

OBSERVATIONS

ON A TRACT

ENTITLED

“THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST AS SET FORTH
IN A LECTURE ON PSALM VI.
CONSIDERED,”

By B. W. NEWTON.

LONDON:

J. K. CAMPBELL, 1, WARWICK SQUARE.

PLYMOUTH,

TRACT DEPÔT, CORNWALL STREET.

1847.

INTRODUCTION.

It appears needful to give some account of the circumstances which have occasioned the publication of the present Tract.

About eighteen months ago, I was giving lectures on some of the Psalms. Notes of one of these being taken, not in short hand, by one of those present, were afterwards copied and lent by the possessor to some of her friends.

I never saw one line of these notes, nor indeed knew of their existence (though aware that such notes were often taken,) until I heard that they were read and severely censured in a meeting convened in Exeter for the purpose. Shortly afterwards they were published, accompanied by the Strictures on which I now comment. This was done without any communication having been made to me, and therefore no opportunity was afforded me of avowing or disavowing any of the sentiments, or of rendering any explanation, or even giving any judgment as to the accuracy of the notes.

I have not the slightest remembrance of the particular lecture in question. It had entirely passed from my mind; so much so, that if I had been asked whether I had ever lectured on the sixth Psalm, I should not have been able to return a definite reply. All therefore that I can now do is to state what are the doctrines intended to be conveyed. The fact that I am accustomed in such lectures to occupy

an hour, and not unfrequently more, whereas the notes can easily be read in twenty minutes, sufficiently proves that much must have been omitted. Indeed it is the necessary habit of any who take notes, not in short hand, to mark the new or most prominent sentiments, and to pass by those which are more familiar. Yet the latter may be very important in the way of explanation—definition of terms and connexion.

This Tract and another which has been already published will, I trust, sufficiently show what my doctrines really are. They will show to what I object and what I avow in the notes. Nor would I wish to cast on others blame, that I may myself perhaps equally or more deserve. That on this and many other occasions, I may have spoken unguardedly and without sufficient precision of thought and expression, and so have given just reason for the present chastisement, I willingly admit; and I desire to mark the rod and who has appointed it. At the same time I increasingly feel, after writing the present tract, that the doctrine intended to be conveyed will bear, as a whole, most rigid examination by the word of God.

I would further take this opportunity of stating, that I am not responsible for any notes of my lectures that may be now or at any future time circulated, unless they are authenticated by my signature.

September 1, 1847.

OBSERVATIONS CONSIDERED, &c.

§ I.

THE offering of the body of the Lord Jesus on the Cross, as the sacrifice for the sins of His people, and their union with Him in life as the Second Adam, are truths, which through His grace have been for more than twenty years the rest of my soul and the foundation of all my hopes. During that period, I have written and spoken much on these subjects : I have written on them controversially, and these writings are still open to inspection. Salvation by grace through faith in His blood, is a doctrine for which I would gladly, through His help, lay down my life. For the sake of it, it has been needful for me to break many links—to lose many a friend whom once I valued. But I have never regretted the sacrifice. I desire increasingly to “count all things but dung that I may win Christ and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.” And I appeal confidently to all who know my ministry, whether I have ever sought to lead their souls to any rest except the blood and the righteousness of the Lord Jesus.

It has therefore very greatly pained and surprised me to find myself publicly accused of teaching things that go to subvert these foundation truths of our holy faith. I would indeed say “God forbid.” If it can be proved that I have written or uttered any thing that would tend to undermine the doctrine of the Cross, I trust that I should be willing to own it with true contrition. But I can sincerely say that my conscience acquits me of any such sin. If half of that of which I am accused in the Tract before me were true, I should indeed deserve the stigma with which it seeks to mark me. I should

undoubtedly be a heretic, and as such to be avoided by all who fear God and obey His word. "A heretic after the first and second admonition reject." But I trust I am not a heretic. I trust I should resist not less earnestly than the Author of the Tract, the evil doctrines which it has imputed to me.

