did, by one pro-

* The fact that the imputation of the first sin of Adam is taught by the Apostle to be the cause of the condemnation that rests on men as men, is admitted by the more candid among the Neologians. They admit that the Apostle teaches it, but they say that he taught what is false. "Wegscherder, (says Professor Cunningham,) admits that it is impossible, in accordance with the principles of philology and exegesis, to deny that Paul taught this doctrine; while he does not scruple to say, 'That imputation of the sin of Adam, which the Apostle Paul, following the Jewish teachers of his day, made the basis of his argumentations, must be relegated to those obsolete dogmas, which ignorance both of philosophy and history has propagated and cherished to the great detriment of true piety throughout the Church.'"—See *Cunningham's Historic Theology, Vol. I., p. 507.*

longed act of righteous service, continued through life and consummated in sacrificial death, establish the basis on which the sure action of God's grace, in unchangeable mercy toward them that believe, is founded for evermore. The fountain-head of blessing has been opened: the streams flow and will never cease to flow: the consequences are sure. All is the result of the "ONE RIGHTEOUSNESS." And that "one righteousness" is, as I have already said, termed by the Apostle, in the succeeding verse, "an obedience." The operation, therefore, of the hand of God toward us, in bringing to us justification and all the consequences thereof, is founded, not on any act or condition of the Son of God before He became incarnate, nor upon any act or condition that now pertains to Him in resurrection: it is founded exclusively on a righteousness wrought out by Him and finished *in the earth*—finished in His sacrificial death. It was a developed righteousness, developed under a prescribed rule (for He was made under the Law, and He kept it) and it is therefore called an "obedience." "By the obedience of THE ONE shall the many be constituted righteous." "By acquaintance with Himself shall the Righteous One, my Servant, bring righteousness unto the many, and their iniquities He shall bear." The bearing the iniquities and the presenting the finished righteousness, were both consummated on the Cross. All the action of the hand of God toward us in blessing is *founded* exclusively on the work finished by His righteous Servant in the earth; and yet it is the *earthly* service of the Holy One that many are now seeking to depreciate.

By that service was caused "the travail" of Christ's soul, and from that travail all the satisfying results flow. "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." Already in the midst of Sin's empire, where sin reigneth in the power of death (*εβασιλευσεν η̄ ᾱμαρτια εν θανατω*) a circle of light has been drawn around the family of faith, and over all within that circle, grace reigns. If we see Sin seated like a Monarch upon her Throne and reigning, we see also another Throne which Grace occupies and whence Grace reigns—"reigns unto eternal life" through the righteousness provided in the service of Jesus. See Romans v. 21. This is a present portion. As to the future, we are taught that we, who have known suffering and sorrow under and in Sin's empire, are soon ourselves to reign—"to reign in life through One, Jesus Christ," made perfect like Him, glorified with Him. These hopes, and these comforts, are some of the present results of the travail of Christ's soul which have reached "the many" who have believed.

Yet they of "the many" who have believed have as yet been but a remnant. "The many" have for the most part despised this great salvation. The true children of the kingdom are and have been but few. "The way is narrow that leadeth unto life." Our present mercies come to us in the midst of a dark and "evil day." But an hour is drawing nigh when God, in a manner not known as yet, shall allot to His righteous Servant a portion "among the many," greater and more extended far than any that has as yet been allotted to

Him. Such is the promise of the concluding verse. "Therefore will I allot to Him a portion among the many, and mighty ones He shall divide as spoil, in return for that He laid bare unto death His soul, and was with transgressors numbered and bore Himself the sin of many, and for transgressors made intercession." The coming age "when the Redeemer shall come out of Zion and turn away ungodliness from Jacob," shall witness the accomplishment of this promise unto the full. Then, not in Israel merely, but "amongst the many," Christ shall receive an allotment, fair, fruitful, blessed, and reaching unto the ends of the earth. The "strong ones" of the earth, even mighty nations and mighty kings, He shall divide to Himself as spoil. Rescued from darkness and from the Devil, they shall follow Him as willing and rejoicing captives—captives of grace. So the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God. So shall be prepared multitudes as the stars of heaven, as the sand upon the sea-shore that cannot be numbered, who, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, shall together with the Church of the first-born ones who have preceded them, be together gathered to these new heavens and new earth where Christ shall fully see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied—where also all of His redeemed shall be satisfied likewise, because they shall all have awaked *in His likeness*. "I shall be satisfied when I awake up in thy likeness." Such are the results of redemption—all founded on the one obedience unto death—all founded on the fact that Immanuel was "led as a lamb to the slaughter,"

and "laid bare His soul unto death." That death was precious. The power of incense-like fragrance was in it. Its preciousness remains, and forms the meritorious ground of all our blessing for time, and for eternity.

Notes on Isaiah LII. 13 to end, and on Isaiah LIII.

VERSE XIII.

Behold, my servant shall cause [men] to understand : he shall be exalted and lifted up and high exceedingly.

Behold &c.] These words have commonly been referred to the *present* exaltation of Christ. It is true, indeed, that He is at present “exalted and lifted up and high exceedingly.” But these verses do not refer to His present “hidden” exaltation, which faith only recognises. They belong to that coming period when His glory shall be *manifested*; when every eye shall see it; and when forgiven Israel and spared repentant nations shall rejoice in His salvation. “Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear asunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still and know that I am God: I WILL BE EXALTED AMONG THE GENTILES: I WILL BE EXALTED IN THE EARTH.” When the hour comes for this Psalm to be fulfilled, then, and not till then, will the words of Isaiah be accom-

plished. Isaiah speaks of the great Melchizedek of Israel in the hour of His manifested glory "when he shall stand and feed in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah his God;" and he calls on Israel and on the "escaped of the nations" (see Isaiah xlv. 20) to "behold" Him. It is a sight of joy, and peace, and gladness. In a far different sense are we now taught to say, "behold." Our testimony is, "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail at him, even so, Amen." But when the time comes for this verse in Isaiah to be fulfilled, the dark cloud of judgment shall have passed away, and Jerusalem shall answer to her name, and be the "vision of peace."

My servant.] This is a name applied to Christ in the time of His glory as well as in the time of His humiliation. "Thou art *my servant*, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified," are words addressed to Christ as the Head of Israel, and have not yet received their full accomplishment. His mission, when He shall come forth in glory, will be to subjugate all enemies; for "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." The sovereignty (*ἡ βασιλεια*) with which He is to be invested when brought before the Ancient of Days (see Dan. vii.) is to be exercised for this specific end—the putting down all enemies. And when this shall have been accomplished by the destruction of the last enemy, death, He shall deliver over *this* sovereignty to the Father, "that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 28. As therefore, Christ has manifestly served in humilia-

tion, so also shall He manifestly serve when He cometh forth in His millennial glory.

Shall cause to understand.] There has been considerable difference of opinion as to the rendering of **יִשְׁבֵּל**. A rendering frequently found in our English version is, “*shall prosper.*” See for example Jer. x. 21, and Josh. i. 7. To this, Alexander and others very properly object. Prosperity may be the result of understanding imparted or possessed; but we are not to confound cause with effect. There is nothing in the word itself that implies prosperity. That is denoted by the Hiphil of **לָמַד**. See Ps. i. 3. The meaning which Alexander and Delitzsch propose, is, “*to act with understanding:*” but although action is no doubt a necessary result of the condition expressed by this word, yet “*to act with understanding*” cannot be said to be the literal rendering of the Hiphil of **יִשְׁבֵּל**. Alexander, indeed, thinks it is; but he fails to supply a satisfactory example.

The proper force of the Hiphil of **יִשְׁבֵּל** clearly is to cause [others] to understand. We have an example of this in that memorable verse where this word is for the first time used—“*a tree to be desired to make one wise,*” literally, “*for causing to understand.*” Gen. iii. 6. In this sense it is frequently used, as in Prov. xvi. 23. “*The heart of the wise teacheth,*” literally, “*causeth to understand.*” In the titles of many of the Psalms, we find this word *Maschil* used in the sense of “*causing to understand,*” or “*giving instruction,*” as it is translated in the margin.

But inasmuch as he who is able "to cause others to understand," must be himself *possessed* of understanding, the Hiphil of שָׁבַל is frequently used in this secondary sense, and is translated in our English version, "to be wise," or (in the participle) "wise." Thus in Prov. x. 5, "he that gathereth in summer is a wise son;" and Prov. x. 19, "he that refraineth his lips is wise." There are a multitude of like instances in which this word indicates the *possession* of understanding—*συνεσις*, "*practical intelligence.*" See 2 Tim. ii. 7. "The Lord give thee *understanding* in all things."

We have thus to choose between two meanings, namely, to be *causative of understanding to others*, or to be *possessed of understanding*. As a general rule, it is best not to deviate from the strict grammatical meaning without necessity, and *also to adopt, if possible, the rendering that is most comprehensive*. I therefore prefer to give to שָׁבַל its proper causative force, and to regard it as indicating one of the offices which the great Solomon of the earth will then in His mercy assume, as the instructor of, or "*causer of understanding to*" others. In that case, this verse describes Him as King, Prophet, and Priest. As King, He shall be "exalted, and lifted up, and be high exceedingly." As Prophet, He "instructs," or "causes to understand." As Priest, He "sprinkles." Thus, too, the connexion between the use of the word here, and its first use in Genesis, is preserved. Men will at last see before them One more to be desired for "causing to understand" than the Tree of knowledge in Paradise. The eating of that Tree

brought indeed to man the knowledge of evil and of good ; but it left him to know evil as something with which he had become identified ; and good as something from which he was utterly and (if God should not intervene) hopelessly and for ever separated. The evil he had to know as nigh ; the good was seen afar off. But in Christ, the lesson is reversed. They who feed on Him by faith, whether as now *hidden* with God, or as then *manifested* in glory, find in Him the anti-typical Tree of Life, as well as of Knowledge. Quickened by a new power of life from above, they find themselves enabled both to receive knowledge, and to act according to it when received. This, even at present, is true of those who feed by faith on Him who is hidden in the Heavens. But the passage before us speaks of that yet future hour when the true Tree of knowledge—the Tree “to be desired for causing to understand” shall be manifested in the earth in all the beauty of its excellency, (see Ps. i. 3) and when its excellency shall be recognised, and men shall seek unto it that they might learn wisdom, even how to walk with God, in fellowship with His thoughts and His ways.

He shall be exalted, and be lifted up and be high exceedingly.] “The Prophet,” says Hengstenbergh, “combines all the words that in the Hebrew language express elevation, and still adds the term מָאֵר to denote with greater intensity the elevation of the Messiah.” When these words נִשְׁבַּח and רָם are used together and applied to God or to Christ personally, *moral* exaltation (such as is expressed by worship, praise, honour and thanks-

giving) seems chiefly denoted by the first word, **וַיִּשְׁבַּח**. See Ps. xcix. 5. "*Exalt ye Jehovah, our God, and worship*" &c. Also Ex. xv. 2. "*My fathers' God, and I will exalt him.*" And Ps. xxx. 1. "*I will extol thee, O Jehovah :*" and Ps. xxxiv. 3. "*Come let us exalt his name together.*" The second **וַיִּשְׁבַּח** denotes rather the *outward manifestation* of the exaltation. See Ps. xciv. 2. "*Lift up thyself, thou judge of the earth.*" And Is. lvii. 15. "*Thus saith the exalted and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity.*" The application, therefore, of these words to the Servant of Jehovah expresses not only the wondrous exaltation of that Servant, but indicates also who that Servant was—"the man that is *my fellow*, saith Jehovah of Hosts." The last words, "*high exceedingly*," are a general ascription to Him of elevation in every relation with which it is possible to connect the thought of elevation. His glory will be great in the earth; but the home thereof will be known to be "above the heavens."

VERSES XIV. AND XV.

According as many wondered at thee (so marred more than any man was his visage, and his form more than the sons of men); so shall he sprinkle many nations; at him kings shall shut their mouths, because that which had not been told them they have seen; and that which they had not heard they have considered.

According as many wondered at thee.] As many once gazed in ignorant and stupid amazement at His marred

and wasted form, and loathed Him, so, by and by, shall they gaze at Him with admiring wonder, when they shall see the great Melchizedek of Israel stand before them in His glory, as the one appointed of God to sprinkle and to cleanse them. They shall seek to Him more earnestly than Naaman sought to Elisha; for they shall recognise their own leprosy, and know that *He* is mighty to heal. Once Israel thought *Him* to be the moral leper; now they shall discover that defilement pertained, *not* to Him, but to themselves. They shall understand the reason of His past sufferings; and shall see in those sufferings their salvation. For remarks on the meaning of *שָׁמַח*, *to marvel*, or *wonder*, see preceding observations, page 150. The antithesis between “many” and “nations,” should be noticed. “*Many*” gazed on Him and loathed; but “*nations*” shall behold Him and worship.

So marred more than any man was his visage, and his form more than the sons of men.] This parenthetical clause gives the reason of His having been scorned.

His visage—מַרְאֵהוּ.] This word, generally translated in our version *appearance* (as in the description of the cherubim throughout the commencing chapters of Ezekiel) refers to the general *aspect*, or *look* of the person or thing spoken of, especially to the look of the *countenance*, and is therefore not unfrequently translated “*countenance*,” as in Judges xiii. 6. “The man of God came unto me, and *his countenance* was like the *countenance* of an angel.” “*Countenance*,” therefore, or “*visage*,” may be taken as the most suitable rendering here. In

the next clause, תִּאָר from תָּאָר to *mark* out or *delineate*, refers to the form or figure of the body generally. Thus we read of Joseph that he was “beautiful *in form* and beautiful *in countenance*.” פִּה־תִּאָר ויִפֶּה מֵרֵאָה Gen. xxxix. 6. So of Jesus we read, “The child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon Him. . . . And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.” Luke ii. 40—52.

So marred &c.] מִשְׁחָת here not unsuitably translated *marred*, is really a substantive. It is derived from the verb שָׁחַת to *destroy*, to *ruin*, either by laying waste as a *country* or a *field*, Gen ix. 11: or by *pulling down* as the walls of a city, Gen. xiii. 10: or by *killing*, *wounding*, or *harming* in any way whatsoever. See Gesenius. Hence in 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, it is applied to the *destroying* angel that smote Israel with pestilence. In the passage before us, it denotes the *wasting* effect of anguish and suffering on the native vigour and beauty of the Messiah’s countenance, whilst He was passing through the sufferings appointed to Him as the Substitute of His people.

Many (Delitzsch for example, Alexander and Hengstenbergh) in order to intensify this passage, give to מִ in מִאִישׁ a *negative*, instead of a comparative, meaning, and render, “His visage was disfiguration *away from* man,” that is, His condition of suffering seemed to be so in excess of human misery as to separate Him off into distance from all the known forms of suffering humanity. Hengstenbergh quotes the words, “I am a worm and no man,” as illustrative. I prefer to take

the comparative force of ב as adopted in our own version. Whichever translation we follow, the unequalled greatness of our holy Substitute's anguish, and the results thereof on His countenance and form, are emphatically declared.

So shall he sprinkle &c.] So, answers to *as* in the commencing clause. *As* was the amazement at the suffering, *so* shall be the amazement at the glory.

There has been much controversy respecting the meaning of נָזַף , and our right to render it "*besprinkle*." Elsewhere it is uniformly followed by a preposition (commonly עַל) and is used to denote the act of scattering or sprinkling something, such as water or blood *on* a person or thing; but it is not elsewhere found in the sense of "*besprinkle*." In English we say, "I sprinkle water on thee;" or we may say, "I besprinkle thee;" or less correctly perhaps, "I sprinkle thee." So in Latin we may say, "*spargere aquam*"—"to sprinkle water;" and also, "*spargere corpus aquâ*"—"to *besprinkle* the body with water." The question is whether the fact of נָזַף not being elsewhere found in *the second* of these meanings, is a sufficient reason for denying to it that liberty of variation which is accorded to the corresponding word in our language and in Latin. The same may be said of the use of $\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omega$ in Greek. Although the use of נָזַף in the sense of "*besprinkle*" may be confined to this passage, and be *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον*, what possible reason is there that it should not be so?

"The Hebrews," says Kocher, "for want of compounds, supply the defect by various uses of the simple

verbs." There is only one instance in Scripture in which we find the Hiphil of פָּדַק followed by the preposition ל . Once, however, in the 11th verse of Isaiah liii. it is : whereby its meaning is materially changed. See note on that verse. Because this is an unique instance, are we to refuse to recognise the variation ?

Again, in the 10th verse of Lev. xvi. there is a most remarkable example of an expression used in an unique sense. When the scape-goat is brought to be presented alive before the Lord, we find the words, "to make an atonement with him"—literally, "*upon him*"— לְנִפְרַר עָלָיו —that is, the atonement to be made was regarded as based on the victim. But this is, I believe, the *only* instance in which these words are used in this meaning. In every other case they refer to the protective power of the atonement brought as a shelter over that which is placed under it. Are we on account of this singular use of נִפְרַר עַל in the tenth verse, to refuse to accept the only meaning which it is possible for the words in their contextual connexion to bear ?

If we do not render נָזַח in this verse "*to besprinkle,*" I think I am justified in saying that we cannot translate the passage at all ; for the attempt made by some to *determine* the meaning of a Hebrew word by an Arabic one could not be accepted as right in principle, even if the result were satisfactory : which it is not. See Hengstenbergh's remarks on the failure of this attempt. "Sprinkle" in the sense of "besprinkle," is the rendering adopted by the Syriac, Vulgate, Jerome, Luther, Vitringa, Dathe, Kocher, Jahn, Hengstenbergh,

Alexander, Wordsworth, and our own version; and we shall do well to retain it. Instead of its being a meaning difficult to associate with the context, it is suggested by it: for what thought will be more present to the minds of those who shall stand before Jesus in His millennial glory than this—that He who, because of His sufferings had been by men *accounted* defiled, had, by means of those very sufferings, acquired the title to call them who *really were* defiled, into His presence, and to give them cleansing, by applying unto them the value of His atoning blood.

The kings shall shut their mouths at him.] That is, in reverential awe, they shall be silent in His presence. Compare Job xxix. 9. “The princes refrained talking, and laid their hand upon their mouth.” A greater than Job or than Solomon will be known to be there—One whose name is “Counsellor.” They shall bow before Him, and learn wisdom from His lips. “That which had not been told them, they have seen, and that which they had not heard, they have discovered.” We are frequently, as in this passage, carried forward by the Prophet into the future, and taught to view it sometimes as if present—sometimes as if past.

That which had not been told them &c.] These words show the uninstructed condition of the earth generally at the time of the Lord’s return. “Darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the peoples.” See also Is. lxvi. 19. “I will send those that escape of them (*i.e.* of Israel) to Tarshish, Pul and Lud . . . to the isles afar off that have not heard my fame nor seen my

glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles.”

The strength and fulness of the light that shall then illumine Israel, causing them to see no longer darkly and partially, but clearly and fully, is strikingly referred to in the preceding verses. “Therefore my people shall know my name, therefore in that day they shall know that I am he that speaketh, behold it is I. . . . The voice of thy watchmen, they have lifted up their voice together: they shall shout for joy; for they shall see eye to eye, when Jehovah shall bring again Zion.”

It is the minute and exact knowledge which Israel shall then possess of Jehovah and His ways, that will render them fit instructors of the nations. The watchmen of Israel shall see “*eye to eye*,” *i.e.* that what they behold they shall behold not indistinctly and remotely, but with a power of minute inspection such as characterizes those who gaze on one another “*face to face*.” The words, “*eye to eye*,” do not in themselves express unity of apprehension, but clearness and distinctness of perception: although the *result* is unity. They lift up their voice *together*, and shout for joy, because they apprehend with like distinctness the objects presented to them to be known. Communion in service, and communion in joy, must be hindered amongst God’s people if there be not *like* objects set before them, or if those objects, whilst viewed by some distinctly, are by others so partially or imperfectly apprehended, as virtually not to be apprehended at all.

But whilst the Spirit of God can thus speak of a time

when the eyes of Israel shall be opened to behold and recognise the glory of their King, He has also to speak of another and previous period when their eyes were closed. This is the subject of the commencing verses of the *next* chapter.

VERSE I. OF ISAIAH LIII.

*Who believed our report [message]? And to whom was the arm of Jehovah revealed?**

Who believed &c.] Vitringa has been greatly ridiculed because he has said that these words in their strict interpretation, belong to converted Israelites; but he is quite right. Will any one deny that in the immediately subsequent verses, repentant Israel are the speakers? Is it not they who say, "We did esteem him stricken" &c. The whole chapter is proved by its contextual connexion to be (as to its strict interpretation) *future*, and to belong to the period when the veil shall be rent from the heart of Israel, and when they shall look on Him whom they pierced. We who now believe, anticipatively enjoy the spiritual blessings of millennial Israel. We forestal them in their repentant confessions, and in their expressions of rejoicing faith. We too say, "all we like sheep have gone astray, but Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquities of us all." The

* The two past tenses in this verse are to be rendered as having an *aoristic* force—who "believed;" not "who *hath* believed." See John xii. 38. *τις επιστευσεν τη ακοη ημων; και ο βραχιων κυριου τιμι απεκαλυφθη;*

words of Israel's future joy, ~~from~~^{from} the language of our present confidence.

The report or message which they will be commissioned to bear, and which they call "our report," will then be welcomed everywhere. But they will recognise, and that with shame and contrition, that it is the very same message that they and their forefathers had in previous ages, scorned. Looking back over the past, they will say, "*Who believed it?*" "The arm of Jehovah" —the mighty power of God unto salvation was present in the foolishness of preaching: but who recognised it as being there? Here then, we find a distinct proof (if any be needed) that the message which is to be preached in the millennial age, is the same as that which Paul and the twelve Apostles preached. It is the same "report" —the same "everlasting gospel"—essentially alike in all dispensations. There are not two gospels, nor two ways, nor two ends of salvation, though many now tell us that there are.

The use made in the tenth of Romans of the words, "*who believed our report?*" should not be overlooked. One great object of that chapter is to shew that the means appointed of God to bring into connexion with the salvation that is in Christ, is PREACHING. "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is, the word of faith which we PREACH." But this Israel spurned. Signs or wonders they would welcome; but "the foolishness of preaching" they despised. The Apostle, therefore, reasoned with them. He argued that even in a passage which all admitted to belong to

the future hour of Israel's blessing, Isaiah speaks of *preaching* as the means by which Israel are to be reached. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them that PREACH" &c. Why then should Israel object to the instrumentality of preaching being employed now? It was answered; that the cases were not parallel—that the preaching mentioned by Isaiah was a preaching welcomed and received—that the feet of those who preached were counted "beautiful," and that results, great and glorious, followed: consequently, that such preaching could not be likened to the preaching of those who were rejected and counted as "the filth of the world and the off-scouring of all things." The Apostle admitted the contrast, but he added—Remember that Isaiah not only spake of a time when the heralds of this message should be welcomed, he spake *also* of a time when the message would be rejected, for he said, "who believed our report?"

VERSE II.

And he grew up as a tender sprout before him, and as a root out of a dry ground; there is not to him form, and there is not majesty; and we behold him, but there is no sightliness that we should desire him [or it.]*

* Some (see Mason and Bernard's Grammar) translate, "and when we used to see him," observing that the Future expresses "frequency of past action." But it also expresses habitude or continuity of present action, and may in that case be rendered by our present tense.

As a tender plant before him.] יִנְק, from יָנַק *to suck*, is a word that denotes tenderness of infantile condition; needing, therefore, kindly care and nurture. There was freshness and vigour in this tender plant; and if it had been duly nurtured—if no adverse influences had been brought to bear on it, it would have grown up before Jehovah in beauty. But a young and tender plant is not an emblem of majesty or of glory; especially when it is a sprout from which the earth withholds nourishment. Men saw enough of Jesus in His tender years to know that He was a plant of singular excellency. They marvelled at His understanding and answers: they saw Him “increase in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.” But at the same time, they observed that He did not gather around Himself the world’s admiration, or the world’s strength. What the world esteemed majesty and glory, He had not—and sought not. Society, therefore, soon frowned on Him. What He might be in the sight of Jehovah they cared not for. As soon as they had convinced themselves that He had not, and would not have form and majesty in the world’s eyes, they abandoned Him.*

* The verse we are considering must not be read as parallel with Isaiah xi. 1. It is to be read *in contrast with* that chapter; for *that* chapter speaks of Christ’s millennial glory. “And there shall come forth the rod out of the stem of Jesse” [observe, “*come forth*” as from a place where it had been hidden like Aaron’s rod in the sanctuary: not “spring up” as from a place of origin]—“there shall *come forth* the rod out of the stem of Jesse, and the sprout (נִצָּן) from נִצָּר *to be bright with verdure*) out of his roots shall flourish.” The eleventh of Isaiah does not (like the chapter

There is not to him form, there is not majesty.] For the meaning of תֵּאֲרָ, *form*, see remarks on preceding verse. His form, whatever it might have been originally, was “*marred*.” The word which I have translated majesty, הִרְרָ, is generally rendered *glory, honour, majesty*, and sometimes, *beauty, comeliness, goodliness*; but in such cases, a beauty resulting from official dignity or honour, rather than personal. It is a word frequently used of the Messiah in the day of His manifested glory. See for example, Ps. xlv. 3. “Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty; with thy glory and thy *majesty*. (הִרְרָ) And in thy majesty ride prosperously because

before us) speak of the time when the tender plant springs up to have nourishment refused to it, and to be crushed: on the contrary, it speaks of the time when He who is the rod from the stem of Jesse (“*rod*” is a word denoting authority and power) shall be brought forth from the place where it is hidden, and when the sprout from Jesse’s roots (“*sprout*” being a word denoting verdure and beauty) shall “*flourish*.”

In the passage before us, Jesus is compared to a *tender shoot* or *sucker* springing from a root, and to a root (שֹׁרֵשׁ) also. [Compare “I am the root and offspring of David.”] In Him as a root was hidden all that sap of heavenly excellency, which, by and by, shall be manifested in its full developed results of fruitfulness in Earth and Heaven. The tender sucker evidenced the character and excellency of that sap. Nevertheless, it was a root from which earth withheld her nourishment: and the tender sprout is seen here no more—it has been cut off: its life has been taken from the earth. Nevertheless neither the tender shoot nor the root nor the sap have perished. He whom we recognise as the tender shoot that hath been, shall soon be manifested as the “Branch of Jehovah, beautiful and glorious;” and “the root of Jesse shall stand for an ensign of the peoples (all nations shall gather unto it) and His rest shall be glorious.”

of truth and meekness" &c. And Ps. xxi. 5. "Honour and *majesty* hast thou laid upon him." No such outward majesty clothed Jesus of Nazareth. "I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people." Ps. xxii. 6.

There is no sightliness [or appearance] that we should desire it [or him.] Appearance, מראה—here used in its most general sense as denoting the whole aspect which the Messiah in the days of His suffering, outwardly presented. Israel saw no beauty in it—nothing that they deemed attractive. All was marred.

VERSE III.

Despised [was he] and ceasing from amongst men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with disease, and there was as it were a hiding of [his] face from us—despised [therefore] was he, and we regarded him not.

Despised was he.] This verse not only states the great fact that Jesus was "the despised one," but, in its central and virtually parenthetical clause (viz., that which comes between the twice repeated words, "despised was he") it gives the reason *why* He was despised. He was discerned to be one who refused to countenance the ordinary pursuits and interests of human life. As regarded men He was one that "ceased," *i.e.* He ceased from and forsook their ways. See the use of the verb חָרַל in sense of *forsake* in Judges ix. 9. The adjective חָרִיל is to be taken in an *active* sense, as in Ezek. iii. 27. See Hengstenbergh, and Alexander, and Delitzsch. But

though He ceased from the methods of men, and refused to tread their paths of greatness, and to drink the cup of their joys—though He stood amongst them as “a man of sorrows,” He was not listless or inactive. The world, morally and outwardly, was, in His sight, as one vast lazarus-house in which sin reigned in the power of death; and He stood in the midst of it as One acquainted with its disease. He took the place of One who sought acquaintance with its miseries and its diseases, that He might bring healing and salvation. “To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.” But human society and its leaders looked on the world as no lazarus-house. It was rather their paradise. They refused to recognise either the depth, or the extent, or the hopelessness of its woe. If Jesus had confined Himself simply to the relief of suffering, men would not have so hated Him; but when He spake of suffering as a consequence of sin, and as an evidence of God’s wrath against sin, and when in faithfulness He charged sin upon them, and on their ways, and, by withdrawal, discountenanced those ways, they despised and hated Him. They felt that there was on His part “a hiding of his face from them” in displeasure and grief; and it irritated them—the more, because their conscience told them that His reproof was just. Were they to receive such reproof from One whom all men despised?

They had never before seen any one who ceased from the ways of men, and withdrew Himself in the manner that Jesus did. All that men were doing secularly and

religiously, He refused to sanction. He acted as if the foundations of all things were out of course. He would wield neither the sword, nor the sceptre. He would not sit in the judgment-seat of the ruler, nor wear the robe of the priest, nor the garb of the philosopher. He stood in a place of lonely isolation. "By so doing thou condemnest us also," was the universal cry. Yet it was needful for Jehovah's righteous Servant to be thus separate. "Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as Jehovah's servant?" His eye and His ear were closed to the seductive sights and sounds of earth, but they were quick towards heaven and towards God. If as respected the ways of men, He was "one that ceased," in respect of God and of His ways He ceased not, but laboured and served, night and day, continually. They who are wise will seek grace humbly to follow in the same path.

נִבְזָה, is a very strong word expressive of contempt and loathing. Compare Malachi i. 7 and 12: and ii. 9. It should be taken as the niph'al participle in the end as well as the beginning of the verse, the participle having its abstract force—"a despised one was he."

יָדָע, though a passive participle, is sometimes used in the sense of "acquainted with." Alexander says, "Hengstenbergh and others have shown that the passive participle is employed like *acquainted* in English: so that there is no need of supposing any difference of text, or even that the passive form was used in an active sense. Compare Song of Solomon iii. 8. Ps. cxii. 7.

ciii. 14. Gesenius in his commentary characterizes this interpretation of the word as 'false,' but quietly adopts it in the second edition of his German version." *Alexander in locum.*

In the next clause מִתֵּיָר must certainly be taken as a substantive and not as the Hiphil participle which would be מִתֵּיָר. The rendering of מִמֵּנֵי "from us" is that which is adopted by the Sept. Vulgate, Chaldee, Aquila, Jarchi, Van der Palm and Jahn. See Hengstenbergh. It is a rendering that would, no doubt, have been adopted by all, if the central part of the verse, between the first and second "despised," had been taken as parenthetically describing the practical course and character of Jesus, and so giving the reason of His being despised.

In the next clause—"we regarded him not," regard is perhaps a somewhat better rendering of הִשָּׁב than *esteem*: but neither are very suitable. The word implies that Jesus was so despised that He was counted as nothing. He was not deemed worthy of being numbered as one of Israel. He was set down as nought. "Non reputavimus eum, scilicet, ullius rei. Sensus est, fuit apud nos quod Græcis dicitur, οὐτ' ἐν λογῶ, οὐτ' ἐν ἀριθμῶ."

VERSE IV.

Surely our infirmities he did himself take and our diseases bear: and we deemed him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted.

Surely.] אֲנִי, *surely, verily*, derived probably from

כִּי (see Gesenius), implying, therefore, *certainty, absence of all doubt*. Compare Gen. xxviii. 16. "*Surely Jehovah is in this place,*" &c.

Our infirmities he took &c.] The first clause of this verse is quoted in Matt. viii. 17, and is rendered: "himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." ΑΥΤΟΣ τας ασθενειας ημων ελαβεν, και τας νοσους εβαστασεν.

If Jesus relieved any of their afflictions or diseases, *in token that their sins were forgiven* (see Matt. ix. 5, 6) it was needful that compensation should be made to God's governmental holiness by equivalent sufferings on the part of Jesus. His sufferings were not identical in kind with those of the sinners whom He pardoned—His essential holiness forbade *that*: but they were sufferings afore appointed to Him as equivalent and compensatory. Jesus purchased His title to relieve His people from their guilt and its consequences by Himself incurring penalties, though not the same form of penalty.

We read in Matt. viii. 16, that Jesus in that favoured village where Peter dwelt, did in the case of all those whom "they brought unto him, cast out the spirits with his word, and heal all that were sick." It was a scene of joy and blessing. I regard it as *typical*, and intended to foreshadow that still future hour, when the cities and villages of Israel, having turned in faith to Him that healeth them, shall see "sorrow and sighing flee away," and "tears wiped from off all faces"—results which they shall recognise then as flowing from those past sufferings in life and death, whereby Jesus as the Substitute, purchased for them health and cure.

Jesus, therefore, was "a man of sorrows," not only because He mourned over evil and sympathised with human woe, but because He had undertaken to tread to the end an appointed path of suffering terminating in judicial death under wrath, in order that He might thereby earn to Himself the title to relieve and rescue His people. The *channels through which the appointed sufferings reached Him* were infinitely various; but the *object* was one—the redemption of His people. Israel, therefore, were not wrong in thinking that Jesus was smitten of God. He was smitten and afflicted by God, but not as they thought, because of His own sins. He had none; and their consciences told them that He had none. They ought, therefore, to have discerned that if afflicted, He was afflicted because of others. Their own Prophets and all their daily sacrifices had preached to them the vicarious sufferings of the Holy One. But they steeled themselves against the testimony both of facts and of Scripture.