I will first turn to some of the charges about which the Tract expresses itself most strongly. The notes of my Lecture, in the copy which the Author has printed and prefixed to his strictures, represent me as having said, "It was after He (Jesus) had been proved a Lamb without blemish and without spot—after He had in various ways been tried—seen to be the Lamb made perfect through suffering, &c." On these words the Author thus comments, (p. 43) "I must confess that the language of this paragraph makes me shudder. What a thought! that Jesus had *to be proved* a Lamb without blemish and without spot," and after dwelling for a little on this, he comments with almost equal severity on the latter clause, viz. "the Lamb made perfect through sufferings."

The last clause is indeed very objectionable. I can safely say that such an expression never passed my lips in private or public on any occasion whatsoever. Nor is it found even in the notes as originally written—but only in a copy through the mistake of the transcriber. The expression in the original notes is "the One made perfect through sufferings."

Nor do the notes in the former clause state that He *had to be* proved a Lamb without blemish, though this is the way the Author represents them. They merely state that He *was* proved or manifested to be a Lamb without blemish. Why should this be objected to? If it had been implied that He *had been made* the Lamb without blemish by His course of obedience, *that* indeed would have been heresy: for He was the Lamb without blemish, when laid as a babe in the manger; and would have been, if at that moment offered, a spotless sacrifice; but why any one should deny, what the Scriptures

so plainly reveal as a fact, viz. that He was in various ways proved by God, and that His excellencies were thereby manifested, I cannot understand. The same chapter in Isaiah which calls Him the Lamb, calls Him also the "righteous servant." "Through the knowledge of Himself shall my righteous servant justify many." It was a name, to which He evidenced His title by serving righteously. He was "a *tried* Stone."

Again on page 58, the Author writes: "Is any one so presumptuous, not to say blasphemous, as to predicate of Jesus what the Apostle says of himself as a Jew and others, "were by nature the children of wrath even as others?"..... Could it be said of Jesus personally, that He was cursed when He went out and when He came in? I really tremble to write such language."

"Presumptuous and blasphemous" are strong expressions—but they are not too strong. I willingly admit that they might most justly be used of any one who taught that Jesus, the Holy One, could in any sense whatever be included in that verse in the Ephesians "children of wrath even as others." It is a thought which I never before heard of, nor can I conceive it possible that it should be found in the bosom of any saint. It is not in the notes. It is a gratuitous addition. And I know that I may with all certainty affirm, that it would be abhorrent to the spirits both of those who have written and those who have read them. Nor do the notes say that Jesus was ever "accursed," (Gal. iii. 13,) or "made sin," until He was crucified. They state that He was obnoxious, i. e. exposed to the inflictions which in consequence of the curse of the broken Law, had gone forth against Israel, and that He suffered under many of them; but they do not state that He was "accursed." Who would deny that Elijah was obnoxious to, and that Elijah suffered under the drought and the famine which his own prayer had brought down on Israel; and yet who on this account would call Elijah "accursed?" Or to use an illustration which I have elsewhere employed, suppose a servant of God

* are drought & famine the inflictions due to the curse of the broken law?

were to go voluntarily and dwell with the people of a wicked and abandoned island, and suppose inflictions from God, such as drought or famine were sent upon that people, the servant of God would not be personally accursed, because he suffered or pined under those calamities. They would reach him as an innocent person who suffered because of others, yet in consequence of his position, he would be obnoxious, that is exposed to all the inflictions that the hand of God might be directing against that evil generation.

Or to use another illustration. If we suppose an evil and rebellious family banished by an Emperor to some distant and inclement region, and there subjected by law to many hardships and privations, and threatened, unless reclaimed, with yet severer sufferings, we should easily understand that this family was not only banished, but under inflictions also from the Law of him who banished them. And if the Son of the Emperor in pity and because it pleased him to fulfil a known desire of his Father, were to banish himself *for an appointed season*, into that distant land and become one of that exiled family, so as even to bear their name, and were to drink of their cup of misery, we should regard him not only as one of the banished, but as one suffering also under the penalties which the law of his Father had imposed on the banished ones, with whom he had thus placed himself in association. The heart of the son thus circumstanced would remain faithful and true towards his parent. Obedience and love would be the very reasons of his being there. The heart of his parent also would yearn towards him in tenderest sympathy. Yet he would still be during the whole appointed season, a banished sufferer, suffering under the inflictions of the law of his own parent, who was yet loving him through all.*

* The Author will observe that this illustration does *not* overlook the banisher—and the son's relation to the banisher. On the contrary, the more you dwell on that relation, the more is the point I wish to illustrate confirmed.