We deemed him stricken.] נָגַע, rendered by Theodotion μεμαστιγωμενος—*plague-stricken*. Compare 2 Chron. xxvi. 20. "The Lord had smitten him." See also subsequent verse in Isaiah liii., where the substantive נָגַע is used—"because of the transgression of my people was the stroke upon him." "This word נָגַע, always signifies suffering as a calamity proceeding from God." Delitzsch.

Stricken of God.] מִכֶּה אֱלֹהִים—the genitive indicating the efficient cause. Compare Ps. cii. 4. "My heart is smitten and withered like grass." Also Is. v.

“Why should ye be *stricken* any more.” In both these passages the Hophal of נָכַר is used.

And afflicted.] The word here used עָנָה (Puhal part.) forcibly expresses the being brought down very low under the pressure of affliction. The cognate adjective frequently in our version translated “*poor*,” and sometimes (though less correctly) “*humble*,” is continually applied to the Lord to indicate the low estate into which affliction had brought Him. Thus Psalm lxi. 29. “I am *poor* [afflicted] and sorrowful.” Also Psalm cii. (title) “A prayer of the afflicted one:” and Psalm xli. “Blessed is he who considereth the afflicted one.” Hence the meaning of *Bethany*—the house of the afflicted one.

Of the three words so frequently used to describe our Lord in the days of His suffering—עָנִי, רַל, אֶבְיוֹן, the first expresses the condition of one pressed down under inflicted suffering: the second רַל, denotes the condition of *weakness* and *exhaustion* produced by suffering. See the use of רַלֶּל (from which רַל is derived) in Judges vi. 6, where it is translated *impoverished*, more properly, *exhausted*; and Is. xvii. 4: “the glory of Jacob shall be *made thin*.” Gesenius says רַל expresses that which is pendulous and swings to and fro, as too weak to resist the influences which cause it to vibrate. Compare Ps. cix. 23, “I am tossed up and down as the locust.” The third of these words, אֶבְיוֹן, which is continually used in association with עָנִי, and is generally translated “*needy*,” means the need and sense of longing desire for relief (from אָבַר to desire) which accompanies extreme suffering. Hence we read of “the sighing of the *needy*,”

and of "delivering *the needy* when he crieth," and of "the Lord hearing *the needy*."

VERSE V.

But he was wounded by reason of our transgressions; crushed because of our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we were healed.

He was wounded.] Or more literally, *He was a wounded one.* לָלַךְ of which the Participle Poal is here used, means *to pierce or perforate as with a sword*: hence *to wound unto death*. Compare Ps. cix. 22. "My heart is wounded within me."

By reason of, or because of our transgressions.] Literally, מִן from our transgressions. The source, or origin, whence the effect referred to emanates, is continually indicated by the prefix מִ. Our transgressions are here spoken of as the source whence the sufferings spoken of flowed out to our Substitute. Εκ is used similarly in Greek. Compare Gen. ix. 11. "All flesh shall not again be cut off by the waters," &c. (מִמֶּנּוּ) Also Ps. xxxvii. 23, "by Jehovah (מִיְהוָה) the steps of a man are established." See also Dan. viii. 11, (an attempt to alter the translation of which has been wrongly made by some) "by him (מִמֶּנּוּ) the daily sacrifice was taken away."

Crushed.] More literally, *a crushed one.* The verb נָרַךְ and its cognate נָרַק (see Gesenius) mean *to crush*. It is often used to indicate "crushing in indignation and wrath, as when Moses ground the golden calf" till

he *brought it to powder* (עָד אֲשֶׁר דָּק). In this sense it is applied to the *breaking in pieces* the great Gentile Image; and 2 Sam. xxii. 43 to *the crushing* of the nations by the power of Christ in the great day of visitation. “*I did stamp them like the mire in the streets.*” So Micah iv. 13. “*Thou shalt beat in pieces many peoples.*” See also the force of נָדָד in such passages as these: “*crushed before the moth.*” Job iv. 19. “*He hath crushed my life.*” Ps. cxliiii. 3. See also a subsequent verse of this chapter: “*it pleased Jehovah to bruise him.*” נָדָד is also applied in Hiphil to the holy perfume beaten *very small*, and so prepared to be burned for fragrance. Whatever the crushing of the Holy One, fragrance, and only fragrance, was the result. From *the crushing*, or from *the burning* of that which is *essentially* fragrance, nothing but fragrance can result.

The word translated “*transgressions*” (He was wounded by reason of our transgressions) is derived from נָשָׁב, to fall away, to break away from any one, just like the German, *mit jem. brechen*, to break with any one. Hence נָשָׁב, rebellious transgression. See Job xxxiv. 37. “*He addeth rebellion unto his sin.*”

The chastisement of our peace.] That is the chastisement or punishment (τιμωρια, κολασις, see Prov. vii. 22; and Jer. xxx. 14) by which our peace is purchased, was borne by Him. These, though primarily the words of repentant Israel, are words which all who now believe are entitled to appropriate. So also the next clause: “*and by his stripes we were healed*”—οὐ τῷ μῶλωπι ιαθητε, 1 Pet. ii. 24. No partial or incomplete healing this.

The wound caused by the stroke of wrath is for ever removed. How by any possibility could such a verse as this be explained, if the principle of the vicarious punishment of the innocent One for the guilty be not admitted? Alexander rightly observes that נָרְפָא is not a noun, but a passive verb used impersonally—"it was healed to us," *i.e.* "by his wound, healing was brought to us." None but believers are to be included under that "us."

VERSE VI.

All we like a flock went astray, each one to his own way turned, but Jehovah caused to fall on him the iniquity of us all.*

Like a flock.] Or more literally, "the flock." The article, in order to give vividness to the description, is often used in Hebrew and Greek in a deictic sense—pointing out the object as if present to our eyes. It was an universal associated wandering like that of a whole flock: yet it was also a wandering in which each individual member of the flock actively shared. "Each

* "The common version (laid upon him) is objectionable only because it is too weak, and suggests the idea of a mild and inoffensive gesture, whereas that conveyed by the Hebrew word is necessarily a *violent* one, *viz.*, that of causing to strike or fall."

"The meaning given to this word in the margin of the English Bible (*made to meet*) is not sustained by etymology or usage, as the primitive verb פָּגַע does not mean simply to come together, but always denotes some degree of hostile collision."—*Alexander in locum.*

one to his own way turned." But Jehovah caused our iniquity with all its consequences of wrath to strike upon Him—*hostiliter in eum irruere* (Kimchi)—to rush with all its destructive power on Him. The verb יָצַד with א means, *to meet in a hostile manner, to assault*. Compare 2 Sam. i. 15. "Go near and *fall upon* him. And he *smote* him that he died." In other passages our iniquity is spoken of as resting on the Holy One, and He bearing it. Here it is spoken of as coming upon Him like a destroying foe, and overwhelming Him with the wrath that it brought with it. Sin brings with it guilt; and guilt, wrath. It was *our sin—our guilt—not His*; yet He bore the wrath.

The words of this and the preceding verse, cannot be used by the world that believe not. They belong only to the family of faith. Primarily, they are the words of repentant Israel in the day when the veil shall be taken from their heart.

VERSE VII.

Oppressed was he [i.e. He was wrongfully oppressed by men] and yet he it was [i.e. the wrongfully oppressed one] who was humbled or brought low; [under further and augmented affliction] but he openeth not his mouth: like a lamb to the slaughter he is led, and yet, even as a sheep before her shearer is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

Oppressed was he &c.] The object of this verse as a whole, is to mark the meek and quiet subjection of

Jesus to His prolonged sufferings. He was the subject of cruel and unjust oppression, yet His persecutors were not crushed. God allowed them to pursue their course, and to accumulate sorrows on the head of the Holy One; and He patiently and meekly bowed His head to the infliction, and "opened not His mouth." At last He was led like a lamb to the slaughter, yet still, like a sheep dumb before her shearer, He opened not His mouth. In the last clause I follow the Septuagint as quoted in Acts viii., and regard } as marking the apodosis: in the three previous clauses I take it in its adversative sense as meaning, *and yet, nevertheless, or but.*

VERSE VIII.

In default of restraining power [for it was not exercised on His behalf], and in default of judgment [which was not exercised on His behalf] he was taken away; and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off from the land of the living; because of the transgression of my people was the stroke unto him: [or because of the transgression of my people was the stroke—with reference to them.]

In default of &c.] There is not a verse perhaps in the Scriptures respecting the translation of which there has been more controversy than respecting this. After carefully considering the various opinions that have

been advanced as to the meaning of בְּ in the first clause, I adopt its *privative* sense, viz., *apart from* or *without*.* One reason that has weighed with me is, that the rendering of the Septuagint adopted in the Acts, is in consonance with such a translation, but not with the other proposed renderings—the general meaning being, that right judgment was *not* exercised by those whose duty it was to have exercised it on His behalf.

They who held the power of government should have restrained the rage of evil men against *Him* in whom could be found “no fault at all:” but no restraint was exercised. There should have been righteous judgment exercised towards Him: but none was exercised. Consequently, He was taken away. “He was cut off out of the land of the living.” If it be asked, Why did Jehovah allow this?—the answer is, “because of the transgression of my people was the stroke—with reference to them,” (*προς αυτους*) that is, the stroke fell on Him in order that the saving results thereof might reach them. This is the translation I greatly prefer as retaining the proper plural force of בְּ . In the New Testament there are abundant instances of expletive

* Luzzatto and Henderson give בְּ the privative sense of *without*, and understand that He was taken off without restraint or authority. [Or rather that He was taken away without the restraint of authority being exercised on his behalf.] The same construction seems to have been anticipated by Zwingle who paraphrases the expression thus: *indictâ causâ citraque iudicium*—“*His cause unpleaded and without judgment.*” Alexander.

words added at the end of sentences. See *κατα σαρκα* in Rom. iv. 1 and *ευδοκίας* in Luke ii. 14.*

And who will of his generation tell?] Was it possible for the Messiah to belong to any age or generation, and for that age or generation not to be marked with honour, and glory, and blessing, so as for all men to magnify and speak well thereof? To this question Israel *have* answered, and *do* answer—It was impossible. They affirm that the generation to which the Messiah of Israel belongs must be one of exaltation and honour. Seeing, therefore, say they, that Jesus of Nazareth did not elevate the generation to which He belonged; seeing that He raised it to no dignity or honour, He cannot be our Messiah. Well; the Prophet declared that Jesus, when He came to be led as a lamb to the slaughter, would not elevate the generation to which outwardly (though not morally) He belonged. He could not elevate evil. Was it not a crooked and perverse generation? He came to die in it, and to gather His people out of it. His life, instead of remaining to make the generation to which He belonged illustrious, was taken from the earth. “He was cut off out of the land of the living.”

* Isaiah xlv. 15 has been referred to by many (see Delitzsch) as affording an example of *לְמִי* used in a singular sense: but this may be questioned, for there seems in that passage an intended reference to the multiplicity of the deities that the idol-maker manufactures for himself—as numerous as the trees of the forest out of which he carves them. It is right, however, to mention that even some of the most advanced in the infidel neologian school admit that *לְמִי* may sometimes be used in a singular sense. The passages, however, quoted by them do not prove it; but rather the reverse: nor do we need the concession.

VERSE IX.

And he made his sepulture with the wicked and with the rich, at his death; although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

He made his sepulture &c.] Christ not only died, He was also BURIED. His burial was an attestation to the reality of His death, and consequently, to the reality of His resurrection; for where there was no true death there could be no true resurrection. Moreover, since the effectuation of a finished atonement was dependent on His death, it was needful that the reality of His death should be indubitably attested.

Accordingly, Jesus not only gave Himself up to death, but He gave Himself also to be buried. His burial or sepulture (here denoted by "grave"—*grave* being used by a common figure of speech to denote *burial*) commenced when, after He had died, He was taken down from the Cross in order to be buried. In taking Him down from the Cross, and so preparing Him for burial, two classes of persons were concerned: first, His crucifiers (here called "the wicked") who ascertained the reality of His death, and delivered over His body to Joseph: secondly, there was the servant of God, Joseph (here called "the rich one") who took charge of that holy body, and, aided by Nicodemus, buried it in his own new tomb. Thus the enemies of God, and the servants of God, were both concerned in His sepulture, and both formally attested the reality of the death of Jesus.

But God had also another object in causing His ser-

vant Joseph to take possession of the holy body of Jesus. In so intervening and rescuing it from the hands of the wicked, and causing it to be buried with spices in a new tomb, He shewed that the time during which it was needful that the holy Substitute should be numbered with the transgressors was over. The penalty had been paid. Atonement was finished by His death. Jesus was no longer the Sin-bearer. The hand of Jehovah was no longer stretched out against Him. The cords of death, whilst they were being bound around Him, had caused Him bitter anguish. But though those cords were not broken, they caused Him anguish no longer. His body in the grave and His soul in Hades—both rested in peace. His tarriance in the grave was not designed as a prolongation of punishment. It was simply an attestation of the reality of that death which had terminated the punitive action of the hand of God against the Holy One. The “crushing” or “bruising” terminated with His death on the Cross.

The words, “in his death,” (or more literally, His *deaths*: the plural, as is usual in Hebrew, indicating the completeness and fulness of that spoken of) is to be regarded as the emphatic expression in the verse. Death in a terrible fulness of penal power had been caused to fall on Him; so that He died, and in token of the reality of His death was buried, *although** “He had done

* For the use of על in the sense of *although*, see Gesenius, who says: על conjunction for על אִשֶׁר, *although*. Job xvi. 17.

no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth. Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him." How could this have been, if Jesus had not been a vicarious sufferer?

It is true, indeed, that the burial of Jesus and His resurrection from the grave, were needful to the accomplishment of *the results* of redemption; but neither His burial, nor His resurrection, nor any of the offices that He now discharges for us in glory, are needful to the completion of that one atonement towards God which He finished on the Cross. "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that by the life maketh atonement."* Lev. xvii. 11. As soon, therefore, as Jesus had laid down His life, the atonement was complete. He ceased to be the sin-bearer, because the sin had been put away. And when He ceased to be the sin-bearer, He ceased to suffer. Whatever suffering He had known, either from the hand of the Father, or from the malice of Satan, or from the con-

עַל לֹא חָמַס בְּכַפִּי, "although there be no violence in my hands," xxxiv. 6; Is. liii. 9. See Calvin in locum, who here renders על by *quavis*. He says also: Quis inter scelestas et sanguineas istas manus obrutum ac sepultum Christum non judicet? Sic enim sepulchrum hęc metaphoricę accipio, quod impii et violenti eum veluti obruerint. Nam si quis objiciat Christum honorifice humatum esse respondeo *sepulturam istam initium esse gloriosę resurrectionis*—"that that burial was the commencement of His glorious resurrection."

* כִּי-הָדָם הוּא בִנְפֶשׁ יִכְפֹּר. "The sacrifice by which the expiation is made, is put with כִּי prefixed, 2 Sam. xxi. 3; Num. v. 8." Gesenius.

tradiction of sinners, ceased. He had no longer reason to say, "Oh that I had wings like a dove, for then would I fly away and be at rest" (Ps. lv. 6)—for the windy storm, and tempest, and the strife of man's city, were known by Him no longer. Though forsaken for a season on the Cross, as soon as He had finished His atoning work He was forsaken no longer; and in token of this, God sent His servant Joseph to take possession of His holy body, and to bear it to a prepared grave. That grave, therefore, was a grave of perfect peace. He entered it as One who was never again to know anguish. In that sense, His grave became to Him a place of *rest*, where His flesh was for a season to abide in peaceful confidence and hope. The grave was not indeed the place of His *sabbatic rest*: that is in glory: but as viewed in contrast with His previous sufferings, the grave was to Him in a very intelligible sense a place of rest. The moment after He had said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," the sword which had awaked against Him was sheathed; the hand that had "bruised" Him, bruised Him no longer, but was turned upon Him as a hand that ministered only comfort, sustainment, and peace. His soul during its tarrance in Hades was not in the place of the lost, but in the place of the blessed. He entered Hades not as the Sin-bearer, but as one who *had* borne, and who *had* for ever put away His people's sins. He entered it as the Conqueror. He entered it with the power of accomplished atonement in His hand. And as soon as the necessary evidence of the reality of His death had been afforded, by the tarrance, during the appointed

season, of His body in the grave, and of His soul in Hades (a tarriance that was one of peace) He brake the bars of His temporary prison-house, and showed that death had no title over Him. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."*

VERSE X.

Yet Jehovah was pleased to crush him: he put him to grief: when thou shalt have made his soul an offering for sin [literally trespass] he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.

To crush him.] For remarks on נִכַּץ and its cognate נִכָּח see page 199.

When thou shalt have made his soul &c.] Some render thus: "when his soul shall make an offering for trespass," but the other translation is greatly to be pre-

* In page 11, in my remarks on the Sabbath, I have, in a note, quoted a passage from the sixteenth Psalm, not with sufficient accuracy. In our version the passage is translated, "my flesh shall rest in hope," as also in its quotation in Acts ii. 26. The literal translation, however, is, "my flesh shall abide, or dwell in hope, or hopeful confidence."

In the same way, a passage in Ps. lv., "then would I fly away and be at rest," should be rendered, "then would I fly away and abide, or remain." It is true, indeed, that the word so used, being contrasted with the scene of confusion that had been left, does necessarily involve the thought of quietness and rest, but it embodies that meaning not in virtue of its own independent signification, but in virtue of its being used contrastedly. To remain in a place removed from tumult, and confusion, and suffering, is in a very intelligible sense, rest.

ferred. The punitive action of *the hand of Jehovah against Christ* is the great theme of this verse.

The words, "when thou shalt make his soul trespass" (the way in which the Hebrew expresses, "when thou shalt make his soul *an offering for trespass*,") closely resemble the words of Lev. xvi. : "he [Aaron] *shall make it [the victim] sin*"—"trespass" and "sin" being the words by which *the offering for trespass*, and *the offering for sin*, were respectively denoted. Hence the words of the Apostle in the Corinthians : "God made him to be sin for us who knew no sin." The expressions in all the three passages are *sacrificial*.

In Leviticus xvi. we find that the victim appointed for the sin-offering was first to be presented before the Lord, in order that its unblemished condition and its fitness to be an offering might be formally recognised.

Secondly, when it had thus been accepted as fit to be a substitutional victim, it was slain : certain parts were "burned up" (שָׂרֵף) without the camp, and afterwards its fat was burned for fragrance (קָטַר) on the altar ; and when this and the other appointed ceremonies had been performed, the priest was then said to have "made it sin," or a sin-offering. Throughout no part of the ceremony, was the victim regarded as tainted or rendered unclean by the guilt that had been typically transferred to it by those who had laid their unclean hands on its head. It was not regarded as so identified with the guilt which it substitutionally bore, as for its own personal unblemished condition to cease to be recognised. On the contrary, it was absolutely necessary that

its own unblemished condition should be recognised *throughout*—the concluding attestation to which was, that *the fat* of the sin-offering whose body was “burned up” without the gate, was burned for fragrance on the altar.

So also was it with the true sacrifice. God “made him to be sin for us,” when He caused Him to be offered as the one expiatory victim. Throughout the whole course of the expiation, the personal condition of the holy victim never ceased to be recognised. He was regarded as personally untainted by the guilt that He vicariously bore. He was not in the actual condition of the sinners for whom He suffered; He had not taken upon Himself the defiled life or defiled state of being that pertained to those in whose stead He suffered; nor was the apprehension of His personal excellency and of the value of His substitutional service lost in the blackness of the sins whose punishment He vicariously bore. On the contrary, whilst being “made a curse for us,” He did, “at the same time” give “Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.” If our thoughts concerning the Cross and the atonement thereon completed, do not bear the test of these last quoted words—if we connect with the truth that Christ was made a curse for us, or “made sin for us,” no thought that answers to the type of the fat of the sin-offering being burned for fragrance on the altar, our thoughts respecting the Cross, and respecting atonement, must be fatally erroneous.*

* For our Substitute to have borne *the penalties* appointed to Him because of the sin that attached to *our* life, or to our state of

VERSE XI.

Of the travail of his soul he shall see : he shall be satisfied : by acquaintance with himself shall the righteous One, my servant, bring righteousness unto the many ; and their iniquities he will himself bear.

Of the travail of his soul &c.] The result of the travail of His soul He shall see &c.

By acquaintance with himself.] That is, the acquaintance which faith hath. "The doctrine," says Calvin, "which Christ delivers respecting the obtaining right-

being, is a very different thing from having our sin attached to *His* life, or state of being. Righteousness always attached inseparably to *His* life, and *His* state of being, as much on the Cross as now. If the sin that attaches to our life had been caused to attach to His life (a thing indeed impossible) it would have been *impartation*—not *imputation*, and in becoming the Sin-bearer the Holy One would have become personally defiled. Consequently, there could have been no atonement.

"The word, 'sin,' says Dr. Hodge, is habitually used in Scripture to set forth moral evil in three aspects or relations :

"I. Sin considered as to its formal nature ; that is, as transgression of God's law.

"II. Sin considered as a moral quality inherent in the soul of the agent, as pollution, *macula*, [indwelling sin].

"III. Sin considered with respect to its legal obligation to punishment, as *guilt*, *reatus*.

"In this last sense it is used in all those passages which speak of 'bearing sin,' of 'laying on iniquities,' of 'imputing sin' &c. In this sense the Hebrew words for sin, חַטָּאת, and guilt אִשָּׁם, were used to designate the sacrifices which were made to suffer vicariously &c. . . . It is an absurdity for which no class of Reformed theologians have ever been responsible, to represent per-

ousness, is the knowledge of Himself. This is no other than faith ; we laying hold of the efficacy of His death, and so resting in Him."

Shall the righteous One.] For remarks on this verse see the preceding paper, page 159. As an instance of the daring of what is called critical sagacity, we may instance the proposal of Bishop Lowth to omit this word, (though it is found in all MSS,) simply because it precedes its substantive *here*, and therefore violates the Hebrew rule which requires that the substantive should precede its adjective. But it was meet that the Son as the essentially Righteous One should be spoken of in

sonal character, either good or bad, as transferable from one person to another by imputation. All that can be imputed from person to person is the guilt or legal obligation to punishment of any sin, and that only in those cases in which the person to whom it is imputed has become in some way or other, justly responsible for the action of the person the guilt of whose sin is imputed." *Hodge on Atonement*, p. 158.

Again the same writer says: "Imputation is an act of God as sovereign judge, at once judicial and sovereign, whereby He,— I. Makes the guilt, legal responsibility of our sins, really Christ's, and punishes them in Him : and, II. Makes the merit, legal rights of Christ's righteousness, ours, and then treats us as persons legally invested with all those rights." *Hodge's Outline of Theology*, page 393.

The Lord Jesus having voluntarily undertaken to be the Surety of His people, to Him in that relation penalties became *legally* due. It must be remembered too, that as Christ was not made a sinner by the imputation of our guilt, so neither was his own *personal* excellency affected by the imputation of our guilt. He remained the Holy One in the integrity of His Person as God and man, throughout the whole period of the imputation of our sin, and was ever so recognised by God.

this character *first*, before He is spoken of as the One, who as the Servant, manifested that righteousness in a course of prescribed obedience in the earth that by means of that obedience He might bring righteousness to us. "Righteous" is not an adjective *attached to* "Servant." It is an adjective attached to One who is unnamed, who, being essentially and from eternity "the Righteous One, became for our sake the Servant, by which servanthip He provided for us a meritorious righteousness, bringing the value of His own essential righteousness into it.

Bring righteousness unto.] Carefully mark the distinction between לְהַצְדִּיק *to bring righteousness unto*, or *to constitute righteous*, which is the work of Christ, and הַצְדִּיק simply, which means *to justify*, and is the act of God as a Judge.

The Hebrew word which we are accustomed to render "justify" (in Greek δικαιω) is the Hiphil of צָדַק.*

"I am a great King, saith the Lord of Hosts." As a King, He has certain principles of government founded on His own essential holiness. He must, therefore, as

* The proper force of the Hiphil voice is to express *causative* action. If Kal expresses a state or condition, the verb in Hiphil expresses an action *causative* of that state or condition.

In Kal the prevailing meaning of צָדַק is to be in a state of righteousness, or else "to have a just plea" in a forensic sense. God, as a Judge, when He justifies us after we have believed, does not, in His character of Judge, cause to us either the possession of a condition of righteousness, or the possession of a just plea. His office as a Judge is to cause to us by an authoritative sentence, *the formal recognition* of our being possessed of a just plea.

our King, determine whether or not, our condition is in conformity with the requirements of His holy government. This necessarily places Him towards us in the relation of a JUDGE. It is of Him *in this relation* that the word we render "justify" (Hiphil of **צָדַק**) is used. Whenever we speak of God *justifying*, the relation in which we contemplate Him is exclusively that of a Judge.

If any mere man say, "I am in the full and proper sense righteous," that is to say, "I answer and ever have answered to the standard by which God in His judicial holiness, measures perfectness," God replies by saying, "There is not a righteous man upon earth." Ecc. vii. 20. "All sinned, and are short of the glory of God." The heart of man says, "But I will make myself righteous." To this God replies, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" Moreover, penalties have been by transgression incurred. How can the incurred penalties be met? Man says; "Then let God change me and make me perfect." To this God replies, "My present relation to thee is that of *a Judge*; and thy relation to me is that of a criminal." It pertains not to the office of a Judge, nay more, it would be contrary to the duty of a Judge, either to put in pleas for a criminal, or to make a criminal righteous. The one necessary duty of a Judge is to pronounce on all who stand before him, a truthful sentence—truthful according to the law by which they are tried. Unless the claims of the Judicial Courts of God be first satisfied, so that He can *as a Judge* say that we are right (*en règle*) in relation to the claims of His Courts, we cannot

be regarded as standing in any relation to Him, save that of criminals, over whose heads eternal wrath impends.

There could, therefore, be no hope for such as we, unless the Courts of God admitted the principle of substitutional righteousness. This they do admit. It is a lawfully provided *mercy*. They admit the validity of a plea founded on the fact that Another has in our stead (that is to say, in the stead of all His believing people) rendered a prescribed obedience, and borne prescribed sufferings. All who put in this plea are regarded as *substitutionally* righteous. They are regarded as "right" [*en règle*] in relation to the claims of God's Courts, quite as truly as if they had been able to plead that they had *personally* met the claims of those Courts. God as a Judge, pronounces their claim to be regarded as *substitutionally* righteous, to be valid; and by such pronouncement they are justified. His act *as a Judge*, in justifying, does not bring or cause to them *the possession* of a state of substitutional righteousness, much less the possession of a state of actual righteousness. What it causes to them is the recognition, or acknowledgment of their being possessed (on grounds altogether apart from anything that He does *as a Judge*) of a state of substitutional righteousness. And that recognition is formal and authoritative: and is grounded on the fact of the righteousness being possessed by them as believers, before its possession is adjudicated on and acknowledged. The adjudication does not give the possession, but causes it to be recognised. To test the

validity of our claim to be possessed of a substitutional righteousness, and if valid, to authoritatively pronounce it valid, and to secure to us the results, is the part of our Righteous Judge: but it is no part of His office *as our Judge* to supply the ground of our claim. Nor does He *as the Judge* make the claim valid: He determines whether or not it be valid: and if it be, by His adjudication, He causes to us the acknowledgment of its validity, and so secures to us the practical consequences.

In every discussion, therefore, respecting the meaning of *הַצְדִּיק*, *to justify*, in reference to us as sinners, we have to consider:

I. Whether in the passage under consideration it be used of *God as a Judge*.

II. We have to remember that if it be so used of God, it does not mean that *in justifying* He causes to us, or brings to us a condition of righteousness, substitutional or otherwise. His act *as a Judge*, is not to give righteousness, but formally to recognise its possession by those who have it.

III. The condition of righteousness so recognised as being possessed by believers must be a condition of *substitutional* righteousness only.

The truth of this last statement does not depend on any argument that can be founded on the grammatical meaning of *הַצְדִּיק*. In certain cases *הַצְדִּיק* *to justify*, might indicate the recognition of the possession of personal righteousness, as for example, when *it* is applied (as once it is) to Christ—"He is near that justifieth me." Is. l. 8. It is not grammatical rule, but the

necessity of fact which proves that *in our case* (we being justified when personally ungodly) the word can only mean the pronouncing us to be possessed of *substitutional* righteousness; for when justified we have no other. Therefore, if ten thousand instances could be quoted, in which, in certain connexions צדק in Hiphil may indicate the act of a judge causing the recognition of the possession of a *personal* condition of righteousness, or of the possession of a plea rightly founded on the possession of such personal righteousness, such instances could have no bearing whatever on the question respecting our justification, because the Word of God lays it down as an axiomatic truth that justifying righteousness can *in our case* never be other than that provided for us in a Substitute.

The righteousness, however, that we substitutionally possess is a real and a perfect righteousness. Christ by His personal obedience supplied it. Therefore, although personally sinners, and pleading as sinners, we plead, nevertheless, that we are possessed of a perfect righteousness in virtue of the substitutional work of Another. And seeing that our Substitute has also, in our stead, borne every penalty, we plead that the claims of God's Courts (seeing that they recognise this substitutional service on our behalf) have been fully answered.

It is also obvious that no expression that is applied to Christ *as the provider of this substitutional righteousness for our justification* can by any possibility denote that He makes us personally righteous *in order that we might be justified*. In that case, we should not need a substi-

tutional righteousness in order to be justified. In the whole solemn transaction it is assumed that Christ, in order that we might be fully and finally justified, has provided for us a substitutional righteousness, because we are devoid of a personal righteousness. Therefore, when the Scripture says, "by acquaintance with himself shall the Righteous One, my servant, bring righteousness unto the many," the necessity of the case proves that He is not spoken of as communicating a condition of personal perfectness. The acknowledged circumstances of the case require, that the righteousness spoken of should be a substitutional righteousness, provided for those who require such substitutional righteousness, because they are confessedly devoid of personal righteousness. As God, *in the character of a Judge*, could not provide a righteousness for those whom He is engaged in judging: so Christ, *as a Substitute*, could not provide any righteousness except a substitutional righteousness for those for whom He acts as a Substitute. The meaning, therefore, of the words, "bring righteousness unto" (which are the words of Isaiah) or of the equivalent expression, "constitute righteous," (which are the words of the Apostle) is not to be determined upon mere grammatical grounds. It is not a question of what the word *may* mean in certain connexions: it is a question of what they *must* by the necessity of the case mean, viewed in connexion with the circumstances in which they are employed. The rules of grammar are not violated. But words, grammatically used, may vary in signification according to the nature of the subject-matter about

which they are employed. God, when spoken of as a Judge, can only be causative of such things as a Judge can righteously be causative of: and Christ, *when spoken of in respect of His substitutional service on our behalf*, can only be causative to us of such results as can from such substitutional service flow.

And [not for] their iniquities he himself shall bear.] If any one should ask what becomes of the iniquities of those to whom the Righteous One brings righteousness, the answer is, "He will himself bear them."

In a recent publication (the object of which was to set aside the truth taught in the preceding clause of this verse respecting the righteousness provided for us in the obedience of our Divine Substitute) I observed this clause quoted, and the word FOR printed in capital letters that it might be rendered emphatic. Hence it was argued that the only means by which our Surety brings righteousness to His people is by being the bearer of their iniquities.

This is equivalent to saying that there can be atonement without the offering of a sweet smelling savour. But the Prophet does not use the word "*for*," but AND. The emphatic, or as Dr. Smeaton terms it, the "grounding" for, in Hebrew, is not expressed by ׀, but by ׁ. Compare Jer. xxxi. 34 and Heb. viii. 12.

It has been rightly said that the whole suffering of our Substitute was *obediential suffering*, and His whole obedience was *sufferential obedience*. He suffered whilst He obeyed; and He obeyed whilst He suffered. His obedience and His suffering (distinguishable in thought,

though not in fact), concur in constituting the one SATISFACTION. Our inability to render the required obedience was met by the vicarious service of our Surety regarded as an "obedience;" our amenability to penal suffering was met by the vicarious service of our Surety in bearing penal suffering.

He shall bear.] *Bear as a burden*, as in the 4th verse: these two verses being the only place in the Scripture in which סבל, βαρταζω (see Matt. viii. 17) is applied to our Substitute. The thought that predominates in סבל is endurance—pressure under a heavy burden. In this, it differs from נשא as used in this chapter: for נשא directs our minds, first, to the active and willing love of the great Sufferer in taking on Himself our responsibilities (see verse 4); secondly, (as in verse 12) to His bearing up the mighty burden to the appointed place of judgment. See succeeding note. The passive thought predominates in סבל, the active in נשא, as here used.

VERSE XII.

Accordingly will I divide to him a portion amongst the many, and mighty ones he shall divide as spoil, in return for that he laid bare unto death his soul; and with transgressors was numbered, and himself brought up [to judgment] the sin of many, and for transgressors intercedeth.

Accordingly.] לְכֵן, with reference to its being so—apa.

Among THE many.] Not amongst Israel merely, but amongst the Gentiles.

And the mighty.] To be fulfilled in the millennial

age. *Then* all kings shall bow down before Him, all nations shall serve Him. See Psalm lxxii. "Therefore shall the strong people (Israel) glorify thee; the city of the terrible nations (Gentiles) shall fear thee." Isaiah xxv. 3.

In return for that.] תחת אשר. The thought of compensation (as in *αντι* in Greek) being here made prominent.

He laid bare.] הוערה. This being the literal meaning of *וה* in Hiphil, it seems best to preserve it here. See Alexander.

And himself the sin of many bare.] No longer here "the many" as contrasting Israel with mankind at large. "Many" is here used as the opposite to *few*. He gave His life "a ransom for many"—*λυτρον αντι πολλων*.

Brought up, or bore up.] This word refers not to Jehovah; nor to Christ in any relation but *one*, namely, when as the Servant of Jehovah and our Substitute, He *brought up* our sins to meet judgment and wrath in that place where He laid bare His soul unto death.

In other connexions, *שנ* may mean to take up, and take away iniquity, and so, "to forgive;" as in Hosea, "Take away all iniquity:" but it never can mean "forgive" when used to direct our minds to the act of Christ, in bearing, as our Substitute, our sin.

The connexion of thought here is the same as in Heb. ix. 27. "As it is appointed unto men once to die, and after death, the judgment." "This is God's appointment to men as men. If believers are to be exempted

from this judgment, and if Christ is, in their case, to return, not to judgment, but to salvation, (see Heb. ix. 28) it is necessary that we should be able to plead that our sins have already been brought up to judgment. This we are able to say, Christ, as our Substitute, has borne up (*αναφερω*, נשׂ) our sins to judgment—*ανηνεγκε*. [*εις κρισιν*] He did this when “offered” (*προσευχθεις*)—in other words, when He laid bare His soul unto death. In נשׂ the thought of holding *up*, or bringing *up*, or taking *up*, always lies hid; with what variation in the application the context will show. Even if *αναφερω* had not been used in Heb. ix. 28 as explanatory of the meaning of נשׂ in this verse, the preceding clause in Isaiah would have shown us that our Substitute is spoken of as carrying, or bearing up our sins to the place of judgment—even that place where He laid bare His soul unto death.

If Jesus took our sins upon Himself, (נשׂ, *λαμβάνω*, Is. liii. 4 and Matt. viii. 17,) and bore them as a burden, (מבל) it was necessary that He should carry them up (נשׂ), *αναφερω*, Is. liii. 12, Heb. ix. 28) to meet the appointed judgment; otherwise, they could not be put away.

For transgressors intercedeth.] Or continueth to intercede. It is the continuous future, used, both in the New Testament and in the Old, to express the continuity of a commenced action or condition. The intercession of our Substitute continueth. “He, because He continueth ever, hath an untransmitted (*απαρβατον*) priesthood. Wherefore also He is able to save them to the uttermost

that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." The *chief* aspect, in which Jesus is presented in this chapter, is as *the Sacrifice*; it was not meet that it should close without some distinct reference to Him as *the Priest*.

On the Imputation of Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness.

NOTHING can be more important, than that we should well understand all that God has been pleased to reveal respecting the relation in which we naturally stand before Him as sinners ; and also respecting the methods of His grace in bringing to us reconciliation and peace. His wisdom has determined the extent of the revelation. He has not revealed all that *might be* known, or all that finally *will be* known ; but He has revealed enough “to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” There is not one, therefore, of the communications that He is pleased to make to us in His Word that can be dispensed with, if we would walk in well-pleasing,—if we would be “thoroughly furnished.” All His instructions, too, are given in loving-kindness and mercy as well as wisdom. Light, indeed, may not always be welcome ; for it may penetrate and expose secrets of darkness ; but the light that God sendeth, whatsoever its immediate consequence, is sent in mercy, that it might guide *to* mercy.

In receiving, however, the instructions of God, it is peculiarly needful that we should be as “little children.”

“Verily, I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Reverential subjection to authority is one of the characteristics of “little children.” God, in His Word, teaches us authoritatively. He has not said that what He teaches shall, to the apprehensions of our minds, be devoid of difficulty. Yet, whatever the difficulty, we receive it, because He who declares it to us is God. Whatever may be our attainments in knowledge, even under the teaching of God’s own Spirit, yet, whilst on earth, we can never know save in part. “We know in part, and we prophecy in part.” So partial is our knowledge, so essentially is it marked by imperfectness, that in glory, it will not be regarded as worthy of being called knowledge, and is, therefore, spoken of as “vanishing away.” How then can they, who have partial knowledge and limited powers of apprehension, expect to find in the school of God no difficulties? The substantive truths which He has revealed are plain; the aspects in which they are presented are likewise plain; yet, by the truths, and also by the aspects, there is instantly awakened in our minds, an infinity of questions which it is not God’s intention to answer now. He requires (and is not the requirement just?) that we should have confidence in *Him*—that we should confide in His character, His truthfulness, wisdom, righteousness, and love. Shall we reply against God? Shall we not rather bow before Him, and say, “Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?” “He shall be justified when He speaketh, and overcome when He is judged.”

God is our King: He is the Sovereign Lord of all His creatures. To the elect angels who have not sinned, that relation is one of unmingled blessing, for they have not become amenable to His judgment. But with us, seeing that we are fallen, it is otherwise. Our relation to our Sovereign is one of sin, and therefore of criminality. The judicial courts of our Sovereign have a claim against us. His relation, therefore, to us, is not merely that of a King: it is the relation of a King whose laws have been outraged—whom, consequently, we have to meet as a Judge. Is it not expedient that we should know this, and be instructed as to the cause and character of our criminality? Accordingly, God in His Word teaches us respecting our guilt, and explains to us its cause.

First, He makes known to us that we are born under the imputation of Adam's first sin committed by him whilst he stood as our appointed representative in Paradise. This is a truth against which the heart of man peculiarly rebels. Execrating the thought of being ruined by the act of a representative, it exalts itself into the judgment-seat, passes sentence on the ways of God, and pronounces them unjust. Yet, when brought to submit ourselves to the lessons of God, what truth do we find to be, in result, more full of blessing? How do we bless God that He has been pleased to admit into His methods, the principle of representative action! If there has been one whose representative action has entailed condemnation and death, is there not Another whose representative action has brought justification and life?

“By ONE OFFENCE* judgment came unto all men unto condemnation.” In these words, God authoritatively reveals that the “one offence” of Adam supplies the ground on which, exclusively, the action of His hand, in judgment, is based. This action in judgment is directed against all those whom Adam represented; and he represented all his natural descendants. In like manner, “By ONE RIGHTEOUSNESS † the free gift came unto all men unto justification of life.” Here it is revealed that Christ’s “one righteousness” (for His whole life was one prolonged act of righteousness ‡) supplies the ground on which God rests all the action of His hand in everlasting grace unto all men who have Christ as their Representative; and Christ is the Representative of all them that believe.

In a previous part of the same chapter, the same truth is taught even more fully. “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by means of sin, and so death penetrated unto all men, on the ground that all sinned.” Observe the concluding words. The Apostle does not say, “on the ground that all had become sinful and corrupt:” he says, “on the ground that (εφ’ ᾧ) they sinned,” *i.e.* did, at some former period, sin. Now this cannot mean, personally committed sin. We were not

* Δι’ ἑνος παραπτώματος.

† Δι’ ἑνος δικαιοματος.

‡ The “one righteousness” is defined, in the succeeding verse, as being an “*obedience*.” The “one righteousness,” and “the *obedience* of the One” are co-extensive. They extended through the whole life of the Substitute.

personally in Paradise. Men cannot sin personally before they are born. Nevertheless, before we have sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression by personally breaking a known commandment, death may be truly said to have "penetrated unto us;" for we are all born under the sure sentence of death, before we actually die. Moreover, many infants and idiots actually die without ever breaking any recognised commandment.* Adam's representative headship explains these things, but nothing else could. Apart from any question of personal transgression, we are in the Courts of God regarded as having sinned when our legal representative sinned. †

Accordingly, the acknowledgment of this truth has justly been insisted on by orthodox Protestants. Beza and Turretine earnestly maintained it. In A.D. 1644 a Protestant Pastor in France, named Placæus, having impugned it, a French Protestant Synod was assembled, and passed the following decree.

* Not that such are lost. On the contrary, it can be proved from Scripture, that all who die without having attained to a condition of personal responsibility, are saved in Christ.

† Attempts have been made by some (chiefly mystics or neologians) to subvert the doctrine of Scripture on this subject, by inventing the fiction of an abstract generic humanity, which humanity, they say, sinned when Adam sinned—and seeing that this generic humanity was as much ours as it was his, we, though not personally in Paradise, did nevertheless sin, quite as actually as Adam, when the common humanity sinned. The folly, as well as the evil of such a doctrine, it is impossible to overrate. It has been truly said, that no determinate dividing line can be drawn between Realism (and this doctrine belongs to that school), and

“ There was a report made in Synod, of a certain writing both printed and manuscript, holding forth this doctrine, that the whole nature of original sin consisted only in that corruption which is hereditary to all Adam’s posterity, and residing originally in all men, and denying the imputation of his first sin. This Synod condemneth the said doctrine as far as it restraineth the doctrine of original sin to the sole hereditary corruption of Adam’s posterity, to the excluding of the imputation of that first sin by which he fell; and interdicteth, on pain of all Church censure, all pastors, professors and others, who shall treat of this question, to depart from *the common received opinion of the Protestant Churches, who (over and besides that corruption) have all acknowledged the imputation of Adam’s first sin to his posterity.*” *

infidel Pantheism. See some valuable remarks on this subject, in Hodge on Atonement, page 93 to 99, and Dr. Charles Hodge on Romans, p. 151.

This doctrine is the more to be watched against, because it prepares the way for the reception of another doctrine not less dangerous, viz.: that believers, are, in other than a *representative* sense, now in Heaven. It is true, indeed, that *as viewed in Christ*, their risen Head and Representative, they are said to be in heavenly places—“seated in heavenly places *IN HIM*. It is true, also, that *BY FAITH* we enter the Holiest of all: but this is neither an actual nor a personal presence there: nor would any one tolerate a notion so palpably false, unless they were beguiled and bewildered by some form of philosophic mysticism, such as that to which I have referred.

* Quick’s Synodicon, Vol. II., p. 473, as quoted in Hodge on the Atonement, p. 85. The italics are mine.

Dr. Owen, after quoting the text, "by one man sin entered into the world" &c., says:

"It is hence manifest what sin it is that the Apostle
 "intends, namely, the actual sin of Adam; the one sin
 "of that one common person, whilst he was so. For,
 "although the corruption and depravation of our nature
 "doth necessarily ensue thereon in every one that is
 "brought forth actually in the world by natural gener-
 "ation, yet it is the guilt of Adam's first sin alone that
 "rendered them all obnoxious unto death upon the first
 "entrance of sin into the world." *Owen on Justifica-
 tion.* p. 399.

During the wane of orthodox Protestantism, and the advance during the last and present century of Arminian, Socinian and Neologian doctrines, this foundation article of our faith became more and more obscured. From carelessness, perhaps, rather than from design, Edwards in America, and Chalmers in Scotland rejected it; though the latter lived to be convinced of his error and acknowledged it. "It is most gratifying to notice," says Dr. Cunningham, "that Dr. Chalmers upon a more
 "careful and deliberate study of this subject, renounced
 "the defective and erroneous view which he had im-
 "bibed from Edwards; and that in his great work, the
 "Institutes of Theology, he, with the candour and mag-
 "nanimity of a great mind, retracted his error, and sup-
 "ported the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin
 "as it has been generally held by Calvinistic divines." *Cunningham's Theology of the Reformation.* p. 384.

At this present hour, however, when a great "with-

drawal" from the faith is taking place around us, there are comparatively few who hold fast this great and vital doctrine. There are few who are ready to say with Cunningham :

"The first ingredient or constituent element of the
 " sinfulness of man's natural condition, is Adam's first
 " sin. . . . Men as they come into the world, are, in
 " point of fact, in such a position, that the guilt of
 " Adam's first sin is imputed to them, or put down to
 " their account." *Cunningham.*

Calvin in reply to a cavilling opponent says, "If it
 " were proposed to thee to subject God to the laws of
 " nature, thou wouldest condemn Him as unjust because
 " that on account of one man's offence all men are held
 " to be involved in guilt and amenable unto eternal
 " death. One man sinned, all are delivered over to
 " punishment, and not only so, but all contract a con-
 " tagion from the vice of one." *

* Calvin as quoted by Turretine. See his works, Vol. I., p. 693. Quæ ix. de Peccato.

This quotation is important, as Calvin has been suspected of not holding this doctrine. The truth is, that the early Reformers had their attention directed, not so much to the doctrines which the Church of Rome did *not* explicitly deny, as to those which they did deny. At the Council of Trent, the imputation of Adam's first sin was not expressly rejected. On the contrary, some of the ultra-Romanists were strenuous in their efforts to obtain the acknowledgment of the doctrine. [See, as to this, *Doctrines of Popery*, page 21, as advertised at end.] This they did, not from love of truth, but because they wished, by the acknowledgment of the imputation of Adam's first sin, to set aside the doctrine of the transmission of his corrupt nature to his descendants. By limit-

Beza says : " There are three things that constitute a man guilty before God.

" I. The criminality that flows from the fact that we all sinned in the first man.

" II. The corruption *which is the penal consequence of* that criminality, imposed both on Adam and his posterity.

" III. The sins which men, when grown up, commit."

This statement of Beza is, indeed, true. Our criminality before God is primarily founded on the imputation of Adam's first sin. The spring and source of human woe is found in that sin. As the result and penal consequence of the criminality that attaches to us, because of that sin, we are born with corrupt natures, and sin dwells and reigns in us. Lastly, our corrupt natures

ing the consequences of Adam's fall to the imputation of his sin, they thought, apparently, that it would be more easy to maintain their dogma respecting Baptism, which, they said, removed the imputation of Adam's sin. Many in the Council, especially the Bishops, favoured this view; but the Theologians, as a body, opposed it. There were, apparently, several reasons that moved them to this. First; many (as Bellarmine afterwards did) would have pronounced such a bare-faced denial of hereditary corruption to be heresy. Secondly; it magnified the efficacy of Baptism to say, (as in their Canon they do say) that nothing, that has properly the nature of sin, remains in those who are rightly baptized. Thirdly; they were quick-sighted enough to see, that if they allowed the imputation of Adam's first sin to be the sole ground on which condemnation came, it would be impossible for them to deny that Christ's obedience imputed is the sole ground on which justification comes. The doctrine of Adam's sin imputed, and Christ's righteousness imputed, stand or fall together. Accordingly, they resolved, not indeed to deny that the Scripture *does*

manifest themselves in inward and outward developments, whereby we become personally transgressors, and the aggregate of guilt becomes each day augmented.

The fact that the action of the Divine hand against us in judgment is founded on the first sin of Adam, necessarily gives to that sin a character that can attach to no other. It occupies a sphere that pertains to itself alone. The sentence of death, a sentence involving (if not arrested) eternal death, is pronounced over us, solely because of the imputation of that first sin. Correspondingly, the sentence of life is pronounced over us, solely on the ground of a righteousness wrought out for us by Another. We bless God for this parallelism: yet there is a difference. All the sins that we as men commit, are so far like the sin of our first parent, that, like his, they merit and receive wrath and condemnation. *Evil desert*

speak of Adam's sin being imputed (they were afraid to do *that*), but they determined to blend with it the doctrine of imparted corruption, so as to make the sin *imputed*, and the corruption *imparted*—the joint ground of the primary condemnation: that so, the external work of Christ for us might not be made the *sole* ground of our justification, but that there might be conjoined with His *external* work an internal work, as forming also the ground of our justification. Those who really love and cleave to the Truth would be willing to lay down their lives rather than assent to such a statement.

Some of the early Reformers were so engrossed in opposing the falsehoods of the Romanists respecting the natural condition of the human heart, and respecting Baptism, and respecting concupiscence, (which, if resisted, the Romanists affirmed not to be sin), that for a time, their attention was less directed than it should have been, to questions connected with the imputation of Adam's first sin.

attaches to them. They go to swell the aggregate of that guilt, which, in the case of the unpardoned, will form the ground of the final sentence. But in the case of the righteousness whereby we, as believers, are constituted righteous, it is otherwise. *That* not only occupies a sphere of its own, as being the ground on which the action of the Divine hand toward us in everlasting grace is founded, but further, it is altogether *sui generis*. It is singular and peculiar: and marked by characteristics that essentially distinguish it from any righteousness that can be found in the creature. As it is said of the holy perfume, "Ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people;" so is it with the righteousness of our God and Saviour. It has an excellency of its own: nothing can be made like thereunto. Even if, as believers, we were able to perform *perfect* acts of righteousness (which we are *not*, for all our services are so imperfect that they require to be accepted in the value of Christ's name), yet, even if we were able to perform perfect services, they would be but the services of creatures; and we should ever have to say, "We have only done that which it is our duty to do." None of our services can ever be *meritorious*. But with our Substitute it was otherwise. He was not obliged to become our Representative. *Voluntarily* He became so. All His services, therefore, were meritorious. And not only so: because of the dignity of His Person, they were *infinitely* meritorious

—having in them, an excellency which cannot possibly attach to any services performed by creatures. The righteousness whereby we, as believers, are constituted righteous, is a super-human righteousness. It is not only a meritorious righteousness, but an *infinitely* meritorious righteousness. Therefore, whatever fruits of righteousness may be produced in us—however acceptable they may be to God—however they may receive the reward of grace, yet they come not at all within the circle in which the infinitely meritorious righteousness wrought out for us by Him who was God manifest in the flesh, stands isolated—singular—and pre-eminent. Nothing, that we can do, augments it. Consequently, the meritorious ground of our blessing is found exclusively in that which Immanuel hath wrought for us.

The heart of man cavils, as I have already said, against all that Scripture has revealed respecting the imputation of Adam's first sin; and it cavils no less against the doctrine of man's total innate corruption. Rome, the great poisoner of Christendom, not only affirms that man is not totally corrupt, but teaches also that concupiscence (evil desire) is not, if resisted, sin. Mr. Irving followed Rome in this; and so do many others. It is, indeed, true that the guilt arising from that sin, as well as all other sin, is not, *for Christ's sake*, imputed for condemnation unto Christ's believing people; but to say this, is a very different thing from saying, that concupiscence is not sin. God has said, "Thou shalt not be concupiscent"—*οὐκ επιθυμῆσεις*. See Rom. vii. 7. Is not that which needs to be restrained by a command-

ment such as this, SIN? In heaven, there is nothing that needs to be bridled. There was nothing in Christ that needed to be bridled. Perfectness needs no restraint: it rejoices in development. To restrain development where only perfectness is, would be to restrain good. On the other hand, if there be something in us which God commands to be ever curbed and bridled, that something must be sin.

Some, even of the true servants of God, have been tempted into metaphysical disquisitions respecting the nature of Indwelling Sin, and have dangerously entangled themselves and others. We have to watch against this snare. The Scripture must be alone our guide, not only as to the subject-matter about which the instruction is, but also as to the mode in which that instruction is conveyed. Sin is not a person; but in order that our apprehensions respecting it may be intensified and rendered more vivid, it is, in Scripture, personified. See, for example, Rom. vii. 11. "Sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me and by it slew me." Sin, therefore, is not merely the absence of good; it is the presence of active evil. Man, whatsoever his natural endowments, is dwelt in, as if by a demon. SIN not only reigns around him, she has also taken up her seat within him. His powers are not only marred and enfeebled: they are under the sovereign control of Sin, who, as a mighty mistress, uses them all, and directs them against God. What then can be more hopeless than the moral condition of man? His desires, his affections, his understanding and his will, are not

only marred and perverted, but are under the absolute control of an indwelling principle of evil. His state is one of utter and (unless God intervene) hopeless bondage. Yet it is a bondage loved. It is willing servitude. Scripture asserts it: facts prove it. The feelings, thoughts, words, and deeds of one in whom indwelling sin reigns, are in willing, as well as habitual, contrariety to God. Naturally, therefore, we stand related to God, as to a King whose laws we have outraged. Our legal relation to Him is one of guilt—aggravated guilt. Consequently, His judicial Courts have claims against us, and unless those claims are met, we not only cannot be received into His favour, but stand amenable to His wrath. This, God, in mercy, makes known to us.

And in order to make this known to us more clearly, He explains to us the principle of His holy Courts. His law is both mandatory and prohibitive. It prohibits the slightest tendency towards evil, saying, "Thou shalt not be concupiscent;" *i.e.* thou shalt not even desire any thing that is evil: it also enjoins that God should be loved unceasingly, and served with a perfectness like that of heaven. There must be no bias towards evil: there must be all bias towards good. The tendencies must be right—the development perfect.

Can we wonder, then, that God should say, "there is none righteous; no, not one." If men in their folly say, "we will make ourselves righteous," God replies, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" Men say, "then let God make us righteous;" God replies, that our relation to Him is that of crimi-

nals before a Judge. It is no part of the duty of a Judge, nay, it is contrary to the duty of a Judge, to alter facts. If the person who stands before a Judge has a valid plea, it is the duty of the Judge to recognise it; but he cannot alter, in judging, either the law or the facts so as to pronounce a plea to be valid that is not valid. Yet it is necessary to meet God's claims as a Judge, before we can receive His pardon and favour as our King. How then is this possible?

It would be impossible, unless the Courts of God admitted the principle of substitutional service. But this, through the prevision of God's infinite mercy, they do admit. In order to supply this substitutional service, the Son of God before the world was, was appointed to become the Substitute. Voluntarily, He undertook the office, well knowing what it would be needful for Him, in that office, to do and to suffer. The character of the required obedience and of the required sufferings were minutely prescribed to the Great Substitute by the Divine wisdom, and were as peculiar as His office and Person were peculiar. No one on earth was required to act and to suffer as did the Substitute. Many of the relations of life, social and otherwise, which we hold, He held not. His sufferings were not, either as to duration, or in kind, *identical* with the sufferings adjudged to unpardoned sinners. The Holy One could know neither personal remorse, nor endless torment. Yet His sufferings, though not identical with those of the sinner, were together with His obedience, appointed by God as compensatory to all the claims of the Divine governmental

holiness. The dignity and glory of the eternal Person of the Son gave to His sufferings and obedience a value that could not attach to the sufferings or obedience of any creature. He who came by means of that obedience and suffering to make SATISFACTION was Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh. He made the satisfaction, and the claims of holiness were finally and fully met.

If it had been a question of raising into a more exalted and more glorious sphere of being, creatures who had never sinned, (angels for example,) and if in order to effect this, a service were required higher than they, according to the constitution of their being, could render—in such a case, a Substitute in supplying the required service, would not have been under the necessity of bearing penal inflictions. But this is not our case. We are sinners. We have not rendered to God the debt of obedience due to Him, and by failing to render it, we have incurred a debt of penalty. Consequently, our Substitute has not only to fulfil for us a prescribed obedience, but also to bear prescribed penalties. This Christ has done for all those who are “of faith.” Our God and King has enabled us to meet His claims as a Judge, by appointing the substitutional service of the Son. By the Son meeting in the manner appointed to Him, as the Substitute, the claims of God’s Courts, all who are of faith in Him are constituted righteous; and when, through grace, we are brought to plead this before God, He as a Judge, acknowledges the validity of the plea, and authoritatively pronounces us righteous.

The service of our Substitute provides a righteousness wherewith we become connected through faith.

“Faith cometh by hearing.” We hear the authoritative message, which, by the appointment of God, is sent forth into all the world, declaring that God is ready to receive all who cast themselves on Him, through the blood of the Lamb. God solemnly declares that He is ready to receive all such, and to impute to them the value, and to secure to them the results, of the once-made SATISFYING oblation. When, therefore, Lydia’s heart was opened by the Lord to receive the things spoken by Paul, and she leaned on that which God proposed to her as that which His grace had appointed to be leaned on for salvation, she was instantly brought under the applied efficacy of Christ’s work, and was justified. Her legal relation to God was abidingly changed. Her name was registered in God’s Courts, not any longer as the name of one to whom sin was imputed, but as one to whom righteousness was imputed. To all who so believe, faith is imputed FOR righteousness.

Observe, it is not said that faith is imputed *as* righteousness. *That* would imply that faith was righteousness. It would make faith meritorious. It would assign to it that place which belongs exclusively to the righteousness of our God and Saviour, which only is meritorious. *On account of* [propter] that—and that only, are we justified, faith being only the link that connecteth therewith. We are justified *through* faith, *on account of* that which Christ hath wrought for us. Faith is like a bank-note. It has *attributed* to it, the value of that

which it represents; but it has not the *intrinsic* value of that which it represents. It may be pleaded in God's Courts as representing the value of the true Righteousness, but it is not in itself that Righteousness.

It has recently been the habit of many who seek to overthrow the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of our God and Saviour (without which we cannot be saved)—it is their habit to affirm, that the Scripture nowhere speaks of righteousness imputed: they say, it speaks merely of faith being imputed FOR righteousness.

Yet, in the fourth of Romans (that very chapter, whose special subject is faith imputed FOR righteousness) we find the words, "God *imputeth righteousness* without works." Rom. iv. 6. Here the expression "*imputeth righteousness*" (*λογιζεται δικαιοσυνην*) does occur; and we are not to confound it with the words, "*impute FOR righteousness*" (*λογιζεσθαι εις δικαιοσυνην*) which are used in other parts of the same chapter. God could not have imputed faith to us *for* righteousness, unless He had first (through the work of His Son) provided a real righteousness which He imputes to us *as* righteousness.

The justified, therefore, have Christ's obedience imputed to them as a perfect and meritorious righteousness—having intrinsic value—being as the true gold. Faith is *also* imputed to them FOR righteousness; it being the appointed link of connexion with the true righteousness, and the evidence of our being possessed thereof. Faith, as to this is, as I have already said, like a bank-note, having an attributed and representative,

but not an intrinsic value. Yet the note being, by lawful appointment, reckoned to its possessor for the value of the gold it represents, becomes, because of that attributed value, precious.

If (to use an illustration I have elsewhere employed*) a service toward my Sovereign which I could not myself perform, were performed for me by another, and accepted by my Sovereign on my behalf, that service would have a real value, and be ascribed to me as having a real value. And if, further, a document were given me connecting me legally with that service, and entitling me to plead its value as mine by imputation, such a document would have a most important attributed value (for it would entitle me to claim all the results of the service that had been performed on my behalf), but the real value would be found, not in it, but in the service itself.

Earnestly, therefore, we maintain the doctrine, that faith is imputed FOR righteousness. They, who in the Courts of God are able in truth to say, "Lord, I have believed," are regarded and treated as righteous. Faith is reckoned to them *for* righteousness. We reject not this truth; on the contrary, we count it most precious. It is one of the necessary links in God's method of salvation; and as such, is the great theme of the fourth chapter of the Romans. But what we protest against is, the habit that has of late years in certain quarters prevailed, of seeking, by means of this truth, to destroy another, viz., the imputation to believers of the obedi-

* See note on page 114 of present volume.

ence of their Substitute—apart from which there is no salvation. Faith could not be imputed to us for righteousness, unless a real righteousness, capable of being imputed to us *as* righteousness, had been provided for us in the obedience of our Representative. It is of this last, that the concluding part of the fifth of the Romans treats. Is the fifth of the Romans to be cancelled? Shall we endeavour, by means of the fourth chapter, to nullify the fifth? Virtually, this has been the effort of some. But if the fifth chapter falls, the fourth falls with it. If one link could be taken from the chain of grace, the whole chain would perish. To say that God could have imputed faith *for* righteousness without a full, perfect, and real righteousness having been provided in the obedience of Christ, is equivalent to saying, that God could have saved us without a propitiation.

If it be asked, what part of the fifth of Romans treats of the imputation of Christ's obedience, we reply—all that part of it which treats of the imputation of Adam's first sin. "By means of ONE OFFENCE (*δι' ἑνος παραπτώματος*) judgment came:" "by means of ONE RIGHTEOUSNESS (*δι' ἑνος δικαιοματός*) the free gift came." Again, we read, "by the disobedience of THE ONE," men "were constituted sinners;" whilst, on the other hand, "by the obedience of THE ONE" all who believe "shall be constituted righteous." Adam sinned—not we: yet in consequence of his being our appointed representative, his sin is ascribed to us, and we suffer. Christ performed a perfect service toward God. We performed it not: yet, He being the Representative and Substitute of

all who believe, His service is ascribed to such, and they are blessed. On the one hand, there is the imputation of a sin which is not personally ours: on the other hand, there is the imputation of a righteousness which is not personally ours. Hence Adam, in his representative headship, is said to have been "the type (*τυπος*) of him that was to come."

Or, let us view the question in another aspect. Did not Christ on the Cross, bear for us the appointed curse, and also give "Himself for us an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour?" Could there be any thing more excellent than the perfectness of Him who thus gave Himself for us? Did not that perfectness give to the offering its sweet-smelling savour? Was not that sweet-smelling savour substitutionally presented for us, and accepted? Is it not, in all its value, ascribed to us? What is this, but the imputation of Another's perfectness? Without this, there could be no atonement. Unreserved devotedness to God; perfectness of developed character; perfectness in the inner man; the absence of all sins of ignorance and of all transgression—these were among the things that went to make up the perfectness which was sacrificially presented for us on the Cross, and accepted: and under the imputation of its value, we stand atoned for, and as a consequence, justified.

This, of course, will be denied by all who regard the Cross *only* as the place of judgment and death; and refuse to see there *also* the offering of a sweet-smelling savour. The doctrine of many is, that the righteous-

ness which now attaches to the life that Christ hath in resurrection, did not attach to the life that He laid down on the Cross. Utterly misunderstanding the meaning of imputation, they think that sin by imputation attached *to the life*, which as our Sin-bearer, He laid down on the Cross; and that from that sin, He freed Himself and us, by laying down, and *not taking again*, the life to which that sin is supposed to have attached. It is obvious, that such attachment of sin to the life which our Lord had as man, and which life formed a part of His holy Person, would have been impartation, and not imputation. He to whom sin is imputed as a Substitute (and it is in this character only that Christ had to do with our sin), is required to be one to whose personal condition righteousness must *inalienably* attach. In the Substitute, righteousness must be as indestructible as His being. He could not be admitted to the office of the Sin-bearer, except on the ground of being One to whose personal condition righteousness inalienably attached. The personal condition of righteousness that attached to our Substitute never ceased to be recognised by God. Our sins and sinfulness (for which he bore the precise penalties afore appointed to Him as the Substitute), formed no part of His sacred Person. Our sin was not infused into Him, nor into His life. Our "old man" (for the evil of which He bore the appointed penalties), became no part of His being. The life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, see John x. 18,) which He laid down, was, as to its perfectness, wholly unaffected by the sin whose penalties He bore. Else the life could neither have been resumed after He

had laid it down, nor could it have been offered up as a part of the sweet-smelling savour. "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you UPON THE ALTAR to make an atonement for your souls." Lev. xvii. 11. If sin had, in any sense whatsoever, attached to the life that He laid down, then it must have attached to the blood that He shed. In that case, how could it have been holy blood? How could it have answered to the type of blood offered as something pure, holy, and acceptable on the altar? Nor was the blood that was shed for us, and offered for us, the blood of One that was merely man. It was the blood of Immanuel—of God manifest in the flesh. As man, He died: but into His death, the efficacy of that which He was as God, entered. Therefore, we read of "the Church of God (or of Jehovah—*κυριου*) which he purchased by his own blood."

We must never forget that atonement has God for its object. "Go quickly . . . make an atonement . . . for there is wrath gone out from the Lord. And Aaron . . . put on incense, and made an atonement for the people. And he stood between the dead and the living; and the plague was stayed." Num. xvi. 46. To atone is to present to God something that SATISFIES the claims of His holiness. Blessed consequences flow down to us: but these consequences are no part of the atonement. They are results—results procured and purchased by the atonement made unto God.

One of the results of atonement to those who are under it, is, that that practical subjection to the dominion

of sin, which came upon them as one of the penal consequences of the imputation of Adam's sin, ceases. Our "old man" is, not indeed destroyed, but it is nullified (*καταργείται*). The title of sin to exercise lordship over us is taken away: sin can no longer control us as its slaves: and finally, we are to be delivered from its indwelling presence. But our deliverance from the dominance of evil within us, though a *result* of atonement having been made and accepted for us, is no part of that atonement. Atonement is found exclusively in that which the Holy One has done and suffered in order to satisfy the claims of God, both as respects appointed penalties, and as respects the presentation of required perfectness. And even as the corruption of our nature, together with many inseparable consequences thereof, was a *result* of the condemnation into which Adam's first sin brought us, and came on us in the way of *penalty*, so it was impossible that that penalty could be removed, unless the state of condemnation were reversed, and a condition of justification attained, by means of an atonement first made. The atonement finished on the Cross is the procuring meritorious cause of *all* the blessings bestowed on us as the redeemed, either in earth or heaven.

All those who stand under the efficacy of the one finished oblation of their God and Saviour, have a title to say, that as represented by their Substitute, they are regarded as having passed through judicial death. "If one died instead of all (the Apostle is speaking of believers) then did the whole die." Judicial death, that is, death as the infliction of wrath, is to such, past.

They have met it in the Person of their Representative. And when their Substitute rose, they (not personally indeed, but representatively), rose, and entered into heavenly places, where He still represents them, and where they are recognised as livingly united to Him. They "live unto God in him." These, and all other like blessings that have reached, or shall reach the redeemed personally, are *results* of the reconciliation effected by the atonement. They are the consequences of the acceptance which the atoning oblation rendered unto God has secured.

Baptism is the appointed sign to us of the blessings to which I have just referred. It brings vividly before us one of the chief results of the atonement *to us-ward*. By being placed beneath the symbolic waters, and so buried in the likeness of our Substitute's death, it is signified on the part of God, that we are regarded by Him as having passed through judicial death when our Representative and Substitute died. When raised from those waters, it is signified, that when our Substitute rose, we too, as represented by Him, rose, and are therefore found in the likeness of His resurrection.

Considering the tone of thought that at present prevails, I am disposed to think that many, if asked whether they prize most the thoughts presented to their souls by Baptism, or those associated with the Supper of the Lord, would instantly reply, that they valued the former most. They would say; Baptism directs my soul to death passed, and to glory reached. It dissociates from the earth. It teaches me to think of sin and the flesh

as left behind ; and bids me think of myself as sharing in the risen glory of Christ, and as seated in heavenly places in Him ; whereas, the Supper of the Lord leads me back to the Cross, as the place of judgment and death, where sin was had in remembrance. How can I rejoice in an ordinance that specifically directs my thoughts to judgment, and suffering, and death, and wrath, in the same way that I do in an ordinance, which, like Baptism, directs my thoughts to heaven and to glory ?