*that is
in appoin-
t season.*

And is it a new doctrine that Jesus by His birth became obnoxious, that is exposed to all the sinless penalties of fallen man? I do not say that they all fell upon Him. Some did not. He was exposed for example, because of His relation to Adam to that sentence of death, that had been pronounced on the whole family of man. Relatively, He was exposed to that curse;—personally, He evidenced His title to freedom from it, and His title to life by keeping that Law of which it had been said “this do and thou shalt live.” And if he was exposed to the doom of man, was He not equally exposed to all the sinless penalties that had fallen upon Israel as dwelling under Sinai? I do not say that they all fell on Him. Some did, others did not. But He was not on this account accursed. He was only the faithful servant, the beloved Son, suffering, as Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel feebly had done before, inflictions that came on Him because of others. They came on Him because of His connexion with others. He suffered then for the sake of others—for our final blessing—for God’s glory in Him.

Again, I am represented as having said, that Jehovah “*bruised*” the Lord Jesus for thirty years (see Tract, page 31.) I am not aware that this is imputed to me even in the notes, for I cannot find it—but whether it be or not, I entirely abjure the thought. That verse in Isaiah from which “bruised” is taken, belongs entirely to His vicarious sufferings on the Cross, and to the Cross I have always confined it.

Again in page 25, the Tract thus remarks: “The doctrine of the lecture tends to depreciate the value of the Cross, to obscure the blessed truth of Christ standing before God as the substitute for His people, when ‘He Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree.’ For if it should be admitted that the Cross is also a dividing point, which the language of the lecture will not allow, yet according to the teaching of the lecture, He endured more from God while *personally* under His wrath and chastisement for thirty years than

* Is the doom of man a
 sinless penalty? Is the
 What a
 sinless pen
 his con
 Sinai?

He did vicariously when 'the chastisement of our peace was upon Him.' I really tremble to deduce this conclusion," (p. 25.)

Indeed I trust that I should tremble likewise, if I had ever written or ever spoken any thing from which such a conclusion could justly be deduced. To affirm that the sufferings of the Lord Jesus were greater during the years of His private life, than when He laid down His life as the great sacrifice, would seem to me folly as well as sin. It would be something that no one even superficially acquainted with the Scripture could be expected for one moment to believe: and very sure I am that I never conceived, much less uttered, such a thought. There are certain doctrines which a teacher when speaking to those who are supposed to be instructed in the Scripture and well acquainted with his doctrines, is justified in assuming as unquestionable. Every one who heard me give the Lectures on the Psalms, knew that I place the Cross high above every thing else that ever was transacted on this earth. Both they and myself would shrink as much as the Author of the Tract, from any thing that would depreciate its value or obscure its excellency. It was assumed as acknowledged and unquestionable truth, that all that Jesus was personally, all that He had endured of suffering, all the excellency of His tried obedience, concentrated itself as it were on the Cross, and made it the crowning point of His service and God's power of salvation towards us sinners. The distinct and pre-eminent excellency of the Cross was assumed in the lecture, and if it had not been, opportunity for the present accusation would not have been afforded. The object of the Lecture was not to speak of the death of the Lord Jesus, but of His active life, and to consider how far the Psalms throw light upon its earlier portion. Into this period the Cross does not enter, but the baptism of John does; and unless the introduction of the preaching of Grace and the Kingdom of Heaven be esteemed nothing, the mission of John must be regarded as an all-important era, not only in the

life of the Lord Jesus, but in the dispensational arrangements of God. "The Law and the Prophets were until John; from that time the kingdom of Heaven is preached," is a text sufficiently distinct. Indeed unless grace be the same as law, and destruction the same as salvation, the infinite importance of that era cannot be denied. But as I have elsewhere written on the subject I do not pursue it now. All that I desire at present is to assure the Author of the Tract, that I utterly abhor the thought imputed to me, and that I never either uttered or entertained the evil sentiment.