We cannot wonder that this tone of thought should prevail wherever the Cross is regarded as being the place of suffering and of death *only* : or wherever the results of atonement *to us*—especially its *heavenly* results, are made the well nigh exclusive object of regard. It is, however, a tone of thought that cannot be too earnestly deprecated. Dangerous error underlies it.

In the first place, it shows a very inadequate apprehension of the lesson taught in Baptism. Baptism does, indeed, direct our thoughts to the life and glory attained in Him who is our Forerunner above the heavens ; but it also brings vividly before us the reality and bitterness of that judicial death through which that glory has been reached. We, calmly and peacefully, are placed beneath *symbolic* waters, that we might be brought into *the likeness* of His death : but that death was to Him reality. “I sink in deep mire where there is no standing : I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me Deliver me out of the mire, and let me not sink : let me be delivered from them that hate me, and out of the deep waters. Let not the waterflood

overflow me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." Psalm lxxix. Such was the language of Him over whom the real power of wrath did, as deep waters roll, when for our sake "He laid bare unto death His soul." We cannot, therefore, dissociate Baptism from the Cross. Quite as much as the Lord's Supper, it brings before us the remembrance of death and wrath; though the death be past, and the life earned by it, remaineth.

But further: although Baptism teaches us of life and glory above the heavens, attained for us by the substitutional suffering of Him *in* whom we now live unto God, yet heaven is not the place where the baptized now dwell. Although representatively they are in heaven, yet personally they are on earth. The place of their present conflicts, and toils, and temptations, is earth. They serve in an evil day, with enemies around them, strong and many. We walk by faith, not by sight. Quickened in the power of a new and heavenly life, having in the heavens a heavenly Head, in whom all fulness of heavenly life is hidden for them, having also heavenly laws, and indwelt in by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven (all these things being the results of the association into which they have been brought with Christ risen), believers are, in many senses, heavenly. We do well to remember this; and to thank God for the greatness of His unspeakable gift. But have we no responsibilities? Can we ignore them? We are on earth, in the midst of the darkness of the kingdom of Satan, where his power is being strengthened daily.

Do we say, Jehovah-nissi—the Lord is my banner, and do we rally to it faithfully—and to it alone? Are we altogether satisfied with the manner in which we show forth, before God, and before men, our high and heavenly calling? Do we, as walkers in paths of light, detect in none of our habits of thought and action, any elements of darkness? Are there no obliquities—no shortcomings—no sins of ignorance—no manifestations of imperfectness, that cause us hourly to turn for comfort to the words, “the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from ALL sin.” In what connexion did the Apostle use these words? He used them when speaking of “walking in the light as He is in the light.” He knew that those who seek thus to walk in the light, must, and do, exercise holy self-judgment. He knew that to such self-judgment does, and must, teach many a bitter lesson respecting that root of sin that lies hidden within us; and that lesson would be too bitter—too oppressive, if we were not able ever to say, “His blood cleanseth us from ALL sin:” yea, even from that sin which is discovered by us whilst walking in paths of light, where consequently, because of the light, the intensity of its darkness becomes the more manifest.

Baptism, therefore, though it directs our thoughts to heaven and to glory, does not leave us in heaven as the place in which at present, we personally dwell. On the contrary, it marks our place as being earth, with its darkneses, and conflicts, and sorrows, where we have to walk as those, who, not having personally died, are yet associated with the results of Another's death; and who,

not having been personally raised, are yet associated with the results of Another's resurrection. Heavy responsibilities rest on those, who having been brought representatively into heaven, become thereby associated with its light, and purity, and holiness, whilst sin is yet *in* them, and whilst it yet dominates *around* them. They are responsibilities under which we should surely sink, if it were not for the abiding grace which follows us through the wilderness, and which the Table of the Lord was especially appointed to attest. Baptism, therefore, if its lesson be rightly learned, must cause a constant craving after that grace of which the Table of the Lord is the outward and ever recurring pledge. Day after day the need returns : day after day, the attestation is repeated. It is a Table intended for those who need comfort, not only because of weariness, but because of sin. It is the place of self-judgment—the place where we are commanded peculiarly to consider our ways, inward and outward, yet in the presence of that abiding and faithful grace which, because of the offering once made, hath caused mercy to rejoice against judgment. We think indeed of wrath, but of wrath that has spent itself when the blood of the Holy One was shed ; and to that blood we recur abidingly for strength, saying, "It is drink indeed." We remember that hour when the fire of Divine wrath was kindled against our great Sin-offering, and burned devouringly until it had spent itself, and "ashes" remained, as the silent but blessed and holy witness of the accomplishment of the expiatory death.

But this is not the only lesson taught in the Lord's Table. When the Lord Jesus took the symbolic bread, and said, "This is my body which is GIVEN for you"—the word "given," whilst it includes the thought of "given" *to be broken*, is not *restricted* to that thought.* The holy body, symbolized by that bread, was, indeed, given *to be broken*; but it was also "given as an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." When Noah offered his holocaust (burnt-offering), we read that "the Lord smelled a sweet savour." In the one oblation once offered on the Cross, the sweet savour of the Holocaust, and the fragrance of the incense which shrouded the typical High Priest as he offered the typical blood (see Lev. xvi. 12), are both included. At the Lord's Supper, therefore, we have to think not merely of the ill-savour that arises from us because of our sin, nor merely of the judgment that has, because thereof, fallen on Another—we have also to think of that which, having supplanted and taken the place of that ill-savour of corruption which otherwise would have environed us,

* The words recorded in Matthew are, "Take eat, this is my body." In Mark, the same. In Luke, "This is my body which is *given* for you." In 1 Cor. xi. 24, "This is my body which is for you"—*ὑπερ ὑμῶν*—[given] in your stead—the word "broken," which occurs in the received text, being an interpolation sustained by no adequate authority, and omitted in the critical editions. See Tregelles. It is evident that in the Corinthians, the words of Luke are referred to, and "given," is the word that should be supplied. "Broken," therefore, was not the expression which our Lord used. The thought, however, embodied in that word, is most true. The cup also teaches it: for the wine symbolises the blood, as poured out or shed—*εκχυνόμενον*.

has cast the fragrance of heavenly perfectness around us. This, of course, will be of little comfort to them who imagine that their "old man" has been so destroyed, that no savour of uncleanness any longer emanates therefrom; but it will be otherwise with those who have truly learned to compare their own ways and thoughts with the ways and thoughts of Him who was "God manifest in the flesh."

Nor is the joy associated with the words, "this is my body which is given for you," a joy which terminates with earth. There is, indeed, peculiar sweetness in the thought that the holy incense which ascended from the Cross covers us with its fragrance, even whilst we are here below—conscious every moment of what sin in the flesh is. Yet we must not imagine that that cloud of fragrance, which has for us filled the sanctuary, will vanish when our connexion with earth ceases. Even when sin and the flesh have entirely passed away—when we stand before the throne complete in glory—when that of which Baptism is the pledge shall have received its full accomplishment in our having attained, in resurrection, a condition of regenerated being, perfect according to the perfectness of heaven—when also the full power of the holy anointing oil (see Exodus xxx. 22) will attach to our persons, with nothing in us to counteract—yet even then, what will be our great, our characteristic joy? It will be found in nothing that springs from ourselves—in nothing with which the thought of *our* agency, or *our* personal condition can be in any way associated. The holy anointing oil, precious as it was,

was not designed to be burned on the altar, and so to fill the sanctuary with its fragrance. *That* was reserved for the holy incense or perfume only. See Ex. xxx. "Thou shalt make it a perfume, [literally 'incense,' קטורה as in Lev. xvi. 12] a confection after the art of the apothecary; tempered together, pure and holy." This it was that, on the day of Atonement, the High Priest brought within the veil, and burned on the golden censer, that the cloud of incense might cover the mercy seat. Under its preciousness, the anointed priests ministered, accepted according to its acceptableness. It was the type of our condition as believers—our condition in time—our condition in eternity. The redeemed will never be other than creatures. Whatever may be the grace, or power, or knowledge communicated unto them through the Spirit, He will ever act in them, and through them, as creatures; no meritoriousness can ever attach to their services. Whatever the condition of glory into which grace may raise them, they will have ever to say, "we have done that which it was our duty to do." The measure of their acceptableness will not be found in any thing that attaches to themselves. It will be found in something wholly external to themselves—even in that given by Immanuel in giving Himself. Not only meritoriousness, but *infinite* meritoriousness was there. To be under it, and to be abidingly blessed according to it, will continue, even in glory, to be the distinctive characteristic of the redeemed. The abiding and distinctive blessedness of the redeemed, even when brought into the possession of full personal perfectness in glory,

will still be found in the fact that they will be treated for ever as associated with that infinite meritoriousness, to know the unsearchableness of which would be to know the unsearchableness of Him, of whom it is said, "no one knoweth the Son but the Father." This will be the result of God having been pleased to recognise the principle of Representative action, and of Imputation.

Representative and Personal Condition of Believers Contrasted.

ENOUGH has been said in the preceding pages to show that whatever may be the results of atonement towards us, it is not to be considered *first* in reference to those results, but in reference to the satisfaction rendered *unto God*. The first great object of Christ when He became the Surety of His people, was to meet the claims of the holiness of God. Otherwise, none could have been "constituted righteous;" and without being constituted righteous, they could not be "justified;" and without being justified, they could not have been received as heirs of blessing. Believers standing under the infinite preciousness of the oblation once made, find in it, not only the procuring cause of their blessing, but they find in its acceptableness, the measure of their own acceptableness. They stand, and that for ever, under the continuous abiding imputation of a meritoriousness that is infinite. That infinite meritoriousness, having been sacrificially presented and accepted for them, forms the basis, in eternity as well as time, of the action of the Divine hand towards them for blessing.

The results of the meritorious service of Christ, quite

as much as the service itself, were appointed before the world was. It was appointed (and it is one of the chief *present* results), that all who are brought through faith under the efficacy of the one oblation, should be regarded, even before they personally enter into their rest, as associated with their risen Head in that condition of glorified being which He now has above the heavens. He, as their Substitute, passed through judicial death for them. Therefore, to them, judicial death is passed.* But He who represented them in death, continues still to represent them in glory. Brought in their Representative

* By "judicial death" is meant death inflicted in wrath—death as a curse from the hand of God. This believers never know. "He that believeth in me shall never SEE death." The word translated SEE (*θεωρεω*) means so to see, as to become thoroughly acquainted with that which is seen. Believers never become acquainted with death. To them, it is devoid of wrath. Its sting is taken away. They know not penal death—death under wrath. Penal death was known by their Substitute: but it is not known by them.

The claims of the governmental holiness of God have been so fully met, that there is now no necessity thence arising that believers should either die, or experience any suffering. Accordingly, there are already some (Enoch and Elijah) who have not died—and there will be many more. "Behold, I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." No believer who lives on to the time of the Lord's return, will die. He will be changed without passing through death.

And although, at present, the normal appointment of God to all His believing people is, that they both die and know many sufferings, yet all His dealings with them are in love—not in wrath. Their faith may, like gold in the furnace, be tried; but all such trial of faith worketh endurance. It is precious in God's sight; and will be found "unto praise, and honour, and glory" in the

and Forerunner into association with the glory which He hath above the heavens as the Head of the new creation of God, they are taught to say, "old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new." The full results of this association and union with Christ in glory, it is left for eternity to unfold; but there are results, great and precious, even now. There is not one of the family of faith that is not, more or less, upheld and strengthened by a power that is derived immediately from Christ glorified. See Eph. i. 19. Life communicated immediately from our risen Head, works in

day of Christ. All suffering that is for the present profitable, and in result honourable, must be blessed. As the stars shine brightest at the midnight hour, so the promises of grace are especially appointed to illumine the night of suffering.

Sweet and blessed are the thoughts which may be brought into the hour of death, by the knowledge of what Christ hath wrought, and of what Christ is. Yet faith may be weak—sinfully weak. Nevertheless, there is One who can pity even *that*. "Why are ye so fearful, O ye of little faith." The greatness of His holiness, and the glory of His offices and power, must not hide from us the personal tenderness, and sympathy, and love which He feels towards all His people—that love which caused Him to give that last washing to His disciples' feet—the pity that caused Him to say, "the spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak."

The most terrible form in which death can come to a believer is, when it comes in chastisement. Yet, even then, though there must be an especial bitterness in it, it is sent in love. The testimony of the Scripture, on this point, is most express. "For this cause, many are weak and sickly among you, and many SLEEP. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged we are chastened of the Lord, THAT WE SHOULD NOT BE CONDEMNED WITH THE WORLD." Well may they who fear the Lord say, "that his mercies endure for ever."

every one of the members of His mystical body below. Apprehensions and energies which never could have been ours, unless we had been brought into association with Him in His risen glory, are, through the Spirit, communicated to us here. Those apprehensions and energies may be grievously hindered or enfeebled: but the fact of their inalienable bestowment remains true.

Nothing can be more important to the comfort and sustainment of the souls of believers, than that they should well understand the fulness of blessing, into association with which they have been brought, by the resurrection and ascension of their Head, even whilst personally they are yet militant in the earth. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ." This totality of spiritual blessing is already ours *in Christ*; and effects and consequences of its being ours daily reach us, even whilst the fulness of that which is bestowed remains hidden in the heavens—for our life is hidden with Christ in God. Yet by faith, we can enter heaven: by faith, we can contemplate the blessings that are given to us there, and be strengthened. By the gracious appointment of God, not a day passes in which we do not receive some supply of power and blessing, flowing down from the great depository of our strength above. If our faith were vigorous and more rightly directed, we should, no doubt, receive more consciously, and more largely. It is in the knowledge of the blessings reserved for us above, that the children of God find their characteristic joy. Fruits

are thus brought down to us from our heavenly Canaan ; and we feed on them, whilst the wilderness is still around us. Yet, that which is most precious, needs to be with most vigilance guarded. Earth is a place of danger. There is an enemy at hand, who, "whilst men sleep," can secretly bring the asp, and hide it in the basket of our pleasant fruits.

The sphere of life and glory above the heavens into which Christ has, as our Representative entered, is not the sphere to which, at present, we practically belong. The present place of our service and action is below. What two spheres can be more contrasted? Very conscious was the Lord Jesus of the contrast when He said, "And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil." The fact of this contrast will be denied, I suppose, by none. Yet, virtually, it would be denied, if we be tempted to say, that God so exclusively regards us as one with our Representative above, that He ignores (and that, in faith, we also should ignore) those present relations to sin and to the flesh that temporarily attach to us below.

Earth—not Heaven, is the present sphere of our service, and conflict, and labour. We stand here in a relation to sin, and to the flesh, and to the world, in which we shall not stand when brought personally into our resurrection rest. These, our present relations to things below, are not by God ignored as if they were non-existent, or of no moment, in His sight. On the con-

trary, not only the present action of His hand toward us in discipline, correction, and guidance, but also His future action in dispensing to us rewards of grace, is made dependent on the manner in which we move through the present temporary circumstances of earth. God never forgets the relation in which He has brought us to Himself in Christ risen: but He also recognises our present practical position in the earth. In one sense, "we are not in the flesh;" in another, we "walk" and "live in the flesh" (see 2 Cor. x. 2, and Gal. ii. 20). Although "seated in heavenly places *in Christ*," yet, personally, we are in the body, and "groan being burdened." In one sense, "we know no man after the flesh"—in another we say, there are those who are "dear to us in the flesh" as well as in the spirit. These are no contradictions to faith. But nature refuses to walk in the path of faith. It seizes on one part of truth, and so uses it, as to destroy or nullify the other. Thus it is, that asps become hidden among the fruits of our Canaan.

If, because our "old man" has received its award of judgment—damnatory judgment, when our Substitute died, we should therefore say that the relation in which we still practically stand thereunto is so ignored by God, that His course of action toward us is no longer influenced thereby: if, because it is true of us as viewed in Christ, that "old things have passed away and all things become new," we therefore imagine that relationships and duties that pertain to us as men in the flesh are to be retired from, as inconsistent with our new.

condition in Christ risen : if, because we are *in Christ* seated in heavenly places, we therefore regard heaven as the only right sphere of life, and deem relationship to that which is in the earth cancelled by heavenly relationship to Christ—if thoughts like these be in our hearts, we have surely strayed from the way of Truth, and are entangled in the snares of the Destroyer.

There was once in the earth One whose relation to heaven and to God, was higher and greater than any that can ever pertain to us : for He was “the only begotten Son”—the Life and the Light that was with the Father—the I AM—One who was “from above”—One who, whilst speaking of Himself as the Son of Man, could say, the Son of Man, *ὁ υἱ*—the Being One in heaven. Christ was essentially the Heavenly One, for He was “God manifest in the flesh.” Yet, for a season, His place of service was the earth. *Here*, in the midst of a world where Satan reigned, He became “the faithful and true witness” for God. Was it the desire or object of Christ to abstract Himself into heaven, whilst His appointed place of service was earth? Earth is the sphere of the great conflict between evil and good—Satan and God. There are in the earth principles, positions, persons, that are *of God* : there are also principles, positions, persons, that are of Satan. Christ was *with* the one, and *against* the other. How could He, whose mission was to separate “the precious from the vile,” abstract Himself into a sphere where nothing vile was? Now, indeed, His tarriance on earth is over. He has been able to say, “I have glorified thee on the earth,

I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." The Heavenly Bridegroom has returned to the true mountains of Bether—to a height of heavenly separation in unearthly glory. By faith we can follow Him—by faith we can behold the Land of His glory, which is our Land also; for He hath won it for us, and bestowed it on us. But the Mountain of His glory is not, as yet, the place where we are to seek to *dwell*, even by faith. At present, our energies are elsewhere demanded. The Land of glory will not be the place of our rest, till the night of evil shall have passed—"till the day shall break, and the shadows flee away." Till then, the place of the Bride is at the sheep-fold, where the sheep are sheltered and fed—or at the vineyard, where the vines are cultured for her Lord—or in the valley, where the pomegranates should blossom—or in the hidden gardens, whence fragrance should exhale: but these vineyards, and gardens, and valleys are not on the mountains of Bether, where all is joy, and light, and glory: they are found amid the mists and darkneses of earth, where the turmoil and strife of evil is. Paul, when caught up into the third heavens, and John when taken up to behold God's throne in heaven, were brought into nearer proximity to glory, than we shall ever know till our earthly pilgrimage ceases. Yet it was not their normal condition. They were not to abide in heaven. They were taken there for a brief moment only, that they might be instructed; and then sent down again to earth as the present place of their service—there to know the buffetings of Satan—there to know what it was to

struggle and testify "against many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings:" there also to know and to prove the bitterness of that root of evil found in their own flesh. The *φρονημα σαρκος*—the mind of the flesh, was in them; and *that* was enmity against God.

It is true, indeed, that they, together with all believers, were delivered from the judgment due to this evil, and were also delivered from its control. When the great Substitute died, God condemned (*κατεκρινε*, visited with damnatory judgment) sin in the flesh; that is, *our* "sin in the flesh." Our Substitute bore the judgment due thereunto, at the moment when He presented the great atoning oblation unto God. "Our old man was crucified with Him." We are therefore delivered from its curse, and delivered from its dominance; and finally, in sure and certain prospect, we shall be delivered from its presence. But was it expedient that we should be delivered from the presence of that which had become virtually identified with our ruined nature, before we had any deep practical experience of what the virulence of its evil is? It was *not* expedient. Therefore, after the bond which binds us up in unity and identification with sin has been for ever broken, God allows that we should practically experience what sin is. And see, how gracious is His method. First, having associated us with Himself in Christ—giving to us a new standing in Him, He bids us view ourselves as associated with Himself against our evil selves. By giving to us life in Christ, and by creating in us "the new man," and by giving His Spirit to dwell abidingly

in us, He strengthens us against our natural selves. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh." To fight against ourselves is part of our appointed conflict during the season of our militancy; and the conflict may be for our honour. "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." James i. 12. These words are true of us whilst resisting the evil that is in us, quite as much as whilst resisting the evil that is around us. In the midst of the struggle, we think of the approval of God, and of the crown of life. The sphere of the struggle is below: and the struggle is temporary. It pertains to the period of our natural existence here. It has no place in that sphere of perfected being above into which Christ has for us entered. Yet we ignore it not; nor would we desire that God should ignore it. On the contrary, we thank Him for having appointed it. It is for our instruction; and it may be for our honour. If we fail in it, we may be chastened; yet, even *that*, is for our good; whereas, if we succeed, we shall receive honour and praise. Either of these results make manifest His goodness, and the enduring faithfulness of His love; whilst they both prove that God has not ceased, because of His work toward us in Christ, to recognise the temporary relations which we hold to circumstances below—circumstances, which, when we become "children of the resurrection," we shall know no more for ever.

And if, notwithstanding our heavenly association and

union with Christ, we nevertheless hold certain recognised relations to the flesh in its evil, much more are not the relations ignored which whilst *in* the flesh, we necessarily hold to others who are likewise in the flesh. "Flesh," used in this second sense, has a physical—not a *moral* meaning; and includes those various relations which must subsist whilst our earthly existence continues. The Apostle speaks of those who were dear to him "*in the flesh* as well as in the Spirit." Again he says; "though *we walk in the flesh* we war not after the flesh." 2 Cor. x. 3. And again: "the life that *I now live in the flesh*, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. ii. 20. Thus he who was, in one sense, "not in the flesh," in another sense, lived and walked in the flesh.

Unspeakably important is this "life in the flesh" below. It is the sphere in which our practical condition for good or for evil is tested. It is the seed-time for that harvest in which, perhaps, many sheaves may be brought in with rejoicing. Shall we then ignore it? Because it is written, "old things have passed away:" "henceforth know we no man after the flesh," shall we so interpret these words as to say, that we are raised above the responsibilities involved in the temporary relationships of earth? Shall we say, that that act of the Divine hand which freed us from the judgment due to our sin, freed us also from all the responsibilities which attach to man's mortal life below? Onesimus did not think so, when he bowed his neck to the yoke he had sought to break, and returned as a bond-servant to his

master. He judged (and he judged rightly), that in serving Philemon, he had found an opportunity of serving Christ. He knew on the other hand, that if he refused to bow, he would disobey and displease his heavenly Master, and lay up for himself fruits of chastisement and bitter sorrow.

All earthly relationships sanctioned of God, though they will in the hour of glory cease, are, nevertheless, spheres in which heavenly grace can so operate, as to bring out of circumstances that are in themselves earthly and temporary, fruits that shall remain unto eternal life. If, under pretence of heavenly separation, we should despise or neglect these earthly spheres of duty: if we say we will be "children of the resurrection," before the hour of the resurrection comes; we shall find, sooner or later, that we have listened to a voice other than that of the true Shepherd. Believers, though they have truly died *in Christ*, and have truly been raised *in Christ*, are not yet "children of the resurrection." We cannot say of them that, because of that which they are in Christ, they hold now the same relation to sin and to the flesh, as they will hold when the day of resurrection comes. They still walk *in* the flesh, though they neither war nor walk *after* the flesh. (*κατα σαρκα*)

Nothing can be more important for the people of God than to know, whether, in order to please God, they have to seek to abstract themselves from the earth, and to make heaven their dwelling-place; or whether, on the contrary, they find their "Bethel" in the earth—heaven, indeed, opened over it, but itself found in the

wilderness—a moral wilderness now, where we have to be girded with the armour to meet the conflicts of a dark and evil day. See Eph. vi.

Heaven (not physically, indeed, and visibly, but in a sense that faith easily recognises), is opened in everlasting complacency and love over all who are gathered in faith to Jesus. They have found “the Stone of Israel”—the “Anointed One”—the antitype to that stone which Jacob set up and anointed in order to mark Bethel.* Heaven is never closed against them that belong to Bethel. By faith, they can look up—by faith, they can enter by the new and living way consecrated for them, even into the Holiest of all. There their Forerunner has for them entered—the Heir of all things—the Head of the new creation of God—the great Melchizedek who ever liveth to make intercession for them—One who has

* There is no word, perhaps, that more clearly marks the place of our present militancy on earth than *Bethel*. It means the “house of God.” Yet Bethel was not Heaven, though it was associated with Heaven. It was at the foot, not at the top of that ladder which connected Heaven and earth, and at the head of which God was. It was the chosen spot of earth, on which blessings dispensed from Heaven descended: yet Heaven that dispensed, was above; and Bethel that received, was below. There, in that spot below, over which Heaven was opened, Jacob, the pilgrim and stranger in the earth, found his place of worship as well as his place of rest. He “took the stone that he had put for his pillow and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it.” It is true, indeed, that we are associated with Him who stood at the top of that typical ladder, in a nearness not then vouchsafed to Jacob; nevertheless, Bethel, at the foot of the ladder, is still the place of our abode; and would remain so, even

brought them in the title of His own name to His Salem, the city of peace—One who rules over them for blessing in the title of a meritorious righteousness which He has Himself provided, and under which they stand for ever. It *may be*, that the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him 'may be so given to us, that we may truly walk in the light of these things, and be strengthened. Yet still it is the walk of faith, not of sight. We are not, like the Apostle, caught up into the third heavens, actually to see, and actually to hear. Moreover, whatever strength may be gained by the apprehensions of faith, it is but as means to an end. It is that we might be enabled to find, and having found, to abide in the only one place of full, true, *present* blessing; and that place is not in heaven, but on earth. Our Lord Himself has marked it for us. He has told

if our faith were a thousand-fold increased for the apprehension of our inheritance above.

Fully do I admit that that blessed and glorious vision which Jacob saw, will, in "the age to come," receive a full and manifested accomplishment; when Immanuel's Land will shine with glory, and Zion be the dwelling-place of Jehovah of Hosts, whence He will watch over, and control, and bless, Israel His inheritance, and all nations. Angels shall then be *seen* ascending and descending upon the Son of Man; and heaven shall be *seen* to be opened over a recovered earth. I by no means deny that we wait for the full accomplishment of this vision of glory. Yet, there is a sense, and an important sense, in which we can speak of Bethel now. Jacob marked by an anointed stone the place. They who have found the true "Stone of Israel,"—the Anointed One, and keep near to Him, have found a Bethel, though the hour of Bethel's glory be not yet come.

us where He desires that we should, at present, dwell. "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him:" that is, we (the Father and the Son) will come to such an one, even whilst he dwells below, surrounded by the storms and conflicts of earth, and we will sanction his ways, and will go with him through the circumstances, and will abide with him in peace. He speaks not here of *our* coming to Him; but of *His* coming to us. Surely, of all present promises, this is the highest. All that Paul or John could have learned, when *miraculously* taken up into glory, was but a means to this end. It was that they might be the more strengthened for so keeping the words of Christ, and so walking in His ways, that they might find, not in heaven but in earth, the place where the Father and the Son could come and sanction their ways, and comfort them by their unseen presence.

It is true, indeed, that they who would keep Christ's words, must be habitually accustomed to go within the veil, and there, as in the presence of God, to judge themselves. They have to judge themselves, not only as to the relation in which they stand to sin within them and sin around them, but they have also to consider the relation in which they stand to God, His people, His Truth, His service. We can judge nothing rightly in the light of mere human thought. As to the world, they walk in darkness; and the people of God have for the most part dimmed, or hidden, the light which they were appointed to uphold. We must go into the pre-

sence of God, if we would see things as they really are. Accordingly, through the blood of Jesus, a way into the Holiest of all has been opened; and we may draw nigh, in full assurance of faith—there to find ourselves in the presence of holiness, indeed, but also in the presence of grace. We draw nigh into the GRACE wherein we have been made to stand. (*εσθηκαμεν*) In its presence, we have to judge ourselves. It is a place where we receive instruction and comfort—and it may be, deep, deep humiliation. But whatever communion may be vouchsafed to us with the light and holiness, and glory, and love that are our inheritance above, the present end of all such communion, is to fit us for so keeping in the earth the words of Christ, that the Father and the Son may be able, practically, to sanction our ways; and to have fellowship with us *here*. The Priests of old, from day to day, entered the sanctuary: but it was not that they might abide there. They had to come out again into the mingled scene of good and of evil without—there to put difference between clean and unclean; and to separate the precious from the vile.

If any should say, that they are accustomed thus to live, we are not instantly to reject the claim, as if it were impossible for any to realize what life unto God is. Yet, the claim must be tested. The higher the claim, the greater the evil that would result from its being recognised, if it failed to answer to the appointed test. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."

The ways of all God's people must be strictly tested by the Word of God. We can look into the hearts of

none; but we can discern the way of their steps, and the testimonies of their lips. Action and doctrine can both be tested by the word of God. "If any man," said the Apostle, "be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that *I write unto you are* the commandments of the Lord." "Every one that advanceth or leadeth forward (*πας ὁ προαγων*) and abideth not IN THE DOCTRINE of Christ hath not God." 2 John 9. Subjection to Scripture, therefore, is a necessary accompaniment of spirituality. Consequently, if claims to high spirituality be advanced by any who are manifestly unsubject to the Word of God, such claims must be resisted with an earnestness proportioned to the earnestness with which they are advanced. And this is the more needful now, when the rallying cry of the true children of the Kingdom, "Christ and the written Word," is met by the antagonistic and defiant shout, "The Church and the voice of the Church;" or, "The Church and the voice of the Spirit in the Church." For the time, Goliath-like strength and numbers may be, and will be, with the latter; but the strength of the true David shall confront it at last; and all its associations and constructions then shall be "as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor."

High pretensions, individual or collective, ill become the present hour. However true it be, that "our commonwealth" is in heaven, not in earth,—though we be, in our risen Representative, already associated with that glory which Jacob beheld at the head of the ladder at whose foot he stood;—though we, separated, by the

death and resurrection of our Head from the corruptions of earth, are thereby circumcised with a circumcision effected by no human power,—though we have a Gilgal-like place of separation granted to us above the Heavens, in Him who represents us there; yet, let it be remembered, that if we have a Gilgal-like place of separation above, we have also a corresponding Gilgal-like place of separation here. The place, typically, held by Israel at Gilgal, when they stood around Joshua as the circumcised people of the Lord, willing and prepared to go forth to battle against His foes, was a place of privilege and honour. Has no analogous place been granted to us?

But we may wander from it, even as Israel did. They acted not as circumcised ones. They ceased to fight against God's enemies. They made a league with enemies whom they had been commanded to destroy; and therefore, we soon read of them at Bochim—the place of tears and of weeping. The joy and strength of Gilgal was exchanged for the weakness and tears of Bochim. Is not this to be numbered among the things written for our admonition?

Not to speak of the professing Church, where are the servants of the Lord of whom it can be said, that they have attained, and stedfastly held the place which the circumcised people of the Lord should hold? Has there been no compromise, no nurturing of persons, or principles, or doctrines, or practices, that are false, worldly, or evil? Has the battle been waged stedfastly against every enemy of the Lord and of His Truth, and that,

with spiritual weapons only—with feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace? There is only one sword by which the battle of the Lord can be fought; and that is, the Word of God—the only sword which the Spirit uses. Are we able to wield it? Is the Word of God so apprehended by us, that we can use it, and it alone, as our weapon? Oh! that God's people would remember, that none can fight the battle of the Lord unless they use it—and it alone. He who most seeks to use it now, will most recognise how the true Gilgal-like—Joshua-like place has been forsaken. Such an one will not despise Bochim. He will not say, as some have said, that it is a place that should not be known by those who are seated in heavenly places in Christ risen. If we needed it not on our own account, we should need it because of others. Paul wept often. He well knew that the time is not yet come for God to wipe away all tears from our eyes. And although Bochim be, in one sense, the place of weakness; yet, it is in another, the place of strength: for there, peculiarly, we prove the mercies of Him who despiseth not the day of small things—who causeth mercy to rejoice against judgment; and whose grace seeks out the bruised reed, and the smoking flax, wheresoever found; refusing to break the one, or to quench the other.

The excellency of the person of Christ unalterable. Remarks on the doctrines of Olshausen.

THE Gospel of John commences thus: "In the beginning," that is, before anything was made that since hath been made—before any point was established by which time was to be measured, "the Word WAS." This is a description that could pertain only to One "whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting." Micah v. 2. WAS, as here used, includes in it the force of the I AM. "And the Word was with (*προς*) God." These words declare the distinctness of his personality. "And the Word was God." This is an express declaration of His true Deity. "The same was in the beginning with (*προς*) God." These words declare that the *relation* which He held towards the Father and the Holy Ghost was a relation from everlasting. "All things were made by him." This is a testimony to His creative power. "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. i. 16, 17. Thus, all creation in heaven above, and in the

earth beneath, bears witness to the eternal power and Godhead of the Son. He was also from everlasting "the Life"—"the Life that was with the Father." 1 John i.

Nor do any of the expressions which denote the essential and eternal excellency of His Divine Person cease to apply to Him when He humbled Himself, and took upon Himself the form of a servant. He did not, as some have said, "empty" Himself, when "he made himself of no reputation." In Him all the fulness of the Godhead bodily dwelt; even as it for ever dwells. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." 1 John i. Such was the attestation of the Holy Ghost to the Person of the Son, not merely before, but after He became incarnate. We believe in our Lord Jesus Christ as being, "the only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father." These things being true of Him from everlasting, ceased not to be true of Him when He became flesh. Yet when it is said of Him that He was made, or became flesh, "misconceive not, as if there were a mutation of the Godhead into flesh; for this was

performed not by changing what He was, but by assuming what He was not.”* The admirable union of God with man can enforce in that higher nature no *alteration*, because unto God there is nothing more natural than not to be subject unto any change.†

The humanity (and that is an expression which includes the life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) which our Surety took as man, and which as man, He laid down)—the humanity which the Word took into everlasting and inseparable union with His divine Person, was, as to sinlessness, purity, and holiness, like unto the sinlessness, purity, and holiness of Him who assumed it. Righteousness, *essentially* attached to the life that He took as man; and therefore, never was dissociated, or regarded as being dissociated from it. The physical weakness, passibility and mortality, that He was pleased to connect with Himself, when He came as man to obey, suffer, and die in the stead of His people, did not divest either His Deity or His humanity of one of their essential characteristics: and unchangeable holiness is a necessary and inseparable characteristic of a humanity taken into personal union with the Son of God. The very first announcement of His birth to Mary speaks of Him as the Holy One. “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that HOLY THING which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Hence a pure and holy

* Flavel’s Fountain of Life. p. 34.

† Hooker’s Eccl. Polity. p. 264.

humanity, by the miraculous operation of God the Holy Ghost, became united, not to the Person of the Father, nor to the Person of the Holy Ghost, but to the Person of the Eternal Son : so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures—the Godhead and the manhood, became inseparably joined together in one Person, “without conversion, composition, or confusion.” Immanuel was that Person in whom the Godhead and manhood were thus united. Now at last, the question, “Is there any new thing whereof it might be said, see, this is new?” could be answered. There had been a *new* operation of God’s power ; and the result was the manifestation of something that was altogether new. “Behold, the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth ; a woman shall compass a man.” The new Head of redeemed man—One in whom was quickening power of life, was, when JESUS was born, manifested.*

The angels when they sang, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth the peace of *ευδοκία* (well-pleasèdness) *amongst* men,” well understood that the “new thing in the earth” had come. There was now

* Christ, in the days of His flesh, was as truly “The Living One” (ὁ ζων, Rev. i. 18) and “the Life-giving One,” ὁ ζωην διδους, John vi. 33) and One who quickeneth (ζωοποιεῖ, John v. 21) as He now is in resurrection. This is denied by many : and they use the expression *resurrection-life*, in order to indicate that the life that He now has in resurrection is not the same that He had in the days of His flesh. But it is not so. He has the same life in different circumstances. He who was THE LIFE from everlasting must be THE LIFE unto everlasting. As respects the life (ψυχῆ) which He took as man, and which He laid down, that

One in earth in whom the perfectness of heaven was—over whose head heaven could be opened in attestation that the Father could rest in Him in complacent satisfaction. “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.” A circle of heavenly light was thus drawn, in the midst of the world’s darkness, around the Person of the Holy Substitute; and within that circle, all the true children of God were gathered, to be blessed through, and with Him, who had come to obey and suffer in their stead. In finding Him, they had found “the Stone of Israel”—the anointed One—the antitype to that anointed stone which Jacob set up to mark the place of Bethel.

He stood amongst His believing people as a friend, and as a brother: saying, “behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me.” He was a man, as truly as they were men. His humanity was not, as some have said, heavenly humanity. “Forasmuch then as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of THE SAME.”* Yet there was a

very life that He laid down He took again (See John x. 18) and with that life so resumed He was received up in glory. The life that He has as God, and the life that He has as man are essentially the same now, as when He was on the earth; though the *condition* of His being is changed—He being known now no longer “according to the flesh (*κατα σαρκα*) but according to the Spirit (*κατα πνευμα*). They who believed on Him in the days of His flesh were as truly quickened and with the same life, as they who believed on Him after He had ascended into glory.”

* “Let it be observed, that Christ took not our nature, as it is now in the glorified saints, who are not only freed from sin, but from all the sad effects of it; nor as it was in our first parents, in

difference betwixt Him and them. His humanity was sinless. It was, moreover, inseparably and for ever united with Deity; and to Him was given the Holy Ghost *without measure*. In a word, He was Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh. Whether regarded officially, as the Substitute, or personally, as being Immanuel, He always occupied a place that pertained to Himself alone. The fact of His bearing His people's sins, never brought Him down to the level of their personal condition. When all the guilt of His people was accumulated in one mighty aggregate on His holy head, His own personal place of holy separateness was still retained by Him, and recognised by God as retained. Though not separate from *the punishment* of sin, He was separate from the sin. Though He bore the sin of his people, and brought it up for judgment before God on the accursed tree; yet, He, who thus bore it, was still the Holy One—the Light and the Life—the Son of the

the state of innocency, before they had sinned, and before sin had made any breach upon human nature, and brought those weaknesses and infirmities upon it, which they afterward, and we now suffer under. But He took the nature of fallen man, as it was bruised and rendered infirm by the fall; He took our nature as weakened by sin, though not as defiled by it: there was no sin in His human nature, but there were those weaknesses and infirmities which were the sad issues of sin. These He laboured under and so knows how to pity and sympathise effectually with those that are yet under them. He was not exempted from those infirmities, which are part of the curse brought upon our nature by sin, but only exempted from what was sinful in them.”—Clarkson on “Christ touched with the feeling of our infirmities.” Clarkson was the co-pastor and successor of Dr. Owen.

Father's bosom. Heaven was opened over the Cross; and wrath, burning as fire, thence poured down on the head of the holy Substitute: but that which from the Cross returned to heaven, ascending in a cloud of grateful fragrance till it filled the sanctuary, was INCENSE. The sin of His people was imputed to the mighty Sufferer; but it was imputed to Him as the Holy One. Their sin entered not His nature: the imputation, thereof, wrought no change in the holy life that He laid down. It took not from that life its essential, inseparable perfectness. Personal separateness, in all holiness and heavenly perfectness, as much attached to Him when "He was made a curse for us," as now that he represents us in glory. Circumstantially, indeed, the difference is vast between His condition on the Cross and His condition in glory: but He was a Person whose essential characteristics no circumstances could change.*

* Some seriously misinterpret our Lord's words in John xii. 24, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone." They strangely imagine that the words "abide alone," refer to His separateness from sin and sinners; and that, until the Cross, He did abide alone in holy isolation; but that at the Cross, He gave up this isolation, and identified Himself, for a time, with the condition of those for whom He suffered. I scarcely need say, that this is a complete misunderstanding of the passage. What the Lord meant, was, that unless He made atonement by His substitutional death, He would remain alone in glory, with none of His people associated with Him there. That result He prevented by His atoning death—thereby reconciling and bringing unto God. His own isolation in holiness was maintained, and recognised as maintained during His death, quite as much as during His life. Otherwise, He could not have been a Substitute.

The veil, which in the Tabernacle separated the Holy Place from the Holiest of all, was the constituted type of the humanity of Christ. "The veil, that is to say, *his flesh*." Heb. x. 20. And it is especially associated with His death; for it was *then*, from its top to its bottom, rent. All the characteristics, therefore, of that holy veil were recognised as attaching to the humanity of Him on whom our iniquities were laid. The veil was weak, otherwise it could not have been rent. There were no wires of gold interwoven in it. In other words, Deity was not commingled with humanity in Christ. He was perfect God AND perfect man. Yet the natures, though distinct, were united. The veil was suspended on gold—the type of Divine nature. The basis, moreover, of the veil was pure white linen; and on this basis of perfect *purity* were displayed, heavenly blue, as well as purple and scarlet; and these, wrought into forms of cherubim; indicating that there were displayed, in the character and ways of Christ, traits and habits of heavenly and superhuman excellency. Glorious and almighty power also (and it was this that the cherubic forms indicated) dwelt in the man Christ Jesus: and its presence, ever discerned by the eye of God, was sometimes acknowledged even by man, as when they said: "never man spake as this man": "what manner of man is this that even the waves and the sea obey him." "He dwelt amongst us full of grace and truth:" "and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Thus, heavenliness and heavenly developments were recognised as associated with His humanity;

even before it became so circumstantially changed, as to be what it now is—glorified above the heavens. The body of Christ is now a spiritual body : the capacities of His humanity are enlarged ; for it is glorified according to the glory of God. But it is the same body, and the same humanity. The life that He laid down, that same life He took again. As to purity and holiness, His body ~~was~~^{is} not more suited to be the temple of God now, than it was in the days of His humiliation. No defilement ever penetrated it.

The true doctrine of Substitution (which is the keystone in the arch of Truth) must be subverted, if it be imagined that our Substitute, during any part of His work as the Sin-bearer, ceased to be recognised as personally standing in that isolation of holiness which pertained to Him, as being One from whom the absolute perfectness of heaven was inseparable. When we speak of Him as bearing our sin, we do not mean that He took the taint or pollution (*macula*) of our sin—we mean simply that as One avowedly retaining His own essential perfectness, He took on Himself the *reatus* or legal ascription of our guilt, so as to subject Himself to the penalties appointed to Him because of such assumption. Never, either at the Incarnation or on the Cross, did He identify Himself with our moral condition. He met the penalties appointed to Him because of the sin that attached to our moral condition ; but that is a very different thing from making our moral condition His. “Reason and Scripture alike teach that the personal character of one man can never be transferred to

another ; but on the other hand, that the legal responsibility, or liability to punishment, under which one man labours, may be transferred to another, whensoever sovereign authority recognises one as legally representing the other When we are justified or declared to be righteous for Christ's sake, we are no less than before personally sinners in heart and habit, because it is His legal merit, and not his personal holiness that is counted ours. So Christ remains no less infinitely 'holy, harmless, and undefiled,' when the chastisement of our sins is laid upon Him, or their legal responsibility counted His." *Hodge's Outlines of Theology*, page 314.

In Germany, however, and in this country, great efforts have been made, even by those who have not in word rejected the substitutional work of Christ to represent Him as incurring when He became the Surety, something more than the *reatus* or legal ascription of our guilt. As an example of the manner, in which, in Germany, writers reputed to be evangelical speak of Christ's relation to sin, I may refer to Olshausen, who has by many been greatly magnified as if his writings were a mine of Truth. No one probably more than Olshausen would shrink from attributing personal sin to Christ, yet we find him saying that "bodily the Lord was connected with this world of sin" though "loosely:" that the Lord "*identified Himself essentially* with sinful men, His relation being to them *as their new man* to the old." Olsh. on Rom. viii. Now, inasmuch as he admits that there is but one personality in the regenerate man (for the personal name Peter denotes a person in whom

the old man and the new co-exist), it would seem necessarily to follow that if Christ's relation to men is that of their new man to their old, Christ and sinful men must be united in a personal unity of being. I am disposed to think that he would shrink from this conclusion; yet we find him saying, that Christ is not *A* man (*i.e.* one who has a distinct recognised personal standing of His own contrasted with that of those whose Substitute He is), but He is "*THE man, the real comprisal of the totality,*" so that "the sin of the collective race" is regarded as being "*IN* [observe the word *in*] the Holy One." (p. 266.) "God," says Olshausen, "in agreement with Christ's *real unity* with sinful man regarded Him as surety and sacrifice for the whole race, in order in His Person [so that His Person is regarded as embodying in itself sin] to condemn sin for ever." Olshausen on 2 Cor. v., p. 326. According to this system, therefore, Christ saves, not by coming as the Holy One *substitutionally* to bear the punishment due to others, and *substitutionally* to present His own perfectness in their stead, but He saves by bringing Himself into personal connexion with man's sin; abolishing it, and then communicating instead His own perfectness. The thought of satisfaction made to God is quenched; and the principle of substitution is made to disappear before that of union. Accordingly, he speaks of there being through faith, "a transfer to man of the *being* of Christ;" and adds, that this is denoted by the expression, "righteousness is imputed to him:" so that, according to this, we are not justified as ungodly by the transfer to us of Another's merits,

but by the transfer to us of *the being* of Christ: and this, Olshausen calls *imputation*; whereas, it would most certainly be, *impartment*. He says also that as all men have fallen in Adam, so in Christ have they all been raised again; and that therefore "God recognises all as righteous in Him." This, if it were true, would be justification not by the Cross, but by union with the Person of Christ risen. It would be, indeed, difficult to say what place the Cross could hold in a system like this. Shall we abandon the blessed doctrines of the Reformation on Justification, as taught by Calvin, Beza, Turretine and Witsius, Owen and Clarkson, the Halldanes, Hodge and Smeaton, for falsehoods like these?*

It may seem wonderful that a person like Olshausen should commit himself to such manifest absurdities. The reason evidently is, that Olshausen refuses to receive the true doctrine of Substitution, as taught in the Protestant standards and in the extracts I have just

* I have not thought it necessary to dwell on the patent error of Olshausen in supposing that there is an actual union betwixt *all* men and Christ, who is supposed to be the generic representative and embodiment of the whole race. The doctrine of universal restitution must of course result from this statement; and this Olshausen, elsewhere, does not hesitate to avow. See my remarks on this in Occasional Papers, No. III., p. 195. But even if there were not these added errors, the system would still be most deadly. His principles would be utterly untrue, even if in their application limited to the true children of God. All that he says about Christ bringing Himself into union with men by incarnation is false: for by the act of incarnation, He did not bring Himself into union with any, not even His people. His union with all those to whom He is united is in the Spirit.

quoted from Hodge. He is striving to invent a theory by which, whilst retaining many of the same theological terms, he may invalidate the thoughts which orthodox Protestantism has associated with them. He is not content to say, that Christ as the sin-bearer was bearing the penalty of something that was recognised as thoroughly in every sense distinct from His own holy Person; because, if he said this unqualifiedly, he would also have to say (what he does not wish to say) that we are justified solely on the ground of a service, performed externally to ourselves by Another. He is not willing to admit that the ascription of Another's righteousness to those whose personal condition is that of sinners, does, of itself alone, supply the title to complete justification. Rather than admit that we are justified solely on account of the ascription to us of that which is Another's, He labours to show that Christ, as the Sin-bearer, became connected with the sins He bore, in a sense more intimate than that which is implied by saying that He suffered only because of the ascription to Him of the guilt of sins which pertained to others, whilst, personally, He still remained in the avowed and acknowledged isolation of His own unchanged and unchangeable perfectness.

In England, there are very many who (whilst shrinking from the doctrines of Olshausen touching the incarnation, and all that he teaches as to the consequences thereof) do, nevertheless, believe that righteousness did not attach to the life that Christ laid down on the Cross, as it now attaches to the life that He hath in glory.

They do not see that His own personal excellency was, throughout the whole period of His suffering on the Cross, recognised and presented as a sweet savour of perfectness unto God. To many of the statements of Olshausen (if limited to believers), they would little, if at all, object; as for example, when he says that there is a transfer to man (saved man) of "the being of Christ," and adds that this is denoted by the expression, "righteousness is imputed to him." There are many around us who are disposed to teach that our relation to Christ is not substitutional, but unional. The thought that many have of the reason of the Lord's sufferings on the Cross, would be far more correctly conveyed by the expression "impartation of His people's condition," than it would be by "imputation of His people's guilt." Thus too, justification is regarded, not as founded on that which has been externally wrought for us by Another; but as consisting in the communication of a new condition of being. Even if the word "imputation" be, by those who hold these doctrines, retained, it becomes, in their use of it, equivalent to *impartation*.

Whenever, therefore, we hear that the life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) which Christ resumed in resurrection is not the same as that which He laid down on the Cross; or that the life that He laid down in making atonement, was not regarded by God as having righteousness essentially and inseparably attached to it, as truly as righteousness now attaches to it in glory; or if it be denied that the presentation of that life in all its essential excellency to God, was as necessary, as was its being laid down, to the

effectuation of atonement; or when life and quickening power of life is said not to have been in Christ while on earth, in the same sense as it is now in Him in glory; or when it is, in any form, asserted, that we are justified, not by knowing Christ as the Substituted One, but by knowing Him as One with whom we are united :* —whenever any of these things are taught, there is error; not exactly, indeed, the same in form with that of Olshausen, but not less subversive of the true doctrine of atonement.

* In that case, our justification would be made to result, not from what Christ has substitutionally wrought for us, but from our union with Him. Now what does the Scripture teach? “By ONE OFFENCE judgment came: by ONE RIGHTEOUSNESS, the free gift came.” In other words, *judgment* took its stand on the ground supplied by the “one offence” of our first representative (Adam) and thence operates unto eternal death. On the other hand, *grace* takes its stand on the ground provided by the one righteousness of our (believers’) second representative (Christ) and thence reigns unto eternal life. Union with Christ in life, and every other blessing that has been, or shall be, conferred on the redeemed, in time, or in eternity, are *the results of grace reigning on this new ground*. But how was this new ground supplied? *That is the great question*. Until it was supplied, the relation in which we stood to God was exclusively one of judgment. He could bestow on us neither union with Christ, nor any other gift of grace. How then was this new ground on which grace founds her throne supplied? Simply and only, by means of “the one righteousness”; or as it is defined in the next verse—“the obedience of the One.” Until our Substitute had met all the appointed penalties, and supplied the appointed obedience, and so made satisfaction unto the claims of God, grace could neither give life, union, nor any other blessing. To say that it could, would be equivalent to saying, that we could be saved without atonement.

Christ, although not separate from *punishment* due to our sinful condition of being, was perfectly separate from our sinful condition of being. He did not take upon Him our state of being, when He took upon Himself to bear *the penalties* due to our state of being. Our *state* of being was a sinful state of being; and Christ never took *it* on Himself, either on the Cross as some say, or by incarnation as Olshausen says. Indeed, unless He had been throughout the whole of His earthly course, from the cradle to the tomb, recognised as personally dissociated in every possible sense, both from our sins and from our sinful condition of being, He could not have been the Substitute. Moreover, atonement was a work *towards God*. It consisted not merely in our Substitute's bearing all that was appointed to be borne of penalty—penalty due to our sins and to our sinful nature; but whilst He bore that which was due to our sinful life, He had also to present as a sweet savour, the contrasted excellency of His own perfect life—that life which He laid down, and which He took again. See John x. 18. This having been done by Him as our appointed Representative, we were thereby brought under the ascription of the value of that which He had thus effected for us. As the act of our first representative (Adam) brought us under guilt, condemnation, and death; so the act of our second Representative brought us unto righteousness, justification, and life. Adam by *acting* brought us into condemnation and death: Christ by *acting* brought us to justification and life. The award of life to us in union with Christ in glory is the result

and the purchase of Christ's atoning service. As a consequence of the righteousness and justification thus attained by His atonement, we are no longer under the dominion of sin, and are finally to be delivered even from its presence. The corrupt condition of being which attaches to us as one of the penal consequences of Adam's sin, is to be abolished; and we are to be brought into actual association with that life of power and glory which Christ now hath above the heavens. *We* are to enter that sphere of unearthly glory as those who have been born again, and made new creatures in Him: but *He* entered it as a sphere to which He properly belonged, saying, "Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." In order, however, that we might be delivered from our sinful condition of being with all that thereunto attached, and become heirs of a glorified condition of humanity above the heavens, it was needful that atonement should first be *made unto God*: but atonement could only be effected by a Substitute doing and suffering such things as were appointed to Him *as the Substitute* to do and to suffer—such a Substitute standing *personally* in a relation avowedly distinct and contrasted with the relation of those for whom He acted; and able to present to God for atonement, a perfectness of person, character, condition, and action—standing in absolute contrast with those whose Substitute He is. The value of such a substitutional service could attach to none except by ascription or imputation. Such was the service which He, who was the Life

and the Light, and who never ceased to be the Life and the Light, came to perform; and did perform for all His believing people. In doing it, He left not His own perfectness. On the contrary, He presented it for them unto God.

The excellency of all that He was as the Light and the Life was brought into His atoning death: and all the infinite meritoriousness thereof rests for ever on the heads of those for whom it was presented. Whatever is bestowed on us personally, is the result and consequence of our having been brought under the ascription of that meritoriousness—our Divine Substitute's meritoriousness. Shall we reject it? Shall we say that it is not "substitution," but "union," by which we are justified and saved? If we do, we war against the Gospel of God, unconsciously perhaps, but as truly as do the Neologians, or the Romanists. The plan of attack and the motive may be different, but the object of attack is the same.

Modern Doctrines Respecting Sinlessness Considered.*

To oppose any who seem desirous of aiding the progress of God's people in the way of holiness, is a painful duty. Yet it is a duty, if in such efforts any deflexion from God's revealed Truth be traceable. The Spirit of holiness is also the Spirit of Truth. He cannot swerve from that which He has Himself spoken. The Scripture is *His* testimony; consequently, the authority of the Scripture, and the authority of the Holy Ghost, are co-equal. Every divergence, therefore, from the testimony of the Holy Ghost, must be anxiously withstood. Bunyan's Pilgrim found that paths which seemed, at first, to run almost parallel to the king's highway, became utterly divergent at last. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." If we use not that Word with subject hearts, we shall soon find ourselves surrounded with the snares and entanglements of darkness.

* This paper more particularly refers to the writings of Mr. R. Pearsall Smith, which, of late, have been extensively circulated in this country. The titles of the pamphlets to which I shall refer are, "*Through Death to Life.*" "*Is Romans vii. to be the continued experience of the Christian?*" "*Holiness through Faith.*"

That the Gospel-light graciously vouchsafed to Protestant Christendom has not produced, even amongst those who have truly received it unto salvation, the effects that might justly have been expected, I fully acknowledge. There has been often great worldliness, slumber, adulteration of Truth, and compromise, even amongst those who have truly received the Gospel of the grace of God. Whilst standing within the circle of light, our desire seems to have been, not to draw nearer and nearer to the brightness of its centre, but rather, to keep as close as possible to its verge; as if we were unwilling to be too decidedly separated from the surrounding darkness. Many who would be miserable if they did not think, that, through God's grace, they stand before Him "*uncharged*" (*ανεγκλητοι*, 1 Cor i. 8) do, nevertheless, show little anxiety to be "*unblamed*." (*αμεμπτοι*, 1 Thess. v. 23.)* Thankful to be, through faith, children of God, we may show little anxiety to be "obedient children." Satisfied with being on the one foundation, we may care little whether we build on it things precious as gold, or worthless as stubble. Priestly garments may have been given to us; yet they may not have been kept unspotted. I freely admit that there is need amongst God's own children of self-judgment and repentance in many things. That condition of "blamelessness" of which the Scripture speaks, should earnestly

* See the difference between the meanings of *ανεγκλητος*, *αμεμπτος* &c., considered in "Notes expository of the Greek of the first chapter of the Romans," as advertised at end of this volume.

be sought after by those who desire to be found in well-pleasing before Him. His mercy and grace are our encouragement to seek it. He can "heal the backsliding." He upbraideth not for the past, but restoreth and giveth liberally. "There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mightest be feared."

What then is blamelessness? In order that God might be able to regard our practical condition as one that He blames not, is it needful that that condition should be one of sinlessness? In order to answer this question, we must first determine what sinlessness is. God's definition thereof cannot vary; because it is founded on the principles of His own unchanging holiness. There must be no known or wilful transgression—no sins of ignorance—absolute perfectness in the inner man—absolute perfectness in developed character—full, perfect, unreserved devotedness to God in all things. In a word, there must be no tendency towards evil: there must be all tendency towards good. And this tendency must be efficacious in result. It must reach perfectly the end proposed.

Christ was all this. In Him, every tendency was towards good and against evil. His holiness (seeing that it was unchangeable) was the same on earth as it is now in glory. Feet comparable to "fine brass as though they burned in a furnace," (Rev. i. 15), must be intolerant and repellent of all defilement—His feet on earth as truly answered to this symbol as they now do in Heaven. He placed Himself, indeed, in the midst of the taints and defilements of earth; but feet of fire could not be affected

by any contiguity of evil. Fire is repellent of corruption. The full power of the Divine holiness was in Him. His feet, therefore, at the end of His sojourn on earth, were worthy of being anointed : and they were anointed with ointment—costly and fragrant. His disciples, even after they had been made clean through the word that He had spoken unto them, yet needed that their feet should be washed ; and they were washed. But His feet were *not* washed ; they were *anointed*. Is there no designed contrast in this ?

Christ was tempted ; but *externally*, by Satan : not internally, as we are. There is something in us, yea, even in the regenerate, that entices and allures away from God. “The mind of the flesh (*φρονημα σαρκος*, Rom. viii.) is not subject to the law of God ; neither indeed can be.” “Every one is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed.” James i. 14. This is a deeply important passage. It teaches us that there is in us, a living, active principle of evil, which, even when not acted on by external agency, does of itself, *proprio motu*, entice from good and draw towards evil. This principle, even if resisted, is *in virtue of its essential bias against God*, SIN. To entice and allure away from good, is one of the great characteristics of Satan as the Tempter : and this, SIN *within* us is able to do, and does do internally, as well as Satan externally. In the millennium, Satan will be bound. Those who will people the earth during the millennium will not be tempted externally by him ; yet SIN (however repressed by grace) will still dwell in all who are yet in their

natural bodies, and will still struggle against God. This will be one of the great lessons of the next dispensation. Sin within us, if not resisted, "bringeth forth sin;" that is, developed sin or transgression. No such principle was in Christ. On the contrary, there was in Him essential holiness—the bias of which was as determinedly *towards* God, as the bias of SIN within us is systematically *against* God. The temptations, therefore, which Satan dared to present to the Lord, were wholly external in their origination. Satan presented them to His holy soul; but as regards response, they were as sparks struck upon the ocean. The susceptibilities, indeed, of His holiness painfully felt their heinousness; but the feeling was one of horror, hatred, and repulency. There was no susceptibility to temptation in Him; no liability to sin. But it is far otherwise with us. Besides our "new man," there is in us an opposed nature, which, however it may be mortified, exists: and its feelings and sympathies are with Satan. Its affections are towards that by which Satan tempts. Accordingly, in our case, external temptation comes like a spark struck upon tinder; or rather, it comes as fire meeting fire. It finds something congenial to itself within us, and with that it mingles; bringing to it added strength. We may be on the watch: through the presence and power of the Spirit, the fire may be prevented from spreading. There may be no conflagration. But still, effects have been produced—effects that make manifest before God, and before our consciences (if sufficiently sensitive), that there is something within

us that does not withstand, but aid, the temptation presented by the external Tempter. There is no thorough, absolute, instant, repellency. It was not so with Christ—the Sinless One. If, therefore, we pretend to sinlessness, we must either raise ourselves to the level of His condition, and say that we have no tendency—no bias towards evil, but that all our tendencies are towards good: or else, we must bring Him down to the level of our condition, and say, that there was no essential difference between temptation in His case, and temptation in ours.

Temptation is not sin, if it arise exclusively from an *external* source. In that case, “it is no sin to be tempted.” But if the temptation arise from the activity of a principle of evil within, or if there be even a dormant principle of evil within, whose sympathies and tendencies, when aroused, are with that which externally tempts, then, none, so circumstanced, can speak of sinlessness. It is true, indeed, that *for Christ’s sake*, the guilt attaching to this principle of evil is not charged on us to condemnation; but the fact of its existence remains, and constitutes *one* most marked contrast between the condition of our sinless Substitute and our condition—however matured in grace such condition may be. This, the Scripture declares; this, the orthodox Protestant Confessions do, with one voice, affirm.

The author, however, of the pamphlets whose titles are prefixed, is differently minded: otherwise, he could not have written the words that follow:

“The soul surrounded by temptation and defilement, feels itself somewhat as a dead miser would be in the presence of a bag of

gold: not indeed without liability to sin, yet with an actual deadness of soul towards it. In such a condition, how sin can be a temptation, I leave. My Lord was tempted, and in 'Him was no sin.' Temptation is not sin, though by consenting to it we may follow the temptation. My object is not metaphysical analysis," &c.

At present, I merely quote these words to show that the writer has drawn no clear distinction between the temptation of Him, in whom no sin was, and the temptation of those in whom sin is. Yet, without the recognition of this distinction between Christ the Holy One and ourselves, it is impossible that any right conclusion can be arrived at on the question we are considering.

§ II.

NOTHING can be more obstructive of progress in true holiness than statements that obscure the difference between the personal condition of Christ, and the personal condition of believers. In the words just quoted, that difference has been more than obscured. At present, however, I will not pursue this branch of the subject.

The author thinks that believers may, and should be, brought into such a relation to sin, that their condition in the presence of temptation (in whatsoever way the temptation may come) would be that "of a dead miser to a bag of gold." In other words, evil would produce no effect upon us at all; for that which is dead cannot feel.

But where does the Scripture speak of such an extinction of sin in me, that Satan and the world find in me the insensibility of death? If that be so, why should I be commanded to "*mortify*" my members that are on the earth? We cannot mortify that which is already dead.

Again, the Apostle, in a passage in which he is avowedly describing the condition of all believers whilst they are yet in the body, says: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh." Gal. v. 17. The Apostle speaks of a constant antagonism, and of a constant conflict. "THE FLESH LUSTETH." Is that death?

Because of the strength and vigour of the flesh, we have to fight against it. What should we think of a soldier who, instead of going forth to battle against his enemies, persisted in declaring that they were all dead! Surely, we should mistrust his soldiership.

Again, we find in the Epistle of James these words: "in many things we all offend. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body." James iii. 2. Shall we reject these words of the Apostle? Shall we say, that although the standard by which the practical attainments of God's people are to be measured, has been in this passage appointed by God Himself, He has, nevertheless, erred, and fixed it too low? Shall we say, that none ought to be considered practically perfect except those who have so *slain* SIN that it remains no longer in a condition capable of being "*bridled?*" Shall we further say, that God has misrepresented the fact of our condition when He says of us all, that, viewed according to the perfectness of His holiness and purity, we all "offend?" This is God's sentence. He proved its truth in the case of Job. Shall we venture to reverse it?

"Bridle" is a word that implies forcible restraint. In Heaven, there will be nothing to be bridled. In Christ, there was nothing to be bridled. Perfectness needs no restraint. It rejoices in development. To "bridle" perfectness would be sin.

In this passage, therefore, we find the testimony of the Holy Ghost to two great truths:

I. That in many things we all offend.

II. That he who effectually bridles his tongue does thereby evidence that he has reached as high a measure of practical perfectness as is attainable here.

Consequently, to affirm that we can ever, whilst in the body, attain to a state in which no evil that requires to be bridled remains in us, is expressly to contradict the Scripture.

Again, we read that after the Apostle Paul had been caught up into the third heavens, there was danger of his being lifted up with pride. Consequently, in the Apostle, the root of evil was not dead. Shall we say, that it ought to have been dead? Shall we say, that if he had walked in the higher path in which we walk, and if his faith had been as strong, and as rightly directed as ours, all evil in him would have been dead; and in that case, whatever the temptation, he would have found himself in its presence "as a dead miser in the presence of a bag of gold?" Shall we elevate ourselves into a condition of holiness which he, who was caught up into Paradise, knew not? If any should do this, it would very convincingly prove that in *them*, at any rate, evil was not dead.

§ III.

THE inaccurate rendering of the aorist tenses by our translators in Romans vi., and elsewhere, has, to many minds, thrown an obscurity over this subject, which needs to be removed. See, for example, the eighth verse of Romans vi. "If we died (*ει απεθανομεν*) with Christ"—that is, if we (as is certainly true) passed *representatively* through judicial death when He died in our stead, we believe that we shall also live with Him. See also Col. iii. 3. "Ye died (*απεθανετε*) and your life is hid with Christ in God." And 2 Cor. v. 14. "If one died instead of all [all believers], then did the whole die." Not one of these, and like texts, speak of our being *in a state of death*. They refer to the great accomplished fact of our having died (not personally but representatively) when our Substitute passed through judicial death in our stead; and they speak also of our being alive unto God in Him. If we were regarded as being in a state of death, we should neither be commanded to mortify any thing, for he who is personally dead cannot mortify; nor can that which is dead be mortified; nor should we be commanded to reckon ourselves dead, for we do not say to a person who is actually dead, "reckon thyself dead;" though to a person who has representatively died, but is personally alive, we may, and should say this. We must be very careful,

therefore, not to misquote the Scripture, and to represent it as saying, "*ye are dead*," when it does not say this, but says, "*ye died*." Believers, though they have never died personally, and though they are not in a state of death, either spiritually or otherwise, can nevertheless say, "we died" when Christ our Representative died in our stead. "If one died instead of all, then did the whole die." Every conclusion, therefore, that is founded on the supposition that the words "*ye died*" mean "*ye are dead*," necessarily fails.

Nor is this a point of secondary moment. We have jealousy to watch that no text which speaks of the substitutional work of our God and Saviour be diverted from its proper meaning. When the Scripture says, "*ye died*"—*απεθавετε*, its great object is to direct our souls to that one moment when our holy Substitute bowed His head in death, and said, "It is finished." Every believer has a title to say that he then passed (not indeed personally but representatively) through judicial death. "I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." Our Substitute (not ourselves personally) was baptised with that baptism of suffering; yet we, as having been represented by Him, are regarded as having been baptised therewith. "With the baptism wherewith I am baptised withal shall ye be baptised."* See Mark x. 39.

* The baptism of His suffering under the power of wrath we know nothing of *personally*: we have passed through it *representatively*. The cup of His joy we are personally to share with Him. Such is the appointment of grace.