The Author of the Tract complains also (pp. 24 and 46) that I have said, that the Cross is only one incident in the life of Christ.....in relation to His service to God only the closing incident of His long life of suffering and sorrow.

I quite admit that the wording of this passage as it stands in the notes is open to serious objections especially at its close. The word incident (which I probably used, for I am often in the habit of using it in the sense of "*event*"*) may be understood in a depreciatory sense. But I can most solemnly affirm that to use it in such a sense was utterly foreign to my thoughts. Even the notes do not represent me as having said the Cross is "*an*" incident, or an incident merely in the life of Jesus. The emphasis is thrown on "*one*," and the sentiment intended to be expressed was this—that the Cross was not the only event in the life of the Lord Jesus—that He who suffered thereon had a previous history and previous sufferings, the nature of which it greatly concerned us to know. † I had long and painfully felt

* I do not possess a large edition of Johnson, in the small one—"event" is given as one of the meanings of incident. It would, I believe, be according to usage to say "these are the chief incidents of his marvellous history."

† The passage in the Notes says, "This was only one incident in the life of Christ, *important indeed to us as involving all our blessings.*" The Author quotes indeed these latter words in one of the two places, but he comments as though they were not there.

that the *extent* of His sufferings was not acknowledged ; that many who have some appreciation of His vicarious sufferings on the Cross have little considered and little desire to consider His living sufferings which were no less true, no less real. The dried ears of corn dried by the fire, even corn beaten out of full ears, is a type of the Lord Jesus as a living sufferer quite as much as the sin-offering burned without the camp is a type of His more terrible suffering under wrath in death. We have to know Him in life, and we have to know Him in death, and we cannot part with the knowledge of one of His revealed relations without suffering loss to our souls. This was all that I intended to convey, and I know that I may safely add, that in this and any other instance of careless or unguarded expression in the notes, it was as far from the thoughts of the note-taker as from my own to say anything that would derogate from the excellency of the cross of our Lord and Saviour.

I beg therefore very earnestly to press it on the attention of the Author of the Tract, that I have never said that Jesus was the *Lamb* made perfect through sufferings—nor that Ephesians ii. 3. could in any sense whatever be applied to Him either in life or death—nor that He was “made a curse” until the cross—nor that Jehovah “bruised” Him for thirty years—nor that the sufferings of those years were greater than those of His death—nor though I may have used the word “incident” did I use it to imply depreciation of the Cross, nor was I so understood by those who heard me.

§ II.

Few things are more needful in controversies respecting truth, than to avoid misrepresentation or misunderstanding of each other's words. Adherence to the expressions of Scripture will assist in this; but even the use of Scripture words will not always avoid ambiguities, because the same word in Scripture is not always used in precisely the same sense. If truth therefore be not watchfully kept before us as our object, we shall find abundance of opportunity to misrepresent one another by seeming (because we use the same word) to speak of the same thing, when really we are speaking of things very diverse.

Let us take, as an example, the word "wrath." How different the meaning we attach to it, when we read of Jehoshaphat who was a servant of God, "therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord," (2 Ch. xix. 2.) from its meaning in such a passage as this, "children of wrath even as others," (Eph. ii.) or in the Revelation, "the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation." It is not only in the nature of the inflictions sent, but also in the mind and intention of Him who sends them, that we feel the difference to consist. Inflictions in wrath and hot displeasure may be sent, and yet it may be the desire of Him who sends them, to bless those who are thus stricken. He may plead with them, reason with them, send them periods of remission, and only give them up to final perdition when everything else has been tried and tried in vain. Such was the character of the inflictions on Israel, nor even yet have they been subjected to their final doom. And if it be asked, why not restrict the word to the denoting that

which will finally be the portion of the lost, our answer is, because the Scripture does not so confine it; and we must not hesitate to adopt the expressions of the word of God. Jeremiah said, (speaking indeed as the representative of another) "I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of His *wrath*."—Daniel ascribes his sorrows and the sorrows of his people, to the *curse* that is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God," (Dan. ix.) and Nehemiah says "ye bring more *wrath* upon Israel," (Neh. xiii. 18.)