Blessed to all who had believed in Jesus was that hour, when, in their Substitute, they emerged from that judicial death. They left it encompassed by all the preciousness of that incense-like fragrance that had ascended from that sacrificial death : and when He was received up in glory, they too entered (still representatively, not personally) those heavenly places where He took His seat as their Forerunner, Representative, and Head. And what was true of them, becomes true of us the moment we believe. The family of faith are they of whom these things are spoken ; and whensoever, through personal faith, we enter that family, *then* the blessings that pertain to that family become personally ours. Thoughts, bright with heavenly radiancy, encircle the words, "ye died;" but they are quenched by the words, "ye are dead." No *representative* thought can be rightly connected with the words "ye are dead," as denoting a present condition : for *representatively* we are not in a state of death but of life, and seated in heavenly places in Christ. "In that He died, He died unto sin once ; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God." To reckon myself to have a title to act according to that which pertains to my *representative* condition, is a very different thing from saying that my actual condition is in all respects identical with my representative condition. Moreover, the Holy Ghost in sanctifying, or causing a practical death to the *service* of sin, effects this by leading our souls to an apprehension of the work of our Substitute—especially His great sacrificial work on Calvary. Our advance in the path of practical sanctifica-

tion will greatly depend on the manner in which we apprehend that which God has effected for us by the death and resurrection of our Head. The Holy Ghost was sent to glorify Christ, and Christ's work. The words, "*ye died*," direct our souls to an hour of victory and triumph over all our enemies—over all that separated us from God: and they speak of results that associate us, even now, with glory; whereas, the words, "*ye are dead*," dim, if they do not destroy, our apprehension of the blessings which representatively pertain to us in our Head, and divert us from those constituted objects of faith whereby the soul becomes comforted and strengthened for its service.

We have also to remember that the words, "*ye died with Christ—ye are alive unto God in him*," are not restricted to any special section or class of believers: they are avowedly used of *all* believers *as such*. They are as true of the babe in faith as of the father in Christ; as true of Mark as of Paul; of the erring believers at Corinth as of the unblamed Thessalonians. The power of Scripture exhortation, as addressed to believers, is founded on the fact that the grace of God has already brought them *in Christ* into that condition to which they are exhorted to be practically conformed. "*Ye died with Christ*;" therefore walk as those who so died. "*Ye are alive unto God in him*;" therefore walk as those who are alive unto God in Him. "*Ye are alive in the Spirit*;" therefore walk as those who are alive in the Spirit. The exhortation is grounded on that which grace has already inalienably bestowed.

Accordingly, Baptism (which is the constituted sign that we are regarded as those who died when our Representative died, and were raised when He was raised) is, by God's own appointment, administered to believers at the very first moment they believe. The Pentecostal converts; the eunuch in the wilderness; the jailor at Philippi; believed and were baptised instantly. They were baptised before they could have had any practical experience of that which Baptism on the part of God signifies and seals. But we must say that the Apostles were wrong in doing this, if we adopt that exposition of the sixth of Romans which requires that the words, "ye died with Christ," should be altered into, "ye are dead;" and be explained as meaning that a state of absolute practical death to sin has been attained. By the author's own showing, such a condition is not attained by *all* believers. Baptism, therefore, could not be administered to *all* believers; but only to those who have attained this perfect practical death to sin. Baptism would no longer refer to that which God has made *all* believers to be in Christ; but it would denote a supposed state of practical death to sin which is attained by *some* believers only. Moreover, seeing that it is alleged that sin, after having been slain, may (if there be not watchfulness and faith,) revive, it would be needful to say, that in every case in which sin did so revive, the condition denoted by Baptism must be lost. We should cease to be entitled to the sign. For, seeing that Baptism denotes a condition *held by us, and recognised by God as held by us*, if the condition ceases to belong

to us, we must, as a consequence, cease to be entitled to the sign. Our right to the sign must depend on our possession of the condition which the sign was appointed to indicate. We should virtually become unbaptised persons. Should we then, in case of recovering our lost condition, be rebaptised ?

I would not intentionally misrepresent the opinions of Mr. Pearsall Smith. That I have not done so, the following quotation will, I think, sufficiently show. In the 14th page of one of his publications entitled, "Through Death to Life, the lesson of the sixth of Romans," he writes as follows :

"You need not, as do some, be all your life dying and yet never dead; always on the Cross, yet never crucified to the world; the process of spiritual surgery progressing joint by joint, member by member, yet never finished; handing over your old life to death, and yet resuming it again; consigned to burial, yet refusing to die. Oh, what a life-time of suffering some insist upon enduring in spiritual hospitals, when, if they *would* but be 'planted in the likeness of Christ's death,' they would find 'also the likeness of His resurrection'—the 'life . . . more abundantly;' for which the Son of God came, suffered, died, and rose again. When on the battle-field a man is wounded, he limps away, or is carried off to hospital, to recover his vital power again; but if he throws up his hands suddenly into the air, every one knows that the bullet has reached his heart, and that he is a dead man. The centre of his existence has been reached, and as life once radiated thence through all his frame, so now death extends thence to all his members. Death is sudden, but the death is over. There are no lingering agonies, no weary days, months, and years of half-life, no amputations,—death is the accomplished thing. It is thus, dear Christian, that I desire death in you. Not so much by the process of a gradual, never accomplished crucifixion of the flesh ;

not so much by a severing of this and that and the other member ; not so much by the cutting out of the cancers,—though this otherwise might be needful,—but by dying in the centre of your existence to self ; that is, to that bundle of passions, selfishnesses, ambitions, uncleannesses, and idolatries, which constitute the many members of ‘ the body of death ’ which is to ‘ be destroyed.’ What this means the Holy Spirit alone can explain to your experience ; but I cannot doubt that He *will* define it to the honest, God-fearing inquirer after God’s highway of holiness.” *

Now, inasmuch as the Apostle declares that the condition described in the sixth of Romans is one that

* In a note at the foot of page 14 Mr. Smith adds : “ In using this figure [that of a dead man] it is possible that more may be inferred than is intended. No simile is perfect, and this fails in that, although there has been a death to sin and a resurrection in newness of life, yet all the avenues of temptation through the senses and the motions remain open ; and a want of continuous faith and watchfulness on the part of the believer would be followed by the resuscitation of the old life ; as in chapter vii. : ‘ sin *revived* [or became alive again] and I [as to this full resurrection-life] died.’ The word ‘ revived,’ in the original, is only used in one other place : ‘ My son was dead and is *alive again*.’ The flesh is *liable* at any moment to ‘ revive ’ or become ‘ alive again,’ though through faith it may unvaryingly be kept in the place of death.”

If sin could revive so as for the state described in the sixth of Romans to be forfeited, that state could never be recovered. But this cannot be. Sin can never again assume that relation towards believers which the power of God’s grace in Christ has for ever taken from her. Mr. Smith has evidently not observed the contrast between that part of the seventh of Romans (from verse seven to twelve inclusive) which describes Paul’s condition *as a man*, and the subsequent part of the chapter (from verse thirteen to end) which describes his experience *as a believing man*. See this treated of in Tract entitled, “ Romans vii. Considered,” as advertised at end of this volume.

pertains to all believers *as such*; whereas Mr. Smith restricts the condition to those believers who become practically dead to sin like men slain on a battle-field, it is obvious that the teaching of the Apostle, and that of Mr. Smith essentially differ; and we have to elect which we will follow.

Mr. Smith also says, page 16 :

“ ‘The likeness of his resurrection’ is elsewhere expressed by the words, ‘*working in you* that which is well pleasing in His sight;’ and by the words, ‘for it is God that *worketh in you* both to will and to do of His good pleasure.’ The natural will being dead, the agony of a divided life and purpose is gone; for now our glorious motive-power, God’s own will, works in us, freed from internal opposition,—even though still subject to external assaults, and, through want of watching unto prayer, liable to a revival of the old slain will.”

Here again it is obvious that, according to the teaching of Mr. Smith, none could rightly apply to themselves those blessed words, “ye died;” nor rightly receive in Baptism the sign of that past death, unless *their natural will was dead*, and God’s will worked in them “*freed from internal opposition.*”

Further, it is evident that the state described in the sixth of Romans, and indicated in the rite of Baptism, is a state that attaches of necessity to all the justified. They to whom that state attaches *not*, cannot be numbered among the justified. Consequently, if we adopt the principles of Mr. Smith, we must say that they in whom God’s will does not work “freed from all internal opposition” have not attained the state described in

the sixth of Romans, and indicated by Baptism ; and therefore, must be numbered among the unpardoned.

Thirdly, it is manifest, that if the state supposed by Mr. Smith to be indicated in this chapter could be attained, the practical commandments of this chapter, and of Scripture generally, would, the moment such a state was attained, cease to be applicable ; for we could not use such expressions as “ mortify,” “ bridle,” “ keep under,” “ bring into subjection,” and the like, of any in whom the natural will was *dead*, and in whom God’s will worked “ *freed from all internal opposition.*”

§ IV.

THE object of the sixth of Romans is not to teach us that our conflict with indwelling sin can cease whilst we are yet in the body. There is nothing there that tells us that God's own will works in us "freed from all internal opposition." What we learn from that blessed chapter is, that in virtue of what our Representative has done, we, *according to the judicial sentence of God* (a sentence already pronounced over us, though not yet carried out into its final results), stand in a relation to Sin and to God, similar to that in which our Representative stands. When Christ as our Representative died, we (representatively) died: when He as our Representative rose, we (representatively) rose. He passed through judicial death in our stead. That terrible hour is past; and He has borne us through wrath into glory. In Him we live unto God. Our life is hid with Christ in God. Hence, when the hour of resurrection comes, full participation in the glory and perfectness of our risen Lord is secured to us. We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. Then no longer shall we have to contrast, as now, our representative and our personal condition.

In the meanwhile, however, our personal and practical relation to Sin is essentially and for ever changed. Our natural relation to Sin is clearly defined in the fifth

chapter of the Romans. Sin is there personified. In consequence of Adam's transgression, Sin is described as entering like a mighty monarch into the world, there to reign in the power of death. See Rom. v. 21.* As a penal infliction of the hand of God in consequence of our first representative's transgression, we are delivered over to the sovereignty of Sin. Sin reigns around us, and over us, and in us. We are amenable to the curse of judicial death, which she is entitled to inflict on all who are her subjects. She has become the mistress of all our powers, outward and inward. In a word, we are altogether in her hand. It is, as I have already said, a penal infliction of the hand of God because of our first representative's transgression.

The governmental appointments of God are not like those of men—*arbitrary*. They are all founded on principles that necessarily emanate from the requirements of His essential holiness. Men may enact arbitrarily, and as arbitrarily reverse what they have enacted. But it is otherwise with God. He can only act (whether in punishing or in forgiving,) in consistency with the claims of His own essential holiness: and as He only is able, so He alone has the right, to determine what the claims of that holiness demand. Accordingly, when Adam, after having been constituted the representative of others, did in that character transgress, the holiness of God appointed that “judgment unto condemnation,”

* *Εβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ.* The Law is similarly personified in the commencement of the seventh chapter.

founded on that one transgression, should go forth. And when judgment had gone forth with all its penal consequences, (and of these consequences, the establishment of Sin's empire was one,) God's holiness required that before the action of judgment was intercepted and supplanted by the action of mercy and grace, a second Representative should be found, to supply, by His compensatory obedience, a ground on which the action of grace might be founded, even as the action of judgment was founded on our first representative's transgression. Before the power of penal death, wherewith Sin had been empowered to smite us, could be taken from her, it was needful that the penalty should be met by One able to bear it—able to die under it; and having died, to live.

Bearing these things in mind, we can have little difficulty in understanding the words, "in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Our Substitute, in all the power of heaven's own holiness, came into the midst of Sin's empire; lived in it; glorified God in it; advanced, as it were, to her throne, and demanded the release of His people. Yet, in order to effect this, it was needful to meet the curse which Sin had a title to inflict on *them*: a title nullified once and for ever by His substitutional death. "In that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

In no other sense than this could the Holy One die unto sin. Sin had no claim against Him personally. She had never had *Him* for her subject. In the power of

heaven's own holiness and light, He moved through her dark empire, ever glorifying God. In taking on Himself the curse and penalty due to our "sin in the flesh," He did not incorporate with Himself our "sin in the flesh." Our sin, whose punishment He bore, remained as much contrasted with Himself, as does a burden with the person who bears it. Laden, however, with responsibilities removed from us sinners to His own most holy Person, He met that penal death, under the power of which Sin held us because of Adam's transgression, and because of our corruption, and because of our personal offences against God's holy Law. "The strength of sin is the law." Meeting the penalty, and at the same time presenting the perfectness of His own obedience unto God, our Surety did thereby supply the ground on which grace hath established her throne and reigns for evermore; that as Sin reigned in the power of death, even so might grace reign THROUGH RIGHTEOUSNESS unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Atonement having been made to God, and full satisfaction rendered to all the claims of His holiness, grace could proceed to dispense the blessings that become the heritage of those over whom she reigns.

Our natural relation to Sin is this:

I. We are in her empire.

II. In that empire we are her lawful subjects.

III. Sin dwells within us.

IV. She *rules* in us.

V. She holds us under the power of judicial death and everlasting curse.

Such is our natural relation to Sin ; but through redemption, that relation is changed—and changed for ever. Although still personally in her empire (for we are in an earth over which she reigns), yet, representatively, we are “stablished” in the heavens, where our Head and Forerunner is. Moreover, although *in* her empire, we *belong not to* her empire, but to the kingdom of our God and Saviour ; having Him for our Sovereign ; His laws for our guidance ; His Spirit for our strength. A circle of light has been drawn in the midst of the black darkness of earth ; and over it, heaven is opened in complacency, and peace, and love. Grace, by the preached word of the Gospel, gathers all who believe within that circle, and reigns over them there. We are “translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God’s love.” And although Sin is permitted still to *dwell* in us, yet she no longer *reigns* in us. She is deposed from her throne *within* us. Her power, though not destroyed, is “nulled.” Lastly, she no longer holds us under the power of judicial death and curse. The snare is broken, and we are delivered.

And to what are we indebted for this deliverance ? To the work of our God and Saviour. Thereby has been provided the ground on which grace has established its throne, that it might reign over us for ever. Reigning by means of the righteousness supplied by the obedience of Jesus, grace delivers us from the curse, because He hath borne it in our stead. It delivers us from the authority of sin (even whilst we are yet locally

in Sin's empire), and brings us into another kingdom, uniting us with One who is its Head in glory above the heavens. It enables us to withstand the power of Sin within us, by creating in us "the new man," and sending down the Spirit from above; that so, whilst Sin is yet in us, we might confront it, and resist it, and refuse to obey it in the lusts thereof. These are some of the blessed present consequences of redemption. The ground on which judgment operated against us having been removed, and a new basis constituted from which grace operates, the *penalties* (and all those relations to sin to which I have referred came as penalties) are cancelled, and instead thereof, blessings come.

Some may perhaps say, Is it then a blessing to be left in the midst of Sin's empire? For a season only we are left here, with a mission entrusted to us from above. We are left here as subjects of a heavenly kingdom—a kingdom of grace, and glory, and strength, and power; that we might, in the midst of the fierce rebellion of earth, uphold the banner of Truth, and fight the battle of the Lord God of Israel. Is this no honour—no blessing?

And if it be further asked, whether it be a blessing that Sin should still dwell within us, we answer, that, in result, it is a blessing. Is it not meet that such as we, debtors to grace alone, should well understand what Sin is? Was not Hezekiah, after many years of faithful service to God, allowed to fall, that he might be taught what was in his heart? See 2 Chron. xxxii. 31. Was it not meet that Job should be caused to know that there

was a principle of latent evil hidden within him, which, as soon as temptation in sufficient strength came, developed itself, and caused him, in seeking to justify himself, to impugn God? It would not be well that Job, or any other servant of God, should form an utterly wrong estimate of his actual condition. It were, indeed, no blessing, if it were appointed that Sin should dwell in us for ever: but it is not so appointed. On the contrary, one of the reasons why it is left in us is, that it may quicken the expectancy of faith, and enhance the joy of the coming hour of deliverance. Nor would it be a blessing if Sin were left in us as a mistress whom we were compelled to serve. We serve her not. We have "crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts." We resist and fight against her indwelling power; and in the conflict we learn many a lesson. Our faith is exercised, and it may be, we earn for ourselves praise. "He that ruleth well his own spirit is greater than he that taketh a city"; and such greatness is ever estimated in God's sight.

Seeing, however, that in this conflict there may, and will be from time to time, failure (for "there is no man that sinneth not," 2 Chron. vi. 36.) it is possible that on such occasions, especially if the failure should be great, Sin may in the ear of our conscience loudly re-assert her ancient claims. She may say that we have broken the link that had bound us to the service of God, and that consequently He has delivered us over to her that we should be her servants as before. But we have an answer. God has supplied it. He has said, "Sin shall

not [whatever be the circumstances] have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace." If we were under the law, failure would be ruin. "He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all": but grace having brought us, *on the ground of Another's righteousness*, into new paths, preserves in those paths. We are "preserved in Jesus Christ," as well as called. Grace sometimes preserves by upholding, so that we fall not: but it can also preserve by *restoring* after we have fallen. Whatever claim, therefore, may be advanced by Sin with the view of re-constituting those relations to herself, which grace has cancelled, *all* believers are, through God's unspeakable mercy, entitled to reply, It shall not be. "We died"—died according to the power and efficacy of that death which our Substitute died in our stead: and he that *so* died, has been justified from every claim which Sin, his ancient mistress, can possibly urge against him. Such is the meaning of the words, "he that died (representatively died) hath been justified from sin." No valid plea remains to Sin. She can substantiate against us no claim, either in respect of curse to be inflicted, or servitude to be exacted. Her ancient power over us is gone—and gone for ever. Associated at present with all the results of the death of Christ in respect of everything from which that death was intended *at present* to deliver, and associated in prospect with all its results in respect of every thing from which it is *finally* to deliver, and associated with other results that flow from our union with Him in resurrection, it is impossible that we can be removed from a condition into

which grace, by no less means than the death and resurrection of the Holy One, has brought us. "Our old man," therefore, cannot *revive* out of the condition into which it has been brought by that death to which the sixth of the Romans refers. Our present question, let it be remembered, concerns that chapter. The advocates of the system we are opposing, contend that after ourselves and SIN have been brought into that relation one to the other *which the sixth of Romans describes*, that relation, through failure on our part, may be set aside, and the original condition be fallen back into again. Whereas this chapter, as indeed all Scripture, declares the very reverse. It teaches that our relation as believers, through redemption, to SIN and to God, being founded on the death and resurrection of our Substitute, is fixed and unalterable. Because of what we are through and in Christ, the new man is created in us, and the Holy Ghost abidingly given to us, whereby we stand in a practical relation of deliverance from *servitude* to sin, which is fixed and unchangeable. If all this could be reversed, and we could fall back into the state from which redemption has raised us, it would be a fall more terrible in its results than Adam's; for, seeing that God has in reserve no second redemption, the fall would be final and irrevocable.

§ V.

IN considering these subjects, it is of the deepest possible moment to recognise that there are certain practical relations to sin and to holiness, that are necessarily held by all believers as such. One of the blessings pertaining to all who stand under the New Covenant of grace is, "I will write my laws upon their hearts." This is effected the moment "the new man" is created in them. All the impulses, tendencies, and desires of "the new man" are perfect according to God. Its creation in believers is a result of that quickening power of life that is in Christ; for He was, and is the Life-giving-One. (*ὁ ζῶν διδούς*, John vi. 33). We know that every one who has looked believingly on Him is quickened with new and heavenly life. The Holy Ghost comes to dwell in all such; so that the life that is in them is sustained and directed by His agency. It could not be supposed that God, who is described as our "Stablisher in Christ," (*ὁ βεβαιῶν εἰς χριστόν*, 2 Cor. i. 21) would bestow on us in the heavens in Christ, that marvellous fixity of condition which is expressed in these words, without also planting in us certain equally fixed habits of thought, feeling and action, so that we might practically become, radically and essentially, distinct from all who know not Christ. Accordingly, the relation in which we stand to God by the creation of "the new

man" in us, and by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, is a relation as fixed and unchangeable, as that which grace has given us above in Him in whom our life is hidden. We may confidently say that there is not any moral characteristic that will finally attach to us in heaven, of which the seed-principle is not found in the new man already created in us.* Moreover, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, "God's own divine power hath been given us in all things that pertain unto life and godliness." Such is the fixed essential condition into which grace has brought all believers. I am not now speaking of development, but of radical condition.

Accordingly, the difference between believers and unbelievers as regards the relation which they respectively hold to good and to evil, is carefully marked in the Scripture as being essential and abiding. This may be especially seen in the first Epistle of John. "He that is a doer of sin is of the devil." "Every one that hath been born of God is not a doer of sin." The Apostle does not mean that a believer never sins. On the contrary, he says, "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And again; "if any one sin, we have an advocate with the Father." What he means is, that no believer does, or can *habitually* tread the same path that the world treads. None who *habitually* tread the world's path of darkness belong

* Even as the seed-principle of every evil that ever has been, or ever will be developed in the world, is in our flesh.

to Christ. There is a path of light, and to it believers belong; and there is a path of darkness, and to it the unregenerate belong. There is a difference between the two classes: and that difference is radical and essential.* Again and again, in various forms, John reiterates the truth that *πας ὁ ἁμαρτανων*—"every one who is a *sinning-one* [in that essential, habitual sense which this form of expression denotes†] hath not seen him [Christ], neither known him." Do we marvel at being told this? Do we say, What need is there that we should be taught a truism? Can any one doubt that he who habitually serves sin belongs not to Christ? It *was* doubted. The habit which has since made Christendom what it is, had even then begun—the habit of placing the sanctifying name of Christ on those who were habitually, and with full purpose of heart, treading paths of darkness. It was needful, therefore, to proclaim in ears that were becoming dull, the elementary and self-evident truth that "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all;"

* "The regenerate," says Bishop Davenant, "may fall into sin; but they do not habitually walk, nor can they live in sin. For *he* walketh in sin who sinneth by his hearty choice in his constant course, and with the full consent of his will."

† See this considered in "Occasional Papers," Number II., page 99. Nothing can be more dangerous than the habit that some have, of explaining these, and similar passages, as meaning that the new man in the believer does not sin. Could Peter excuse himself for his sin at Antioch by saying, "my new man did not do it." Such a system would assign to the believer two personalities. Peter, though having in him "the new man" and "the old," was one person; and to him as a person, responsibility for his actions attached.

and that, consequently, none who were habitually walkers in darkness could belong to Him. Hence the contrasts reiterated in this Epistle. "We are of God"—"they are of the world." "He that loveth (*ὁ ἀγαπῶν*) is born of God." "He that loveth not hath not known God." 1 John iv. 8.

It is true, indeed, that in this dark and evil day, when the flock of Christ are scattered, and often fed on fouled pastures, and caused to drink polluted streams, the *development* of some of their most essential characteristics may be so feeble as to be almost hidden from the eye of man. But He who searcheth the hearts seeth deeper than we, and marks characteristics that we fail to discern. "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you," are words true of every believer from the first moment he believes. He is thus taken out of the class of those who are "not obeyers of the truth, but obeyers of unrighteousness," and is numbered among those who "by enduring continuance in well-doing are seekers of glory, and honour, and incorruptibility." He is by a power that comes from above, and that abides with him, set in antagonism against Satan, and the flesh, and the world. This is a state not attained by our efforts. It is one freely given to us of God, when first He brings us within the bonds of the New Covenant.

To us, therefore, as believers, the question is not respecting the attainment of this state: the question is whether the power belonging to that state into which

grace has brought, be duly developed. Simon Peter, the moment he had known and confessed Christ, was on the Rock. Christ was the Rock (*πετρα*), and Simon with all his weakness was brought into association with that Rock, so that all its strength was his. He had, therefore, become a Rock-man (*πετρος*)—Peter, Cephas. All the characteristics and accompaniments of that Rock-condition pertained to him for ever. Yet the question still remained, whether, in these new circumstances of abiding strength, he would manifest that which savoured of Satan, or of God.

Fully and unreservedly I admit the infinite importance of development. Our one object in life should be, that we might manifest every day, more and more, the characteristics of those who, having been washed and clothed in priestly garments, have also been anointed with the holy oil, that our ways might be redolent with a fragrance, recognised as fragrance in the sanctuary of God. And there is the greater need of anxiety as to this, because it is possible that believers may savour of the world and of Satan, in many of their ways. There may be much worldliness, pride, and wilfulness; insubjection of mind to Scripture and to truth. We must seek to keep very close to Scripture, if we would have our own steps guided, or if we would guide others, into the ways of peace.

Suppose, then, that we should be asked to point out to any one the character of the path which a pilgrim to the heavenly City should tread. Suppose we were asked

what personally should characterize him who would tread that path acceptably. Would our reply to this last question be, SINLESSNESS ?

Next to misrepresenting the way of access unto Christ, the great desire of the Enemy of souls is, to misrepresent and miscolour the character of the path in which the saved walk. Yet, in either case, he can speak as an angel of light. If the attainment of salvation be in question, he says, seek holiness—perfect holiness. By personal holiness, salvation is reached: and then he draws a vivid, and, in many respects, not untrue picture of what holiness is, and says, “that do, and thou shalt live.” The question of our ability to attain this holiness he hides; and hides with it, the way of grace—the only way that God hath opened for the weary and heavy laden sinner. So, as regards the path of Christian service, Satan is able to sketch, and to present to our imagination a picture of sinless and unhindered service according to a perfectness that finally will be ours in heaven; but the question is, can it be ours now? Is it a picture which has the substantive reality of truth, or is it one which our excited and deceived imagination has pourtrayed?

The way of life is narrow: it is entered by a strait gate: and there are many dangers. Apollyon is there: and there is many a pitfall, and many a bye-way. Discouragements, too, may abound. Solitude may depress, or society ensnare: activity may exhaust, or undue rest enfeeble. Success may intoxicate, or failure unduly daunt. In a world like this, where good and evil, truth

and falsehood, God and Satan, are in unceasing conflict, it is not easy to hold steadfastly the exact relation to good and to evil that God desires that we should maintain. In entering on such a conflict, what can be more important than to know whether or not we have a foe within our own bosoms; whether it be possible for God's own will to work in us "freed from internal opposition." There may be to some a certain fascination in the thought that we need but exercise faith, and that we should find SIN within us fall dead like Goliath before the sling of David. There may be a certain fascination in the thought, but is it true? Scripture only can supply an infallible answer.

But will Scripture be really submitted to? I cannot but think that there lingers in many minds a kind of half-formed thought that there may be granted to one who walks closely in the Spirit, a rule which, though not contrary to the written word of God, is yet higher and fuller than it. Some say, Was it not intended that there should be in the Church of God growth and development? In the Scripture we have the record of the Church's infancy; but since, we have advanced to years of strength. Does not the Spirit dwell in the Church; and if He taught it certain things in its infancy, is He not likely to teach it other things in its manhood? Millions in Christendom are perishing under this lie. Yet even in minds that repel this poison, there may still linger a notion that the practical attainments of the early Churches, and it may be of the Apostles themselves, may be exceeded by greater faith and greater

watchfulness than was by them exhibited. If this thought finds entrance into our heart, the Apostles of our God and Saviour will soon cease to be our guides.

I am led to say this, partly by observing that Mr. Pearsall Smith in his remarks on the seventh of Romans (although admitting that that chapter supplies the experience of a true Christian—nay more, that it supplies the Apostle's own experience) does, nevertheless, maintain that it is not *right* Christian experience. He thinks that the Apostle had for a season backslidden; that he had sought to carry out in the flesh what he should have carried out in the Spirit; that there was found in the Apostle a kind of Galatian failure; and so, Sin, which once had been dead in him, revived. Hence the experience detailed in the closing part of the seventh of Romans.

Now, if the seventh of Romans is to be regarded as the Apostle's own experience indeed, but an experience caused by unfaithfulness and declension, it is obvious that I may be told the same respecting other parts of Scripture in which the presence of Sin in believers is in like manner recognised. Thus, when I read in the Epistle to the Galatians—"the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary (*αντικειμενα*, set in hostile array) the one against the other," I may be told that it was so indeed with the Galatians, but that it was a wrong condition—a condition into which they had lapsed. Thus I may be forbidden to regard this as the normal condition of all believers, although the Apostle tells me that it is.

And when I further read that there was a root of pride in the Apostle's heart that needed peculiarly to be watched against, and that therefore a messenger of Satan was sent to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure, I may be told that this ought not to have been, and would not have been if he had exercised faith aright—that if his faith had been more vigorous, he might have extirpated that and every other root of evil from his heart, and been in the presence of temptation “as a dead miser in the presence of a bag of gold.”

I must be permitted to say that I refuse to take one step in the path thus opened. In the course of a somewhat lengthened life I have had, through circumstances, more opportunity than has fallen to the lot of most persons, of observing the course and the end of many who have (unconsciously perhaps at first) abandoned the Scripture as their alone rule, in the hope of treading a higher and a better way. I have watched the course of such. I have witnessed not unfrequently its end. I have seen in it delusion, darkness, and sorrow. I remember the words of the Apostle: “if any man be a prophet or spiritual, let him remember that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.” I know how insubjection of soul to Scripture is one of the most terrible evidences of the practical power of Sin. “Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?”

Well would it be for us if we could say in the same power of *practical realization* in which the Apostle said

it, "I delight in (or rather I delight with) the Law of God after the inner man." None but one walking in close communion with Christ could *experimentally* say that. Yet these words are found in the seventh of Romans.

§ VI.

“The Spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth unto envy.”
James iv. 5.

“The mind of the flesh (*φρονημα σαρκος*) is enmity against God.” Rom. viii. 7.

“The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.” Gal. v. 17.

THESE three texts are so plain and decisive, that it seems wonderful how any one who receives the Scripture, can deny their conclusiveness in respect of the subject we are considering. God has promised ultimately to relieve us; but He has not yet relieved us from the presence of that which lusteth against His Spirit. He has relieved us from its condemnation, and also from its dominance; but He has not yet relieved us from its presence. The three texts I have quoted, are God's own description of our present condition as respects the indwelling of sin; and it is a description which must, by His appointment, continue to apply to us until we depart to be with Christ, or until the hour of resurrection comes. Whilst I am yet in the body, the *φρονημα σαρκος*—“the mind of the flesh,” must remain in me; and seeing that it is enmity against God, it has, in itself, the very essentiality of sin.

But there is in believers not only “the mind of the flesh;” there is also “the new man,” and the indwelling

presence of the Holy Ghost. We delight in the law of God after the inner man. All the desires and tendencies of "the new man" being absolutely perfect, it necessarily seeks to love and to serve God with the perfectness of heaven. It can be satisfied with nothing less. According to "the new man," we desire that there should be nothing in us that thwarts or obstructs the leadings of His Spirit. We cannot be satisfied with anything less than the consecration of our whole being. But these desires are not gratified. We are obstructed by something that yet attaches to our personal condition. There is something in us that is enmity against God—something that cannot be consecrated to Him. Our new desires, therefore, are frustrated as to the attainment of perfect and unhindered service. We have to struggle against ourselves whilst we serve, and we feel it to be a bondage. This is what experience teaches us: this is what the seventh of Romans describes. It describes holy and perfect desires obstructed. It details an experience which must, of necessity, be found wherever the mind of the flesh and the mind of the Spirit co-exist.

It is true, indeed, that the seventh of Romans does not give us the *complete* experience of the believer. We must conjoin with it the eighth chapter. But the eighth chapter does not neutralize the seventh. The truths of both harmonize. The seventh chapter teaches me of that which obstructs my new desires: the eighth teaches me of that which at present counteracts, and finally removes all obstructions. At present, I am so far "held

in captivity by* the law of sin in my members," that I am unable to carry out the desires of "the new man" in two respects. First, I cannot serve God with unhindered service; for there is something in me that draws backward and obstructs. Secondly, I cannot serve God with absolutely perfect service; for the same evil power that obstructs, does also, more or less, mar. Our best services have not the perfectness of heaven. I desire, in the new man, to serve God without one counteracting feeling: I begin to serve God, and instantly, I find within me a counteracting feeling, from which I cannot free myself. I am obliged, therefore, to say, "that when I would do good, evil is present with me." Yet, although the liberating power of redemption which has been brought to bear on me, in and through Christ, has not yet freed me from *the presence* of the law of sin in my members, nor from its power to mar as well as impede my services, yet, ultimately, it will free me perfectly. In the *pronounced sentence of God*, I am a freed man, although that sentence is not yet fully carried into effect; and I have, therefore, to wait for the full development of its results. In the meanwhile, I am thus far liberated—I am enabled, though with obstructed service, to serve God truly; and though my service has not the perfectness which, in the new man, I desire, yet it is accepted by Him *through Jesus Christ*. Not only, therefore, am I free from condemnation, but I am free also

* See corrected reading *Εν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν μου*. Tregelles.

to serve God. This is the blessed truth taught in the eighth chapter. The truths taught in the seventh and eighth chapters respectively do not neutralise each other. They are to be held in combination. In the one chapter I see what I am, because of Adam, in the flesh : in the other, what I am, because of Christ, in the Spirit. These two most contrasted conditions do, at present, co-exist in my one person ; consequently, I have to contemplate them both.

It is very evident, that if the three texts prefixed to this section be true—if “the mind of the flesh,” and “the new man,” do co-exist in us, then the experience detailed in the seventh of Romans *must* be a necessary part of the experience of every one in whom evil and good are so permitted to co-exist.

The only way of avoiding this conclusion would be, by saying, that the principle of evil is, or should be, utterly extinguished in us ; (in which case, we should have nothing to mortify, and nothing to bridle :) or else, by saying, that although it exists, yet its existence is, by God, ignored ; and that we, in faith, should ignore it too. But neither of these things are true. “The mind of the flesh” does exist in us ; and until we depart to be with Christ, it must, by God’s appointment, continue to exist. As respects its existence being by God ignored, it is sufficient to say that its existence is a fact, and that God never ignores facts. If He had ignored it, He would not have sent the messenger of Satan to buffet Paul. The existence, therefore, of a living principle of evil within us which God recognises, and which we are com-

manded to recognise, must produce, in hearts where the perfect desires of the new man are, certain experiences : and these experiences the seventh of Romans details. It does not give a *complete* picture of Christian experience. It does not profess to do this. It gives a phase—a part of our experience only : but it is a necessary, and an abiding part, whilst we continue below. Although our standing as believers is in the Spirit, and not in the flesh ; yet our connexion with the flesh has not ceased ; and we have to know and to consider what that connexion involves. On the other hand, we have also to consider what our connexion with “ the law of the Spirit of life in Christ ” involves. There are two sides to the picture : two parts in the lesson.

I do not here enter further into the interpretation of the seventh of Romans, because I have fully considered it in another publication, to which I may be permitted to refer. Here I am concerned with it no further than to observe, that since it is essential to Mr. Smith's system to regard it as the record of a state into which the Apostle had lapsed,* I think it will be admitted by most, that a system which requires for its sustainment such an admission, stands self-condemned.

As it may not, perhaps, be convenient to all to obtain

* Mr. Smith's words are—After “ having begun in the Spirit, he [the Apostle] had sought to be made perfect by the activities of the flesh.” page 13.

my Tract on the seventh of Romans, I subjoin the following extract :

“The Law is still spoken of in this passage as ‘holy, just, and good,’ but it is not spoken of (this should be most carefully observed) as that which is shunned or dreaded, but as that which is ‘consented to’ (verse 16) ‘desired’ (verse 19) and ‘delighted in’ (verse 22). ‘The new man,’ seeing it is ‘created according to God in righteousness and true holiness,’ must, by the very necessity of its nature, rejoice in that which is ‘holy, just, and good.’ ‘I delight in the Law of God after the inner man,’ are words that may be truthfully used (and where there is much practical grace they will be realized) by every one in whom ‘the new man’ is. Yet the very fact of these new ‘desires’ and ‘delights’ being in the believer, is made the means of teaching him one of his deepest experimental lessons, respecting the Sin that dwells within him. However intense may be our desire, in ‘the new man,’ to love God perfectly and to serve Him perfectly—however we may long to banish from our bosom every desire and every tendency that is contrary to His will, yet there is found in every regenerate heart an antagonistic principle of evil that meets every claim of God with unvarying, habitual resistance. The energy of this evil may in different hearts be developed in different degrees: but as to its essential character, it is alike in all. It acts *for* evil and *against* good. It obstructs and impairs every desire and every action that is directed towards God. None of our counsels—none of our deeds, are found to have the perfect-

ness which the Law of God requires, and which we, in 'the new man,' desire. Our desire in the new man is toward *absolute, unmixed* good: for *unmixed* good is the only thing that the Law, in the strictness of its righteousness, can recognise as good. But, however truly we may, in 'the new man,' long after it, we cannot do it. Unmixed good is beyond us.* We are obliged, therefore, to say, 'the good I desire, I do not.' And when we further consider, how (notwithstanding all our watchfulness) elements of infirmity and evil mingle with everything we feel, or think, or do, we are obliged to add, 'the evil I desire not, that I do.'

"To this many, perhaps, will be disposed to refuse their assent. 'A Christian,' they will say, 'does not habitually do what 'the new man' hates. To say that he did, would make him practically the servant of iniquity ;

* I beg it may be especially noticed that I use the expression, "*unmixed* good"; by which I mean, that absolutely perfect good which was once found on earth, when the Holy One was here, but now is known only in heaven. This passage, therefore, does not speak of that kind of good which believers, through grace, may and do perform—good which, though not perfect, is accepted through Jesus Christ. It does not say that I can perform no good; what it asserts is, that I cannot perform *that perfect good* which the Law commands, and in which I, in the new man, "delight." "Good" in this passage is to be understood only of that which is perfect according to this perfectness: and "evil" is that which falls short in the least conceivable degree of such perfectness. It is the not observing the *kind* of good spoken of in this passage that has mainly caused the difficulty in understanding it.

It must be remembered too, that Sin throughout this passage is personified. It is regarded as a living agent with whom we,

and this, we are expressly told in the sixth of Romans, he is not.'

"It is indeed true that a Christian is not the servant of iniquity. A doer of sin (*ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*) says the Apostle John, one, that is, who habitually walks in the path of evil, does thereby prove that he hath not seen Christ, neither known Him. Such an one does not resist, but indulges and follows, and that habitually, the impulses of Sin that dwells within him. To say that a Christian thus yields himself up to Sin, and that he cannot help so obeying it, and that the words, 'the evil I would not, that I do,' mean that he does, in this sense, serve Sin, is no doubt antinomianism: and that antinomianism has been taught from this passage, I do not deny. But are the words 'to do evil' capable of no other meaning than that in which we apply them to the habitual service of sin? Does the eye of God, judging

naturally, are identified. The first result or *act* of sin in us is evil desire, or concupiscence, which can be no more separated from Sin, than heat from fire: and which concupiscence, being in itself an inward *act*, precedes the deliberate choice of the soul and all developed action. Indeed, concupiscence may be resisted and never go on to a deliberate intention or choice. Yet evil has been DONE by us, the moment a wrong desire has been excited. This is well expressed by Calvin. "*Multum inter deliberatam voluntatem interest et appetitus, quibus titillamur. Hoc igitur ultimo præcepto (viz. non concupisces) tantam a nobis integritatem Deus exigit, ut nulla nos vitiosa cupiditas ad malum sollicitet, utcunque non accedat consensus.*" Unless therefore we can say that there is no Sin in us, we cannot say that there is no wrong desire (concupiscence)—and wherever there is concupiscence, there, there is a "deed" of Sin.

according to the strict holiness of His Law, detect sin only in such developments of it as are outward and palpable, and have in them that character of *unmixed* evil which is found in the actions of the unregenerate world? Is there no inner man—no inward world of thought and feeling which His eye scrutinizes? Is not a thought of foolishness sin? Is not the slightest bias to evil, the slightest tendency towards any thing false or wrong, or the slightest want of readiness or of capacity in *perfectly* following the path of holiness, sin? So the Scripture teaches. If, therefore, when a Christian seeks to serve God, it be found that Sin within him puts forth the slightest power to obstruct the action, or to mar the mode of its performance; if it puts forth one desire or causes one momentary feeling that is contrary to or falls short of, the perfectness of God, that desire, or that feeling is, in the sight of God, *an act*. Sin has wrought something in us, and by us: and we are identified (and but for grace should be identified for ever) with that which is thus wrought in us; for Sin is, naturally, a part of ourselves. We have therefore *DONE* something, which, in 'the new man,' we hate; and although the world will refuse to call it '*a deed*,' and will persist in extenuating human frailty (as they term it); and although they will not allow that evil desire is, if resisted, sin; yet the Law of God determines otherwise. Nor can there be a truer form of antinomianism than to say that the impulses and strugglings of Sin, are, if resisted, *not* Sin. Grace indeed does not impute them to a believer as Sin. That is a different question. We are

not now speaking of the pardoning power of grace; but we are speaking of what that is which grace pardons. If then there be an active power in us, that hinders, mars, and taints our efforts after all good, and renders the performance of perfect good hopeless; and if we cannot, though we would, free ourselves, either from the presence of this evil power, or from its workings, then are we, in a very intelligible sense, subject to the doings and actings of an evil principle within us, which, in 'the new man,' we hate.

"But again, as we must beware of understanding the word 'do' in this passage ('the evil I would not, that I do,') as denoting that habitual willing service of evil that is seen in the world; so we must also remember that it is not to be understood of such sins as believers *may* indeed fall into, but which by greater faithfulness and watchfulness they might have avoided. When Peter temporized at Antioch, and virtually surrendered the truth of the Gospel, his sin was one which watchfulness and faithfulness would have prevented; and consequently, he had no title to say of his transgression, 'it was not I that did it, but Sin that dwelleth in me.' To attempt to shelter deliberate transgressions (whether they be habitual as in the world, or occasional as in the case of believers) by bringing them within the scope of this passage, is antinomianism. The workings of sin contemplated in this passage, are such as no watchfulness can hinder, no faithfulness avoid. The existence of Sin within us entails on us certain consequences which we have no more power to evade, than

the idiot has power to change his look of idiocy ; or the palsied hand has power to free itself from its torpor. The transgression of our first parent brought on us, not only the imputed guilt of that transgression, but has also entailed on us the hereditary possession of a depraved nature. There are certain effects of that depravation which are beyond the power of our control ; and it is of such effects that this passage treats, and not of transgressions which the believer, by watchfulness, could avoid. Any manifestation of evil to which we cannot truthfully apply the words, 'So then it is no more I that do it, but Sin that dwelleth in me,' is not to be included among the deeds referred to in this passage." ("Romans vii. considered," pp. 14—20.)

§ VII.

THE tendency of the system we are considering (and it is true of all like systems), is to direct the mind far more to the thought of death to sin, than to that of life toward God. It could scarcely be otherwise, for who that realized what life toward God involves, could dream of SINLESSNESS ?

He who asserts that he lives sinlessly, must be prepared to show that he renders to God all that is due to Him in Heaven ; and all that is due to the claims of His service on the earth. He must sustain towards evil and towards good, towards Truth and towards falsehood, towards the Church and towards the world, towards the systems of men and the operations of God, relations that are perfect according to the perfectness of Heaven. There must be no sins of ignorance. On the contrary, there must be such a full comprehensive apprehension of that which is written in the Word of God, as for its light to be received and followed with a heart at once understanding and *faithful*. There must be no shrinking from the light of Scripture ; no attempt to qualify its statements ; no refusal to bow to its declarations ; no disposition to reply against God. The conventional arrangements of society and of the professing Church must be faithfully tested by God's Word ; and if they fail to answer to that test, they must be repudiated and

renounced. There must be a withdrawal from every thing that is not perfect ; and such withdrawal must be effected and sustained in the wisdom, and stedfastness, and meekness of the Spirit of Christ. In a word, there must be a complete cessation of fellowship with all evil, and a perfectly sustained fellowship with all good ; and that, without any let, opposition, or obstruction from any tendencies or feelings within. If such be our condition, we may speak of **SINLESSNESS**. Such was Christ's condition when He dwelt on earth. Such will be our condition in Heaven, for we shall be changed into His likeness. But it is far otherwise now. Our consciences, if rightly exercised, would tell us always that which, because of our dull ear, the Scripture reiterates, that "in many things we all offend."

To contradict the true testimony of our conscience must be sin. To contradict the declarations of the Word of God must be sin. To make ourselves like unto Christ the Holy One, must be sin—and very heinous sin. It takes from Christ personally, His characteristic distinctiveness as the alone Sinless One ; and refuses, as unneeded, that most precious and peculiar relation of grace which He now holds towards His people, in that He receives and owns them as His servants, and as His friends, even whilst evil yet dwells within them. Therefore we read of "having access into that **GRACE** wherein we have been made to stand." (*εστηκαμεν*). Has that grace no value in our sight ? Certainly not, if we be sinless ; for in that case, we need it not.

To take from Christ's people the apprehension of the

grace, mercy, and forbearance which He abidingly exercises towards them, whilst they are yet serving Him with sin in them, is to take from their souls the very knowledge by which faith is nourished, and holiness promoted. We should little apprehend the depth of that love which passes knowledge, if we did not prove its forbearance and graciousness in dealing with our spiritual decrepitudes. He who deems that he has no stain to be washed from his feet, will neither prize, nor seek unto the love that washes it away. He who has no sin for the Accuser of the brethren to present before the throne, will neither dread the Accuser, nor value the Intercessor. To be told of One "who ever liveth to make intercession for us," can be of no comfort to those in whom "God's will freed from all internal opposition works." He in whom sin is dead, can need no such intercession.

Israel never thought of entering the Courts of their typical Tabernacle, save under the protecting and sanctifying efficacy of the altar-sacrifice. They stood under the efficacy of a High Priest's service, and that efficacy was based wholly on SACRIFICE. Is it otherwise with us? We draw nigh into the Courts of our unseen Tabernacle, and we serve whilst sin is yet in us. We know that we have something to watch against, and resist, and bridle, when we draw nigh, and when we serve. Moreover, our services, however watchfully rendered, are not, even in the judgment of our own consciences, perfect. Yet God receives both us and our services. But how? Because the guilt of the sin that we carry within us has been borne, once and for ever, by our

Substitute in death : and we draw nigh under the acceptableness of His once offered sacrifice. Its acceptableness rests abidingly on our persons. And as to our services, they too, though imperfect, are offered through the sacrificial efficacy of Christ's name. We offer "spiritual sacrifices *acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.*" 1 Pet. ii. 5. Our prayers need the efficacy of the fragrance of His name to be imparted to them. Therefore, in vision, John saw an angel come forth, having much incense "*that he might give it to the prayers of the saints*" (*ἵνα δώσῃ τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων*) that they might be heard and answered. Rev. viii. 3. These things tell us not of perfectness in us, but of grace in God. And it is the knowledge of this grace through the Spirit, that sanctifies the soul and knits it unto God in love.

It seems marvellous that any one who apprehends even a little of the holiness and purity of God, should affirm that he is altogether dead to every thing in the earth that is contrary to God, and that he lives wholly and *perfectly* unto God. We would desire to think that they who say such things, have not reflected on the meaning of the words they use ; and that they speak of sinlessness, without really understanding what sinlessness is. But if any should deliberately persist in saying that they are sinless, and appeal to the consciousness of their own hearts in confirmation of the truth of their statement, let them remember that the soul never affords a more decided evidence of its own unhealthfulness, than when its consciousness is at variance with the declarations of Holy Scripture. The heart, if it keep

not very close to the Word of God, is sure to form a false estimate of its own condition. The Laodiceans thought themselves "rich and increased in goods, and having need of nothing," just at the very moment when Christ was about to spue them out of His mouth, because they lacked every thing in which, as saints, they ought to have abounded, and yet were self-complacent and self-satisfied.

There may be, and no doubt there are occasions in the life of a believer, when he may find it needful "to cut off the right hand, or pluck out the right eye," for Christ's sake. The struggle may be great: the trial bitter: yet he may look in faith to Christ respecting it; and may be strengthened to overcome and to triumph. There is such a thing as victory. "I have written unto you young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one." I am far from denying that there are many conflicts in the walk of faith; and there may be, and should be, to the servants of Christ, victory. But victory in such conflicts is not sinlessness. It is possible, indeed, that the soul, after having successfully resisted some giant evil, or besetting sin, may deceive itself into the thought that it has overcome *all* evil: but such a thought would be the mere offspring of excitement, and is utterly delusive and false. To overcome one specific form of evil is not to overcome all evil: and even the overcoming is a victory over a repulsed, but not an exterminated foe. To resist sin, is not to extinguish it.

I fully admit that the Church of God have slumbered

grievously, and have not girded on their armour as they should. Even they who are holding fast to "the Pauline doctrines of grace" (as they are contemptuously called), have fallen, not unfrequently, under the condemnation of the words, "unskilful in the word of *righteousness*." As priests of God's sanctuary, we should put a difference between clean and unclean; holy and unholy. But this has been done feebly and imperfectly, if at all. Evils that ought to have been judged, we have, not unfrequently, tolerated in ourselves and in others. Fully I admit that we have to exhort and encourage one another to the attainment of higher, holier, and more separate paths than we have been wont to tread. We have need to remember the prayer of the Apostle for the Thessalonians: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. v. 23. This blamelessness we have to seek; but such blamelessness is not sinlessness.

In Exodus xxviii. 36, we read as follows: "Thou shalt make a plate of pure gold, and grave upon it, like the engravings of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE LORD. And thou shalt put it on a blue lace, that it may be upon the mitre; upon the forefront of the mitre it shall be. And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord." These are blessed words. They should make

our hearts glow with thankfulness and joy. Are they abrogated, or are they still true of us? If they be true of us; if we, too, have a great High Priest appointed "to bear the iniquity of our holy things," it is very evident that the blamelessness which may attach to us under such circumstances, cannot be the blamelessness of SINLESSNESS.

The blamelessness of which the Apostle speaks, is a condition which *grace* has assigned to those, who, if judged according to that which the eye of holiness discerns both in their persons and their services, would be cast out for ever; for in their persons there is sin; and in their services blemish. If there be not an habitual recognition of this, there can be no blamelessness. There must be a deep, heartfelt, habitual recognition of our condition; and of the provision of God's grace in Christ, whereby the need of that condition is met; or else, there can be no rightness of thought respecting God—no rightness of thought respecting ourselves—no right communion with God—no right prayer, and, consequently, no blamelessness.

God may so guide and strengthen us, as that the "counsels" (that is, the deliberate purposes) of our heart may be according to His will. In that case, there might be blamelessness. But where a deliberate purpose has been rightly formed, there must have been a right exercise of the understanding on the circumstances. But if the circumstances have been estimated wrongly, there can be no right purpose, and therefore no blamelessness. Is not this the case with every one

who says that his purpose is to be one in whom God's will shall work "*freed from internal opposition?*"

God never deals with His servants as if they were, or could be, here, sinless like Christ. On the contrary, He requires that they should know, and prove, and acknowledge, that they are personally altogether unlike Christ; and that they are debtors every moment to the grace which has appointed Another to be the bearer of the iniquity even of their holiest things. Though we are not under the Law but under grace, yet God's holiness as taught in the Law is not altered. Weakness and evil are, in His sight, weakness and evil, wheresoever, and in whomsoever, found. Confession, therefore, and an habitual recognition of the truth taught in the words, "His blood cleanseth us from all sin," is as needful to a condition of blamelessness, as is a walking in paths of light. The petition, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us," can never be taken from the lips of God's people whilst they remain in the body.

§ VIII.

THERE are few texts which we have to watch over with more vigilant anxiety, than that which I have just quoted from the Epistle of John ; “The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.” It is a passage important in itself ; important also in its contextual connexion ; and it is one whose true meaning is necessarily evaded or perverted by the advocates of the system we are considering.

The Apostle had been speaking of walking in the light. “If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.” To an exercised heart—a heart taught to know itself, the question instantly occurs : How can any one who has sin within him, and who, therefore, when brought into the presence of light in which there is no darkness, is sure to manifest more or less of ignorance and obliquity—how can such an one abide in the light ? Will holiness forbear from acting against him in the power of wrath ? The answer is ; It will forbear : not, however, on the ground of there being no sin, but on the ground that the sin is not imputed, because of the blood once shed. “The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from ALL sin,” that is, even from such sin as is manifested in paths of light ; where, consequently, its

heinousness and inveteracy become most recognised and felt. It is such knowledge that causes us most deeply to appreciate the words, "My blood is drink indeed." The fact that the same lips that at one moment said to Peter, "Blessed art thou Simon Barjonah," did the very next moment find it needful to call him "Satan," must have taught Peter a lesson respecting his inward tendencies, that he would not otherwise have known. Afterward, no doubt, he restrained those tendencies more : but they were still within him.

It must, however, be remembered, that the words of John, although applied by him to the specific case of sin found in those who are walking in the light, do also declare a more general truth. They speak of a condition that attaches to every believer (whatever his circumstances) from the first moment he believes. They who do not come strictly and fully under the description given in this passage—in other words, they of whom it cannot be said, "The blood of Jesus cleanseth them from all sin," are unreconciled to God. They are as yet aliens and enemies. All the justified are abidingly brought under the efficacy of that blood which cleanseth them from all sin. If they are not so cleansed, they are not justified. It is most important, therefore, to determine what "*cleansing*" means. If it mean *cleansing from the presence of sin*—if it indicate the bestowment of sinlessness, then none can either be pardoned or justified while sin is yet in them. It is vain, therefore, to represent the question we are considering as one restricted to a certain class *among* the justified. It is

not so restricted. It is a question that affects *all* the justified. If "cleanse" in this verse means, cleanse *from the presence of sin*, then it necessarily follows that only the sinless can be pardoned, justified, or saved.

That the words, "cleanse from all sin," do not mean cleanse *from the presence of sin* is sufficiently proved by the verse that immediately follows: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." We must of necessity say that we have no sin, if sin be so effectually extinguished in us that the will of God works in us "freed from all internal opposition."

The words, "cleanse from sin," have in Scripture a fixed and unalterable meaning. And it is a meaning which we have to guard with unceasing vigilance; for if it be once destroyed, the foundations of our faith are overthrown. Mysticism, Socinianism, Neology, and every other system that refuses to give to the Cross the place that is assigned to it in Scripture, struggle against this verse, and seek to pervert the meaning of the words, "cleanse from all sin." The word "cleanse," when applied to the blood of Jesus, is always used in the same *sacrificial* sense in which it is used of the typical blood of expiation in Leviticus, and throughout the whole of the Old Testament. Take Leviticus xvi. 30, and Leviticus xiv. 7 as examples. "On that day [the day of Atonement] shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." Here the cleansing is expressly declared to be an immediate result of an external work

performed for them by the priest. See also Lev. xiv. 7. "And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him *clean*." All defilement involved punishableness: but defilement, when expiated by blood, was not imputed. Consequently, the person who was brought under the efficacy of the expiatory blood, had no defilement imputed to him. Therefore he was clean; and subject no longer to that which otherwise he would have been subject unto, viz., wrath. It is in this sacrificial expiatory sense, and in this sense alone, that the word "cleanse," when applied to the blood of Jesus, is used. Nor can we use it in any other sense without subverting the faith, and destroying all that God reveals respecting the methods of His grace in our justification.

It is true, indeed, as I have again and again observed in the preceding pages, that the blood of Jesus is the meritorious and procuring cause of all those subsequent agencies by which God practically sanctifies and preserves all the redeemed; and finally brings them, perfect according to the perfectness of Christ, into His own presence in glory. Because of the blood of Jesus, and because of our being counted precious according to its preciousness, an agency is brought to bear on us through the Holy Ghost, whereby we are freed from the *dominance*, though not free from the presence, of Sin within us. Because of the blood of Jesus whereby we have been purchased, a power will be brought to bear on us at His appearing, whereby corruption in us shall in every sense give place to incorruption. But it would

be an abuse of language, and a perversion of Truth, to ascribe to the blood of Jesus which is ever placed before us in its sacrificial and expiatory aspect, effects which are produced by the Holy Ghost given in consequence of that expiation, or effects produced by the glorious power of Christ Himself acting in the title of His finished redemption.

To "cleanse from sin," therefore, in the passage before us, means to free from the imputation of the defilement that necessarily, in God's sight, attaches to sin; and consequently, to free from all the penal results of such defilement, whereof exclusion from His house and service would be one. The thought is not different from that presented to us in Rev. vii. 13. "What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple." In another place, we read of "the fountain opened for sin and for all uncleanness." In all such passages, our minds are directed solely and exclusively to the sacrificial and expiatory power of the blood whereby the non-imputation of defilements, which otherwise would be imputed to us, is secured.

The moment we are brought in faith to Jesus as the Lamb slain, we are placed by God under the abiding efficacy of His blood; and are said to be *by God* "sprinkled," "cleansed," "washed." In the fixedness of the New Covenant, He undertakes to regard us in perpetuity

as washed and cleansed persons who need not to wash again, save our feet. "He that hath been washed (ὁ λελουμένος) needeth not save to wash (νιψασθαι) his feet, but is clean every whit."* Our persons, therefore, are regarded as preserved in cleanness, because of the continuously applied efficacy of the blood once offered, under which God continues to regard us. Hence too, our consciences are (or should be) purged. For, though we have still a *consciousness* of sin, yet being worshippers once and for ever purged by a sacrifice enduring in its efficacy, we have (or should have) no more conscience of sins; that is, our conscience testifies no longer to sin imputed to us in its guilt and consequences, but it testifies of sin expiated—and that for ever. And this cleanness, and the consciousness thereof, continues, even when we detect sin in us whilst walking in paths of light. Still we say, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth † us from all sin."

That this, and all other passages of Scripture which speak of the blood of Jesus as cleansing from sin, do refer to it solely and exclusively in its expiatory relation to God, is a truth hateful to all who hate the Gospel of the grace of God. Mystics (than whom few more effectually subvert the Truth) resist, just as much as do the Neologians, the testimony of the Scripture as to this. They speak of "the blood" being "the life" (for "the

* See this subject further considered in a tract entitled, "Jesus washing His disciples' feet," as advertised at end of this volume.

† καθαριζει—for the force of the present tense as here used, see Occasional Papers, No. II., p. 96.

life," say they, "is in the blood") and affirm, that we are saved, not by the life of Jesus having been laid down atoningly, but by the life that is in Jesus being diffused through the soul by the power of the Holy Ghost, whereby the soul becomes purified, and so saved. Among the followers of Mr. Irving, it was taught, that the Lord Jesus, at His resurrection, resumed not "blood;"* but that in His resurrection body the Holy Ghost was to Him in the stead of blood; whence some of them in prayer were accustomed to say, "Thy blood which is the Holy Ghost." Thus, in their minds also, the doctrine of Scripture touching the cleansing by the blood sacrificially shed on Calvary was undermined. Others have

* In a passage cited by me on a previous page (see p. 123), the writer after stating that Christ "rose triumphant in the power of a new life to which righteousness as distinctly attaches itself as did sin to that life which He gave up on the Cross," proceeds to say: "This will help us to an understanding of an expression used by our blessed Lord after His resurrection, 'a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.' He did not say, 'flesh and blood,' because in resurrection He had not assumed into His sacred Person the blood that He had shed out upon the Cross as an atonement for sin. "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls, &c." Lev. xvii. 11. Mackintosh Notes on Genesis, p. 64.

The doctrine that our Lord rose without blood cannot be too earnestly resisted. The life that He had as man was as pure and holy as the life that He had as God; and nothing that penally came on Him whilst bearing the imputation of our guilt, took from that life its recognised essential excellency. It was offered as perfect: was laid down as perfect: was accepted as being perfect, and was resumed as being perfect. His human life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) was part of His sacred Person. It is of this life that we speak when we

gone further still. A Deistical mystic, well known in America, writes thus: "They who dwell in God, dwell "in love, and they are constrained to walk in it, and "they walk in it: they have fellowship one with another, "and 'the blood of Jesus Christ His Son, cleanseth us "from all sin.' But what blood, my friends? Did "Jesus Christ, the Saviour, ever have any material "blood? Not a drop of it, my friends, not a drop of it. "That blood which cleanseth from all sin, was the life "of the soul of Jesus."

I do not for a moment suspect Mr. Smith of accepting such heresies as these. He would, no doubt, repudiate them utterly. Yet I cannot but say that his interpreta-

apply to Him the words, "the life is in the blood." Now we are told by the Lord Himself that He took again the very same life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) that he laid down. (See John x. 18.) He rose in the very same body in which He died: nor did any of the circumstantial changes that attended its resurrection (*important though they were*) give to it additional holiness, seeing it was holy, and regarded as holy: nor did they destroy its character as a body of flesh. When our Lord bade His disciples handle His body after His resurrection, it was in order that they might satisfy themselves that He had really a body of flesh. "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Luke xxiv. 39. He used the word flesh in its ordinary physical sense; and "flesh," when so used, always includes "blood." "Flesh," in the sense in which the Lord then used it, cannot exist without blood. What the exact character of that wonderful change was which took place when the Lord was "received up in glory," it is not for us curiously to enquire. We know that His body is now spiritual; but the nature of a spiritual body we do not know. His humanity is now glorified according to the glory of God. But we are not now speaking of His *glorified* body, but of that body which He resumed

tion of the verse before us is altogether subversive of its true meaning, and opens the way for a flood of dangerous error. He affirms that the Apostle teaches that the blood of Jesus cleanseth "not only from the stains of sin, or the punishment of sin, *but from Sin itself.*"*

The conclusion that seems necessarily involved in this statement is that all sin is eradicated. Yet such an inference Mr. Smith repudiates, for he adds, "This, however, must not make us think that all sin is eradicated." Yet how, with the words of the Apostle before us interpreted in the manner in which Mr. Smith interprets them, can we escape this conclusion? Does not the Apostle say, "cleanseth us from *ALL* sin?" *Must* not

when He left the grave—which body He resumed with everything essential to a body of flesh, still attaching thereunto.

The blood which the Lord Jesus shed was as holy as His Person. It was not the blood of guilty condemned life, (as some of apparently Irvingite tendencies have said,) but of holy life. Therefore, in the Levitical types, the blood was to be presented *on the altar* after it had been shed—its presentation there being indicative of its acceptableness. Moreover, we have to remember that it was the blood of Immanuel—One who was God manifest in the flesh. Christ died as man; but into His death, the efficacy of that which He was as God, entered. Hence we read of "the Church of God which He purchased by His own blood."

"Christ was exalted in His resurrection, in that, not having seen corruption in death, (of which it was not possible for him to be held,) *and having the very same body in which He suffered, with the essential properties thereof* (but without mortality, and other common infirmities belonging to this life,) really united to His soul, He rose again from the dead the third day by His own power," &c. Larger Catechism of the Church of Scotland, Q. 52.

* "Holiness through Faith," p. 58.

indwelling sin be included under the words "ALL sin?" If it be included,—to say that we are inwardly cleansed from "ALL sin," must mean that indwelling sin is eradicated. The only remaining alternative is, to say with the Papists and other like enemies of the Gospel, that indwelling sin, if resisted, is not sin. Shall we say this? The Scripture teaches far otherwise.

The illustration subsequently employed by Mr. Smith does certainly imply that all sin is eradicated. He says :

"Let us suppose that here is a spring of water which is poisoned in its very source, and which can of course therefore send forth none but poisoned waters. But a remedy is found which counteracts the poison, and makes the waters pure and sweet. That remedy is applied in the very source of the spring itself, and the waters *flow out* therefore pure and sweet. But they do so only so long as it is applied. The moment the remedy is stayed, that very moment the poisonous waters flow out as foul as ever. Now this is what the blood of Christ does for us—it reaches the very spring itself, 'purifying our hearts by faith,' cleansing us 'from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit,' and enabling us by faith to realise that wondrous statement that 'every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure.'" We purify ourselves, not by effort, but by faith; not by works, but by the precious blood of Christ. This, however, is the case only while the blood is applied by faith, for the very moment faith ceases to apply it, the same old bitter waters flow out." "Holiness through Faith." page 59.

If Mr. Smith had stated, that in all those who are brought under the cleansing efficacy of the atoning blood of Jesus the Holy Ghost dwells, and by leading to the apprehension of the fulness of blessing freely given

of God, doth thereby practically sanctify and purify the purposes and ways of God's people, no one who receives the Scripture would have objected. But the doctrine taught in the illustration just given is far different from this. In the first place, it has in it the latent poison of mysticism; for that poison is present whenever the practical purification of our inward counsels and habits of thought (which is the work of the Holy Ghost) is substituted for *the purging away of sin from before God*, which is the work effectuated by the Lord Jesus by the oblation once offered on the Cross. Whenever these two things are confounded, the foundations of our faith are endangered; and they are certainly confounded in the extract just given.

But further. The illustration not only speaks of waters flowing out from us, "pure and sweet" (words which if read with the context evidently mean *perfectly* pure and sweet), but it says more than this. It states that the reason of the waters thus flowing out pure and sweet, is that they are made pure and sweet at the fountain-head. "A remedy is found which counteracts the "poison and makes the waters pure and sweet. That "remedy is applied in the very source of the spring "itself, and the waters flow out therefore [observe this "word] pure and sweet." In that case no corruption can remain in us during the time that this marvellous transformation lasts. Indwelling sin, therefore, *must* for the time be eradicated. If not, the illustration must be abandoned; for it distinctly states that every thing that is naturally foul in us, becomes, in the fountain-

head, pure and sweet. This, evidently, is that which Mr. Smith believes. Does it not seem strange that we find no example of such a condition in the Scripture? If we read the concluding verses of the second chapter of Acts, we certainly cannot say that the Pentecostal Church as there described were deficient in practical grace. On the contrary, great grace was upon them. Certainly, if there were ever any of whom it could be said that their hearts were purified by faith, the Pentecostal saints were they. Yet what was the type appointed in the Scripture to indicate even *their* condition? Loaves consecrated by sacrifice, but having in them leaven: and leaven is the symbol of bitterness and corruption.* We therefore, if we are brought into a state in which there remains in us nothing bitter—nothing corrupt, must be exalted into a condition far higher than that of the Pentecostal Church—and the Pentecostal Church included the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. Shall we say that we are better than they?

I by no means wish rigidly to bind down Mr. Smith to the exact meaning of expressions that he may perhaps have adopted hastily. Yet certainly to liken the blood of Jesus, in its relation to the evil that is in us, to a remedy applied to a poisoned fountain, and producing a physical change therein, is a comparison open to the gravest objection. The atoning blood of Jesus, the moment I believe, produces an infinitely important change in my legal relation to God; but it does not *in*

* See this considered in page 54 of present volume.

itself produce any change in my inward evil ; although, as a consequence of my acceptance under it, changes are effected in me, and will be effected on me, that ultimately result in my being made like Christ in glory. If it should be said, that all that is intended by the illustration is, that the blood of Christ apprehended by faith produces *certain* inward effects in us—this is not denied : but it does not produce the effect of so changing the nature of sin in us as for nothing to remain in us except that which is pure. Nor could any faith be exercised towards Christ or towards God in respect of the effectuation of any such change ; because it is not the will of God that our evil nature should be so changed, or that it should be removed from us until the time comes for us to depart and be with Christ. And as regards the resisting and mortifying of the evil that it is in us, it is not true that such mortification is effected simply by an act of faith similar to that by which we cast ourselves on God's free grace in Christ for salvation. In believing unto salvation we do not ourselves act, but repose altogether on that which Another has done in our stead. We repose, rest, lean, rely, entirely on the accomplished work of Another. It is strict passivity of reliance. But in resisting the evil that is in us, and in advancing in the walk of faith, there is not mere passivity. Action on our part is required. The Scripture does not say that we can advance in that path, or conquer our evil, simply by an act of faith towards God. On the contrary, the Apostle says ; “ *giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue ; and to virtue knowledge* ” &c. It is true indeed

that we cannot show that diligence, or take one step forward in the way of holiness without looking in faith to God. It is He who works in us to will and to do. He must strengthen, guide, sustain. But that for which He strengthens is *action*. David did not slay Goliath by an act of faith merely. He took his sling; chose out the pebbles from the brook; and slung the stone. His diligence would indeed have been vain, if he had not looked in faith to God to guide the stone that he slung; but David did not only look to God in faith; he *acted* also. Results attained apart from all action on our part are not to be confounded with results whose attainment, under God, are made dependent on the employment and development of power which God has, through the Spirit, placed in all His regenerated people.