When we say of Jehoshaphat that "wrath was upon him from the Lord," or when we say of Elijah or Jeremiah that they suffered under the wrath that had gone forth against Israel, in neither case do we use the word in the sense in which it is applied to those who finally suffer wrath unto perdition. And again Jehoshaphat, although a saint, personally deserved the wrath which was against him from the Lord. He had earned it by his own transgression. It came on him not as one faithful in the midst of transgressing multitudes, but because of his own sin. The place of Jehoshaphat therefore cannot represent that of Jesus, but that of Elijah may. When the brook that had for a long time sustained Elijah failed, and when he wandered out of the land of Israel to the widow of Sarepta, Elijah suffered. He saw in the burned and smitten inheritance of Israel, no land flowing with milk and honey as the land of promise should—he found no mountains dropping with new wine, no hills flowing with milk, no floors full of wheat, but he was glad to find a cruise of oil and a barrel of meal provided for him with a Gentile stranger. Elijah suffered outwardly and inwardly, because of the curse that was consuming Israel—but who on this account would say that Elijah was accursed or that he was under wrath even in the same sense that Jehoshaphat was?

This may illustrate my meaning, when I say that Jesus during the days of His earthly pilgrimage suffered

in consequence of the wrath that had gone forth against Israel. It will show the meaning which I attach to "wrath" so employed. In the sense of the writer of the Tract I have never said, that Christ suffered the wrath of God, and that not vicariously, before He came to the Cross. I repudiate the thought quite as much as the Author of the Tract.

§ III.

BEFORE I proceed with the examination of other charges, it will be necessary to consider whether Israel was, or was not, suffering under inflictions from God, when the Lord Jesus was born among them. I was not aware, until I saw this Tract, that this was doubted by any one who had ever considered the dispensational and prophetic history of Israel.

It is said by the Apostle, "As many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse, for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them.' Law worketh wrath, for where no law is, there is no transgression." Israel had formally taken their stand before God, under a covenant of law, and therefore the very first moment disobedience was found amongst them, they were brought "under curse." The fire of Sinai began instantly to burn against them, and therefore, even if every deserved infliction had been withheld from that moment to the time when Jesus was born, yet still He would have been one of a nation that was exposed to all the terrors of Sinai. They were all set in array against Israel.

But were inflictions withheld? Let us for a moment trace their history. Israel should have been set on

high above all nations of the earth. "And it shall come to pass, if thou wilt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all His commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth. And all these blessings shall come upon thee, and overtake thee if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God. Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field. Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Blessed shall be thy basket and thy store. Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall cause thy enemies that rise up against thee to be smitten before thy face; they shall come out before thee one way, and shall flee seven ways. The Lord shall command the blessing upon thee in thy storehouses, and in all that thou settest thine hand unto: and He shall bless thee in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.....And all people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord, and they shall be afraid of thee.....And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail, and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath, if that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day to observe and to do them."

This should have been their condition if they had been under the favour of the Lord their God. It would have been a position of unquestioned, manifested blessing, so manifested as for all to recognize it, even as it yet shall be in the last days, when their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the peoples—all that see them shall acknowledge them that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed. Then truly the feet of all who go forth from Zion shall be known and esteemed as beautiful and blessed, and there shall be no longer found one of whom it can be

said, that he is as a root out of a dry ground, having no form nor comeliness.