And we have further to remark, that Mr. Smith has, after all, drawn a very incomplete picture of a believer's condition. He omits to state that there is in every believer something that is essentially and everlastingly pure and holy, for there is in him "the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. iv. 24. This is not our old nature changed. It is a new creation. The words of the Apostle are, "CREATED according to God (τον κατα θεον κτισθεντα) in righteousness and true holiness." Besides this, there is also the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost—the Paraclete, sent to guard, and preserve, and strengthen. Now suppose that, in addition to this, all our natural evil were (as Mr. Smith imagines) transformed into good, what would remain in us but absolute perfectness? A

resurrection-condition might be more glorious, but it could not be more perfect. There would be seen in earth the absolute perfectness of Heaven, and that sustained by the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost. Could then any one in whom the new man is, and in whom the Holy Ghost dwells, and whose carnal nature has become (according to Mr. Smith's supposition) perfectly pure and holy, ever fall from this condition if it had been once attained? Is the Holy Ghost unable to sustain a perfect being in perfectness? If such a condition were reached, it certainly would be retained; and practically, results of pure, unqualified, heavenly, perfectness would be unceasingly developed. Have we ever seen this? Have we ever beheld any one walking in resurrection-perfectness here? Yet where there is not absolute perfectness, there is not sinlessness.

Nevertheless, grace has already pronounced us to be clean. "Ye are clean," said Jesus to His disciples. John xiii. 10. "Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you"*—that word which had guided to Himself as the Lamb appointed to be slain. In the Hebrews, we read of His "having by himself purged our sins," Heb. i. 3: and of being "sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once." Heb. x. 10. Thus we have, even on earth, a *perfect* cleansing, and a *perfect* sanctification; but it is *sacrificial*. It is the result of the one oblation which has removed from us all imputation of defilement, and has left in its room the impu-

* *ἡδη ὑμεῖς καθαροὶ ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον, &c.* John xv. 3.

tation of its own perfectness. It is of this *sacrificial* cleansing, and of that alone, that the passage in John speaks. It speaks of a cleansing that must pertain, in all its completeness, to all who belong to God. To be without it would mark us as being aliens. If in the words, cleanse "from all sin" as applied to the blood of Jesus, the sacrificial meaning is to give place to the other—if the words are intended to describe the condition of those from whom nothing bitter does or can flow, because everything bitter in them has been changed into sweetness, then it follows that none except those in whom this transformation is wrought, can be numbered among the justified. All in whom "the old man" is, must be excluded. The only other alternative would be to say that "the old man" is not corrupt.

None knew better than the Apostle Paul what it is to live unto God. He could truly say, "to me to live is Christ." He fought, as we certainly have never fought, the fight of faith. He fought with his loins really girded about with truth—God's own pure, full, sincere Truth. Yet it was he who said; "in me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." And again; "so then with the mind [the mind of the new man] I myself serve the Law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Nor was he, as Mr. Smith imagines, speaking of himself as a backslider when he described himself thus.* On the contrary, it was the very knowledge

* It is scarcely possible to speak in too strong terms of condemnation of Mr. Smith's tract on Romans vii. He speaks of the Apostle "falling from grace and coming under law in his

that his carnal nature was incurably corrupt, that roused him to action. He fought against it through the Spirit, and effectually resisted; so as to present his body and all his powers, "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." Rom. xii. 1. "I keep under," said he, "my body, and bring it into subjection." He did not say, I have attained a state in which there is nothing in me to "mortify," or "subdue," or "bridle," or "crucify." On the contrary, he knew that part of his appointed warfare was to resist himself. Therefore, like Nehemiah, whilst with one hand he laboured, with the other he held a weapon; for foes were around him, and a foe was in him. The weapons which he used were "mighty through God to pulling down of strong-holds," both in himself and others; "casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." His thoughts were held in subjection to the declarations of God's Word.

Yet, though eminently victorious in all his conflicts, he pretended not to have attained the perfectness of Heaven, either in his person, or in his services. He despised not the peace-offering altar. He desired to feed therefrom; but he knew that blessing was accorded to none save those who were willing to approach that altar with *leavened* bread in their hands as an emblem of

practical ways" (p. 23). He says, also, that the Apostle "having begun in the Spirit had sought to be made perfect by the activities of the flesh," (p. 13) and much more to the same effect.

their own personal condition.* He knew that unqualified perfectness has, on earth, belonged only to One, and that *He* has, because of our unlikeness to Himself, been appointed a High Priest ever living to make intercession for us, as those who in many things "fall short" and "offend." That Priest, and that intercession, Paul despised not. He knew that he needed a High Priest to bear the iniquity even of his holy things. He would not have deemed himself blameless, nor would God have esteemed him blameless, if any thought of personal sinlessness had obtruded itself into his mind, and quenched the apprehension of the Person, and meritoriousness, and intercession of his great High Priest. Yet Paul trod with stedfast step the true way of holiness. And there is no other. We may devise for ourselves other ways: but they are by-ways; and will be found to be so at the last.

* See this considered in "Thoughts on parts of Leviticus," (Chapter on Peace-Sacrifice) as advertised at end of present volume.

NOTE.

SINCE the preceding paper was written, I have seen in "The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy" for April, a paper on the same subject, written apparently by the Editor of that work, Dr. Horatius Bonar. As might be expected from the known character of Dr. Bonar, it is a paper of great doctrinal value. Its character may be judged of from the following extracts :

"We regard Mr. Smith's book on the 7th of Romans as a most mournful example of how far a man may go under delusion, or under a determination to wrest the Scriptures to suit his own views. He asks, on the title-page of this book, 'Is Romans vii. to be the continued experience of the Christian?' We answer, Yes, assuredly, until the very last dregs of sin are purged away, and its last shadow has departed from the being of the believer. Mr. Smith most strongly objects to Paul's exclamation, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' But we have to ask Mr. Smith a question: Suppose that a glorified saint, after the resurrection, should one day discover that there remained about him, in some real though mysterious way, not involving his standing before the throne,—we do not say even so much of the remains of sin as Mr. Smith admits to be possible,—but just one faint shadow of it coming at intervals across the bright and holy horizon of his spirit, could his exclamation be anything less than one of the bitterest, most agonised anguish? And if he further recognised the terrible shadow as unmistakably belonging to his former self, can Mr. Smith not imagine that the cry would become intensely more agonising and personal? Then how much

more may not Paul, notwithstanding his great attainments in holiness, when brought into close contact with the 'holy, just, and good,' the spiritual law of God, exclaim, on turning from his glance at the law to look on himself, 'Alas, I am carnal!' And when he finds the presence of sin lurking about him, and ever coming across his holy 'delight in the law of God after the inward man,' how natural does his cry seem, 'O wretched man that I am!' especially as 'the body of death' is in a real sense his own. The holier the man the more sensitive must he be as to the terrible incubus. Mr. Smith, however, is another stamp of saint altogether. He calls the exclamation of the apostle 'a God-dishonouring and bitterly humiliating' experience, and shelters himself from this 'bitter humiliation' of the apostle beneath the notion of a perfect holiness, 'up to the measure of his consciousness!' Surely this is, to take the kindest view of it, deplorable delusion. Surely it is an utter misuse of words to talk of anything as perfect holiness except such as will bear the scrutiny of Jehovah's searching eye. Mr. Smith tells us he is conscious of perfect holiness—unconscious of sin. Hence he writes down the apostle's experience, and, indeed, cannot account for it at all, except that for a time, as he supposes, Paul must have been 'falling from grace, and coming under law in his practical ways,' and so got into darkness. But we ask Mr. Smith and those who follow him: So long as sin in any form or under any conditions remains about the believer, is it safe, nay, must it not suggest something seriously wrong, if at any single moment he can be unconscious of it? What! the enemy lurking within, and he believing it dead and gone! Impossible! But if conscious of it, how can the consciousness of the believer take any other form than that so touchingly expressed by the apostle, 'O wretched man! who shall deliver me?'" p. 182.

Dr. Bonar again observes :

"The Lord, indeed, answers our prayers for holiness, but he does so, not in Mr. Smith's, but in His own most blessed way. Mr. Smith seems to expect an answer in the way of immediate

miraculous interposition. He tells us, in relating his *first* experience of his new way of holiness, that, 'with the act of faith, there distilled into my heart, like the gentle dew, the sweet consciousness of the presence and power of Jesus.' Then he proceeds to tell us of 'full-hearted obedience,' 'purified affections,' a '*re-adjustment* of the whole nature—spirit, soul, and body,' and the experience already quoted, of being tempted like our Lord, yet, like Him, not sinning. All this, we are told, followed at once upon that one act of faith, after his previous seven or eight years of 'wilderness experience.' But is this the Lord's way? We read of no such results, either described or promised to the Church, with a view to the attainment of personal holiness. Do we ask for cleansing? He at once refers us to His Words, and warns us to 'take heed' to our way according thereto. Would we build upon our faith a superstructure of 'gold, silver, precious stones?' He tells us to give 'all diligence' still according to the Word. Do we ask for enlightenment? He still sends us to the 'commandment of the Lord.' Would we be advanced from the state of infancy, out of which Mr. Smith would have us believe he was rescued at once, by the 'act of faith,' after trying the progressive way in vain? The Lord sends us to 'the sincere milk of the Word, that we may *grow thereby*.' Although, as we have said, the reader of Mr. Smith's works will find many very orthodox passages, yet he will not fail to perceive that, whatever purpose such passages may be designed to serve, the really new and distinctive doctrines advanced by Mr. Smith point to something quite at variance with the idea of gradual growth in personal holiness, which the Word of God, in so many different ways, sets before us as being His plan and purpose with regard to His people." p. 180.

On the Use of the Preposition ANTI in the New Testament.

THE original meaning of *αντι* (a preposition which is never used, like *ante* in Latin, to denote relations of time,) is, *over-against*, or *opposite to*, in a local sense; as *στηναι αντι τινος*, to stand *over against* a person. In composition, *αντηλιος*, *over against the sun*.

Hence it becomes a word especially connected with exchange or selling. In barter, the things to be exchanged were wont to be set *over-against* each other. In weighing, the things compared are put into opposite scales. In accounts, the price is set *over against* the name of the thing sold.

Hence the secondary meanings of *αντι*, *e.g.*

I. *Equivalency*, inasmuch as objects set *over-against* each other with a view to exchange, are *regarded as* equivalents, though it is possible that the intrinsic value of the things themselves may greatly differ.

II. *Correspondency*, because things set *over-against* each other are regarded as corresponding either in value, or in some other respect.

III. *Substitution*, because that which is given or received as the equivalent to another thing, is regarded as

standing in its stead. Retributive compensation comes under this head—*οδους αντι οδοντος*, a tooth instead of a tooth. In lieu of that which has been wrongfully taken, Justice demands that something of compensatory value should be rendered. It need not, in every case, be the *same* thing; but it must be something rendered as *compensatory*, and received as *compensatory*.

The sense of equivalency, or of compensation, is always traceable in *αντι*, whenever it is used to signify substitution, even where the thought of judicial or retributive action is not present. Thus, when it is said, "Archelaus reigns instead of his father"—*αντι του πατρος αυτου*, it is implied that the loss of one king is *compensated for* by the supply of Another. "Will he instead of a fish—*αντι ιχθυος*, as *equivalent to* a fish,—give him a serpent?" But, whenever the thought of judicial or retributive action is introduced, the notion of *compensation* is very strongly marked in *αντι*. Thus in Matt. xx. 28 and Mark x. 43. "To give His life a ransom instead of many"—*λυτρον αντι πολλων*. The life of the substitute is regarded as given up as a *compensatory price* to Justice for the release of those for whom it is given. Thus, whilst both *αντι* and *υπερ* when applied to the sacrificial work of our Lord equally denote substitution, the distinction is, that *υπερ* peculiarly directs our minds to our Substitute as *screening* us by undertaking our responsibilities, and submitting to the penalties due to us: whereas *αντι* directs to the same Substitute viewed as rendering for us *compensation* to God. The predominating (though not exclusive)

thought in *ὑπερ* is the benefit to us: the predominating thought in *αντι* is the recognition of the claim of God, met by adequate substitutional compensation. It must, however, be carefully remembered that distinctions like these imply, not absolute contrast, but only predominating aspect. In 1 Tim. ii. 6, *ὁ δους ἑαυτον αντιλυτρον ὑπερ παντων*,—who gave Himself a ransom for all classes of His believing people—the idea of substitution is equally expressed by *αντι* and by *ὑπερ*:* but the first directs our minds to the compensatory value of the ransom, the latter, to its presentation on our behalf, and for our benefit; but in either case, the redeeming price is regarded as something supplied by Another in our stead. Indeed, there is no passage in the New Testament, in which *ὑπερ* is used in relation to the work of the Lord Jesus for us, in which its strict substitutional force is not maintained. See this further considered in “Notes expository of the Greek of the first chapter of the Romans,” as advertised at end of this volume.

The commutative force of *αντι*, as implying exchange or purchase, is strongly marked in the following passages: *ὅς αντι βρωσεως μιας απεδото, &c.*—“Who in exchange for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.”

* Throughout the *Alcestis* of Euripides the *substitutional* force of *ὑπερ* is strongly marked. See for example *μη θνησχ' ὑπερ τουδ' ανδρος, ουδ' εγω προ σου*. Alc. 690.

See also 286, *θνησκω, παρον μοι μη θανειν ὑπερ σεθεν*.

So in the Introduction, *τον ὑπερ ἑαυτον ἔκοντα τεθνηξομενον* and *ὑπερ τῷ παιδος αποθανειν* and *ὑπερ του ιδιου ανδρος τελευτησαι*.

Heb. xii. 16. And Heb. xii. 2, *αντι της προκειμενης αυτω χαρας*, "who, in return for the joy set before Him [the joy being spoken of as a substantive possession] endured," &c. The joy was purchased by the endurance.*

Closely connected with the use of *αντι* in the sense of substitution, comes its use in the sense of *succession*—a place vacated being supplied by that which succeeds into it. Hence the expression *κυμα αντι κυματος*—wave after wave, *i.e.* wave succeeding wave : *ανια αντ' ανιας*—sorrow after sorrow, *i.e.* sorrow succeeding sorrow in unintermitted flow ; not sorrow accumulated upon sorrow which would be *επι*, as in Phillipians ii. 27. *λυπη επι λυπη*. Under this head may be placed the words *χαρις αντι χαριτος*—grace following on grace, in constant and unintermitted flow out of Christ's fulness, like wave succeeding wave. This rendering seems far preferable to that which adopts the sense of *correspondency*, and supposes the passage to mean that the grace received by Christ's people is in correspondency with, and answers to, the grace that is in Him.

Correspondency, however, is a meaning that, in some cases, attaches to *αντι*. See Eph. v. 31. *αντι τουτου καταλειψει ανθρωπος*, "In conformity with this truth,

* See also the use of *αντι* as denoting exchange and purchase in the following passage, *συ τον αυτας ετλας ποσιν αντι σας αμειψαι ψυχας εξ Αιδα*. Alc. 461.

See also Antigone, 185-6, *ουτ' αν σωπησαιμι την ατην ορων στειχουσαν αστοις αντι της σωτηριας*. "I would not be silent if I saw ruin advancing on the citizens *as the price of my safety*."

or answering thereunto, a man shall leave," &c. The meaning of Col. i. 24 would be entirely obscured, if we were not to give this force of *correspondency* to *αντι* in *ανταναπληρωω*. The Apostle is speaking of the afflictions which he had to pass through for Christ's sake, and which he calls *αι θλιψεις του χριστου*—Christ-afflictions, *i.e.* afflictions for Christ's sake, on behalf of His body, the Church. The words of the Apostle imply that a long list of sufferings, for the Gospel's sake, had been appointed him; and that this list he had to fill up *correspondingly*. Against each appointed suffering in the list, a corresponding accomplishment was to be noted down—*ανταναπληρωω τα υστερηματα των θλιψεων του χριστου*. Out of this list, many of the appointed sufferings had been gone through. But some yet remained. These he calls *τα υστερηματα*—and says, that *in correspondency* with (*αντι*) the list, he went on, from day to day, filling up the appointed measure.

Thus, too, in Heb. ix. 24.—*ου γαρ εις χειροποιητα αγια εισηλθεν ο χριστος, αντιτυκα των αληθινων, &c.* *Αντιτυπον* does not mean *antitype*, for the Courts of the Tabernacle were not antitypes of the heavenly places, but the reverse; nor does *αητιτυπον* mean simply a type (*τυπος*), but it means a type that corresponded with, and answered to, a previous type, *viz.* the pattern shewed to Moses in the Mount, according to which pattern, Moses framed the Tabernacle and its Courts, which thus became a second type, marked by the word *αντι*, as corresponding with the pattern previously given. The heavenly Courts were, of course, the antitype.

See also *αντιτυπον*, as used in 1 Peter iii. 21. It is exceedingly important to observe, in this passage, the force of *αντι* as implying *correspondency*. *Κατασκευαζομενης κιβωτου εις ην ολιγαι τουτεστιν οκτω ψυχαι διεσωθησαν δι' υδατος, ο και υμας αντιτυπον νυν σωζει βαπτισμα κ. τ. λ.*—"Whilst the ark was being prepared, wherein, few that is, eight souls were saved by water, which, that is to say, baptism, doth now, as a corresponding type, save you," &c. Water, at the Flood was the power of death and of destruction to the world of the ungodly; but it found Noah sheltered by the Ark—a type, not of the Church, but of Christ; and, finding him there, it became to him, not the power of death, but, on the contrary, it was the means of bearing him away from a judged earth, and of carrying him into a typically new earth, where it left him safe on the summit of Ararat. Thus the death and wrath which has fallen not on us personally, but on us as represented by our Substitute, has been the *means* of separating us from a condemned world into a new creation, and into a heavenly elevation higher than the heights of Ararat. Water, as used in baptism, is a corresponding type. It corresponds with water *in its relation to Noah*, as a symbol of death; yet, made unto him, deliverance. Water, in baptism, symbolises a power of death and of wrath coming down upon us in the person of our Representative, Christ; and so becoming to us a means of salvation; just as the waters of the Flood, coming upon Noah when sheltered under the protection of the ark, brought to him a typical salvation; for they bore him safely to

Ararat. Hence we may say that baptism, or water as used in baptism, *typically* saves—*αντιτυπον σωζει*, the word *αντι* signifying that it corresponds with a type that had preceded. To say that the waters of baptism *typically* save, is a very different thing from saying that they save. To say that they typically save is truth, precious truth—to say that they save, is deadly, soul-destroying heresy.

Αντι is frequently used to denote reward or retaliation, a sense founded on that of equivalency. Thus *κακον αντι κακου* 1 Thes. v. 15. “See that none render evil in return for evil to any one.” Under this head, we may place the expression, *ανθ' ων*, when rendered as it frequently is, “because.” Thus Luke i. 20, Thou shalt be dumb because, *i.e. in return for* what thou hast done, in that thou didst not believe my words—*ανθ' ων ουκ επιστευσας τοις λογοις μου*.*

Sometimes, however, *ανθ' ων* is used to signify a conclusion drawn, or to be drawn, from previously expressed premises, and is rendered, “therefore” or “wherefore.” In this case, its meaning is founded on the sense of *correspondency* or *conformity*, as in *αντι τουτου* above noticed. See page 377. An example of *ανθ' ων*, in the sense of “therefore,” will be found in Luke xii. 2, 3. “There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid that shall not be known: *therefore*, *ανθ' ων* (that is, in conformity with what has been stated) whatsoever ye

* *Ανθ' οτου* or *ανθ' ων* for *αντι τουτου* or *αντι τουτων οτι*—*inasmuch as*, or *because*. Matthiæ Gr. Gr., § 480. “Because,” (*οτι*) would not in itself denote retribution, which *ανθ' ων* does.

spake in darkness shall be heard in light, &c.” There are instances, however, in which the context requires the retributive or retaliative sense, as in Soph. Elect. 585, quoted by Matthiæ, § 571—*δίδαξον αὐθ' ὅτου τανυ αἰσχιστα παντῶν ἐργα δρῶσα τυγχάνεις*. “Tell me in return for what, thou art now doing,” &c.

In the New Testament, the original force of *ἀντι*, “over against,” is entirely merged in some of its secondary senses in every case where *ἀντι* is used simply. In composition, however, the primitive force of *ἀντι* is, in many cases, very discernible. Thus,

Ἀντιστηναι, to stand over against, in the sense of resistance.

Τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους—those that set themselves over against you.

Ὁ ἀντικείμενος—He that is set over against you as an adversary.

Ὁ ἀντιδικός—He who is against you at law.

Ὁ ἀντιχριστός—He who is against Christ.

See also *ἀντιλεγείν*, *ἀντιστρατεύεσθαι*, *ἀντιτασσεσθαι*, *ἀνταγωνίζεσθαι*. In all these instances we have the sense of opposition founded on the primitive sense of *ἀντι*—over against.

In *ἀντεχομαι* or *ἀντιλαμβάνομαι*, the force of *ἀντι* is, less obviously, founded on the same thought of over-against. *Ἐχομαι*, in the middle voice, to hold oneself to, to hold on by, to cling to, a thing; and since the object thus grasped is commonly opposite to or over-against us, the direction of the hand in grasping is indicated by *ἀντι*, whereby greater vividness is given to the ex-

pression. Thus we say in English, we lay hold *on* a thing; but the Greek has not only this idiom, as in *επιλαμβανομαι* (see Heb. ii. 16) but we find also *αντιλαμβανομαι*—the direction of the hand being, in the one case, downward *on* the object; in the other, *forward*, to an object *over-against* us.

In the New Testament, *αντεχομαι* and *αντιλαμβανομαι* are used only in the middle voice, always in a secondary sense, and generally, in a good sense; as indicating, either that we cleave to the object as good; or that we grasp it, with the view of helping or sustaining it; or that we possess ourselves of it as precious. The following are the instances:

Matt. vi. 24, *ανθεξεται ενος*, will cleave to one.

Luke xvi. 13, *Idem*.

1 Thess. v. 14, *αντεχεσθε των ασθενων*.

Titus i. 9, *αντεχομενον του . . . πιστου λογου*, holding fast, cleaving unto, the faithful word.

These are all the instances in which *αντεχομαι* is used in the New Testament.* Its strong intensive force should be noted.

Αντιλαμβανομαι is used:

Luke i. 54, *αντελαβετο παιδος Ισραηλ*. Helped his servant Israel.

* The force of these words in the middle voice, followed by a genitive of the object, should be noted. "If the partitive genitive follows a transitive verb, we signify that a part of the object is affected; but if the same case follows a middle verb, we signify that we have become a part of the object. Thus *εχω τουτο*, *I have this*; *εχω του αργυριου*, *I have part of the money*; *εχομαι του αργυριου*, *I cleave to the money—I am, as it were, part of it*.

Acts xx. 25, *αντιλαμβανεσθαι των ασθενουντων*, to help the weak. It would be desirable, however, to use a word somewhat more forcible than "help."

See also 1 Tim. vi. 2, *οι της ευεργεσιας αντιλαμβανομενοι*, who lay hold of or possess themselves of the benefit: strictly, who are layers hold of or appropriators of the benefit. Compare the expression, used in law, "*seized of* a property or estate."

Αντιληψεις translated, "*helps*," 1 Cor. xii. 28, is derived from *αντιλαμβανομαι* in the sense of "help." It supposes us in the presence of a person tottering and ready to fall, and we stretch out our hand to grasp and hold him up.

Similarly, *το πυρ ηψε το τειχος*, *the fire lighted the wall*: *το πυρ ηψε του τειχους*, *the fire caught a part of the wall*: *το πυρ ηψατο του τειχους*—*the fire caught the wall, i.e., clave to it*. With regard to the latter distinction, *λαμβανειν τι* means to take or receive the whole of something: *λαμβανειν τινος* to take or receive a part of something; *λαμβανεσθαι τινος*, to lay hold, fasten on something." Donaldson Gr. Gr., 484.

APPENDIX.

IN the preceding pages, the works of Dr. Hodge of America and of Professor Smeaton of Edinburgh have been, not unfrequently, referred to. I would take this opportunity of recommending most strongly the perusal of the two works whose titles are given at the foot of the page.*

The following quotations are from the valuable work of Professor Smeaton. In commenting on the words, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son, cleanseth us from all sin," he observes :

"The Apostle describes this cleansing blood as the blood of god's son,—an addition having peculiar emphasis, as it is intended to exhibit the infinite value and efficacy of that blood. The title son occurs in a higher sense than can be ascribed to any other being. It assigns a divine nature to Him, and, in such connections as the present, exhibits His redemption-work not merely as planned and approved by God, but wrought out, so far as atoning action is concerned, by the only-begotten and beloved Son. This imparts to Christ's atonement its infinite sufficiency and value,

* "The Atonement," by the Rev. Archibald A. Hodge, D.D. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row.

"The Doctrine of the Atonement, as taught by the Apostles;" by the Rev. G. Smeaton, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. Clark & Co., Edinburgh.

making it adequate to procure for men the remission of sins, how great and numerous soever, whether we think of individuals or of countless millions. On account of the personal union of the two natures, the blood is spoken of as the blood of the Son of God. Though the blood belongs to Him as the Son of Mary, yet in virtue of the hypostatic union it is the blood of God's Son, and therefore possessed of all the value that the divine nature lends to it, and adequate to the expiation of human sin laid in the scales against it.

“How is the blood of Christ said to **CLEANSE US**? One thing is obvious, this cannot denote inward cleansing, or the renewing of the Holy Ghost, as it is a cleansing by the **BLOOD** of Christ; that is, by His blood sacrificially shed. Several recent expositors of note have referred the language to inward cleansing from the power of sin, but a cursory examination of the passage suffices to refute that comment. The very terms refer to the sacrifices. Then in no case are men here below cleansed from all sin, in the inward acceptation of the phrase. Besides, it would run counter to the very object which the Apostle intends to teach—that we are cleansed notwithstanding daily recurring stains. He asserts a continuous cleansing by the blood of Christ, applied as necessity requires; and we cannot therefore expound this cleansing, by referring to the mission of the Spirit, or inward Spiritual life, when it is so definitely ascribed to the blood of Christ, considered in the sacrificial sense, as sprinkled and applied to the guilty.

“To understand this cleansing by blood, we may go back to the Old Testament ritual, and notice the great national cleansing of Israel. On the day of atonement, when the blood was brought into the holiest of all, and sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat, this action was regarded as the appointed means by which sin was removed. But not only was this action said to atone (Lev. xvi. 17) it was also said to cleanse the people (ver. 30). In the latter verse we find the two expressions conjoined as coincident or parallel: ‘On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.’” Smeaton, pp. 450, 451.

The following remarks, extracted from Dr. Smeaton's Appendix are important as showing that the Reformers held Christ's vicarious obedience to be as necessary as His vicarious suffering to the justification of His people :

“ Luther never disjoins Christ's actions from His sufferings,—that is, His vicarious obedience from His death. He takes in both. To this point I the rather refer, because it is common among the writers who object to the element of active obedience in Christ's atonement, and call it an ecclesiastical notion, to allege that it formed no part of Luther's testimony, but was a mere subsequent addition, dating from the composition of the *Concordiæ Formula*. That is very far from being a correct view of the Reformation doctrine; and to me it is matter of no small surprise that writers, pretending to any accurate acquaintance with Luther's works, either in Latin or German, could entertain a moment's doubt of this fact. In a remarkable sermon on Gal. iv. 1—8 (vol. vii. p. 438, Erlangen edition of his German works) Luther speaks explicitly on the point. After remarking that no man can fulfil the law unless he is free from the law, and not under it (p. 265), and that Christ fulfilled the law spontaneously, and not by necessity or constraint, he goes on to say (p. 470): ‘ But that we may the better perceive how Christ acted under the law, we are to understand that He put Himself under it in a twofold way. *First, under the works of the law*: He permitted Himself to be circumcised, and sacrifices and purifications to be made for Him in the temple: He was subject to His father and mother and the like: and yet was under no obligation; for He was a Lord above all laws. . . . *Secondly, He put Himself under the punishment and agony of the law spontaneously*: not only did He perform the works to which He was not bound, but He spontaneously and innocently suffered the penalty which the law threatens and pronounces upon those who do not keep it.’ (Luther adds, after a few sentences, *Uns, uns hat er's zu gute gethan, nicht zu seiner*

Nothdurft). In like manner, he elsewhere says (xv. p. 59): 'When the law comes and accuses thee for not keeping it, point to Christ and say: 'Yonder is the Man who has fulfilled it, to whom I cling, *who fulfilled it, imparted His fulfilment to me*; and it must be silent.'

"Not less explicit is Melancthon in many passages of his works, and quotations might be multiplied to this effect from his *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, his *Loci Communes*, and *Commentaries*. Equally express is the language of Calvin, whether we consult his *Institutes* (book ii. ch. 17), the *Geneva Catechism*, or his *Commentary on the New Testament*. Chemnitz and his coadjutors, who composed the *Concordiæ Formula*, expressed the definite doctrine of the Reformation, when they set forth that the ACTIVE AND PASSIVE OBEEDIENCE of Christ were equally vicarious and equally essential. This was no new theory nor addition. Protestant doctrine, alike in the Lutheran and Reformed churches, with a wonderful harmony, set forth that the entire human life of Christ, consisting of the elements of suffering and obedience, constituted the atonement according to the twofold relation which man, as a creature and as a sinner, occupies to the divine law; and that they were equally indispensable.

"We need not adduce the other points of the Reformation doctrine at any length. As to the importance of Christ's divine person for the production of the atonement, it was in full accord with the patristic theology. All depended, according to Luther's exposition, on the fact that the Substitute was the only-begotten Son. He illustrates this doctrine by the case of two scales, in one of which are weighed our sins, with the wrath of God due to them; and in the other the expiatory sufferings, not of a mere man, but of the God-man (*Dei passio Dei mors, Dei sanguis*). A happy coincidence obtained between the two Protestant Churches in this and in almost every point bearing on the atonement. In the Lutheran Church the doctrine of the atonement was, for about a century, discussed under the topic of Justification as its sole meritorious ground. The merit of works was swept away; and

faith was made simply receptive. Thus it was elucidated by Chemnitz, Gerhard, and Hutter, till Calovius, by introducing the systematic method, departed from the topical treatment of doctrine. In the Reformed Church Calvin had, from the first, appended the discussion of the atonement to the person and office of Christ.

“Osiander of Könisberg, in his treatise on Justification, 1550, immediately after Luther’s death, attacked the distinctive principle of Protestantism, by denying that Justification was to be regarded as a forensic act on the ground of Christ’s righteousness. He allowed that mankind obtain pardon and redemption from the curse of the law through the blood of Christ, but divided between pardon and justification in such a way as to make the former relative and the latter inherent; and he charged the Lutheran teachers with ignorance and indecision, inasmuch as they could not state or define what Christ’s righteousness involved. This challenge to the Protestant Church to become self-conscious led to definition. Not only Flacius Illyricus, Brentius, and others in the Lutheran Church, but Calvin also, in replying to Osiander, explicitly combined the active and passive obedience of Christ as equally vicarious. They taught that Christ’s one complete obedience was comprehended both in his actions and sufferings, and that the matter of our redemption consisted of both. Flacius Illyricus sets forth that Christ, as perfectly obedient to the law, did and suffered all that the law required of us, and imputed to us His whole obedience as our righteousness. This controversy, which shook the Lutheran Church in an extraordinary way, led the way to clearer definition as contained in the *Concordia Formula*. It was maintained that sin consists in omission as well as commission, and that remission of sin necessarily involves not only the removal of guilt, but the imputation of righteousness. Their conclusion was, that the divine law must be perfectly obeyed by a mediator; and they defined this righteousness sometimes as satisfaction AND obedience, and at other times as Christ’s OBEDIENCE IN LIFE AND IN DEATH.” Smeaton Appendix, p. 533.

Calvin's opinion of Osiander is thus given in a letter addressed by him to Melancthon, at the time when Osiander separated himself from the rest of the Reformers: "Quod se Osiander nobis subduxit, imo non sine violento impetu se proripuit, non mirum, nec tantopere dolendum. Tu enim expertus pridem es, ex eo esse ferarum genere, quæ nunquam cicurantur: et ego semper inter nostra dedecora eum numeravi. Quo certe die mihi primum visus est, profanum hominis ingenium et fœdos mores sum detestatus. Quoties suave, ac generosum vinum laudare vellet, has in ore habebat voces, 'Ego sum qui sum': item, 'Hic est Filius Dei vivi'—quæ manifesta Dei ludibria proderent. Quo magis scœpe miratus sum vestrâ omnium indulgentiâ talem belluam foveri. Præcipue verò, quum locum in præfatione quâdam tuâ legerem (ubi post Wormaciense insanix specimen plusquam liberaliter abs te laudatur) obstupui. Sed facessat ille, quem alienissimum a nobis esse expedit."

Calvin to Melancthon.