Such should have been their condition—but what was their real history? Early in the wilderness they spake against God; they said, “Can God furnish a table in the wilderness.....therefore the Lord heard this and was wrath, so fire was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel, because they believed not in God, and trusted not in His salvation.....therefore their days did He consume in vanity, and their years in trouble.” (Ps. lxxviii.) “Therefore He lifted up His hand against them to overthrow them in the wilderness, to overthrow their seed also among the nations, and to scatter them in the lands.....Thus they provoked Him to anger with their inventions, and the plague brake in upon them.” (Ps. cvi.) And again in Psalm xcv. “Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, so I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest.” Such was the Sinai history of Israel *even in the wilderness.*

And after they were planted in the land, what is the book of Judges but a record of rebellion, and of chastisements,—intermitted indeed, but no sooner removed, than again needing to be repeated: “The children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and forgot the Lord their God, and served Baalim and the groves. Therefore the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He sold them into the hand of the King of Mesopotamia.” After this they were sold to Moab, then to Midian, and so on—and in the book of Ruth we find, as it were, a remnant of the family of faith in Israel, driven by affliction from their land, and sojourning in the midst of Gentile strangers. Naomi had to drink deep of the cup of sorrow, “Call me not Naomi, but call me Mara, for the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me.”

I scarcely need follow Israel's history of sorrow through the books of Chronicles or Kings. The thoughts of Elijah when he sat down alone under the juniper

tree, and wished that he might die, are a sufficient index of what the condition of Israel was, and of the manner in which the servant of God suffered in the midst of the general ruin. Neither the testimony of Elijah, nor the more wonderful ministry of Elisha, stopped the onward progress of the evil. The sentence was pronounced—and the ten tribes of Israel, the goodly thousands of Ephraim and Manasseh were carried away beyond Babylon, never more to be restored until the day when Jesus shall be revealed in His glory. And although the sentence on Judah was longer delayed yet over them also Lo-ammi (not my people) was soon after pronounced; the glory of the God of Israel was withdrawn before the eyes of Ezekiel, never more to return until Jesus comes,—the staff Beauty was broken, the Urim and Thummim were no longer found, and Malachi the last of the prophets had to say, “Ye are cursed with a curse, for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation.” The dreadful persecutions of Antiochus, the like to which had never been known in Israel, for he set an idol in the temple, even on the altar of God, were succeeded by the iron power of that nation, who had been described to Daniel as the people that should “destroy the city and sanctuary,” (Dan. ix. 26,) the nation symbolized by the beast with great iron teeth that devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it. Israel was in the grasp of this monster when Jesus was born; and, as if in token of the general condition, though known and owned to be of the family and lineage of David, no room was found for Him even in an inn. He was born, apparently in a stable, and laid in a manger—although heir of the throne of David, that throne to which all nations shall bow. Israel was in captivity—Judah to a great extent scattered—Jerusalem trampled down beneath the Gentile monster, and poverty, hunger, blindness, disease, and (if their hearts had not been hardened,) terror of soul was their portion from the Lord. Such was their condition when Jesus came to be one amongst them.

The good things which the Lord had spoken had not come to pass, for they had forfeited them by their sin—but the curse had overtaken them as the Lord had said. Hezekiah had spoken in his days of “fierce wrath,” being against Israel, but it had waxed even hotter when Jesus came; and the very condition of Israel’s king, His being as a root out of a dry ground, the absence of the blessings of Deuteronomy, (for they should have all rested on His head, He should have been blessed, *manifestly* blessed in His going out, and in His coming in,) their absence was a sufficient index of Israel’s state; it shewed that there was curse where there should have been blessing. How then can the tract on which I am commenting, state that “the curse had not yet lighted on them?” (page 59.) The confession of Daniel is, “Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses, the servant of God, because we have sinned against Him.”* (Dan. ix.) Nehemiah speaks

*The author seems to imply that the prayer of Daniel was the means of averting wrath from his people, and that it did not fall on them until the siege of the city by the Romans, mentioned in Luke xxi. 20, 21, 22.

But so far from the prayer of Daniel averting or removing wrath, all the visions granted to him were so many seals, as it were, to the continuance of Israel’s ruin. They all shewed that the power of the Gentiles should continue to trample them down on to the very end, and, therefore, the Jews always consider Daniel as their prophet of woe. The very answer to his prayer, even in the ninth chapter itself, is instruction respecting a prolonged period of woe, not yet finished; and he is told that not until the end of that time should the iniquity of Israel be purged away, and “that determined be poured upon the desolator.”

The author seems also to have forgotten that it was *before*, not *after* the period mentioned in Luke xxi. 20, that it was said by St. Paul, “Wrath hath come upon them to the end.” If, as the writer supposes, wrath did not fall on

even of the favoured remnant around him, bringing by their transgression "more wrath upon Israel," (xiii. 18,) Malachi the last of the prophets says, Ye are cursed with a curse: and John quoting from Isaiah, and therefore spreading the words of Isaiah over all the seven hundred years that had passed between Isaiah and himself, says, "Therefore they could not believe because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." Are these words obscure? Shall we refuse to receive them, or shall we bow to these testimonies of Him whose word standeth fast for ever?

§ IV.

IT must not be thought that the fact of Israel's being under "wrath" and under "curse" at the time when the Lord Jesus was born amongst them, is of trivial importance in the present controversy. It is so important that if the Author of the Tract were once to admit it, his own principles must lead him to acknowledge many of those things against which he now strenuously contends.

For example, he admits that the Lord Jesus by His birth as man became exposed to the sinless sorrows of

them until the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, the words of St. Paul would not have been true.

The very meaning of this text in Thessalonians appears to be that wrath had long since set in upon them, and would continue to rest upon them *until the end*. Such is the right rendering of the concluding words.

the human family. He admits that He was exposed to hunger, thirst, weariness, and partook of the common cup of human sorrow, [p. 75.] This is an important admission; for what are hunger, thirst, and other such like sorrows of Man? They are *infiictions* from the hand of God. Adam, the moment he quitted Paradise, and began to reap the fruits of his disobedience in a fallen earth, felt in the new sensations which each moment brought, the witnesses of God's displeasure, and the consequences of his transgression. It would have been sin and hardness of heart in him not to have regarded them as *infiictions*. And therefore Jesus even because He was perfect and therefore felt every thing according to truth, must have regarded these things as the effects of God's chastening rod.

And if it can be shown (as it has been shown) that there was one part of the human family, which stood in a peculiar relation to God as alone known by Him out of all kingdoms of the earth—and that Jesus became by birth one of that family—and that that nation because of Sinai and the Law which they had broken, was under peculiar infiictions from God, the same reason that has led the Author to admit, that Jesus drank of the cup of human sorrow, would lead him also to admit that He drank of the cup of Israel's woe. And if the sorrow and *infiictions* which had fallen on Israel are said in Scripture to have been the result of "curse" and of "wrath," then Jesus would have drunk of a cup of sorrow which was the result of such wrath and such curse. This would necessarily follow, as the result of the Author's own principle, if he once admitted, as I think, on reflection he *will* admit, that Israel was under such *infiictions* when Jesus became an Israelite. He would then see that there is a peculiar class of sufferings, added to those which flowed from drinking of the general cup of human sorrow—sufferings which resulted from special infiictions on a peculiar people, and which yet were not the vicarious sufferings of the Cross.

When once we see this, we no longer feel ourselves under the necessity of taking from Jeremiah and the suffering prophets their honoured place as types of the Lord Jesus in His living sorrows—for even as Adam in Paradise, and Aaron in the glory of his Priesthood, and Solomon on the Throne, are types of what Jesus will be when the hour of His glory shall have come, so also do the suffering Prophets, (and they suffered many an affliction, *and that from the hand of God*, because of their nation's sin,) stand as the honoured types of what Jesus in His greater path of suffering was. Nor would it be any longer necessary to avoid the force of words of Scripture such as these, “I have eaten ashes like bread and mingled my drink with weeping, because of thy indignation and thy wrath, for thou hast lifted me up and cast me down,” (Ps. 102.) I say avoid their force, for we are chargeable with avoiding the plain and direct meaning of the words, if we say that “Eating ashes like bread and mingling His drink with weeping,” refer not to His living experience, but to His sufferings in death. Like many other passages in the Psalms they describe prolonged and living experiences. And if we should acknowledge this and yet say that there is no reference to the source from which these sufferings came, that also would be an avoiding the plain testimony of the word of God. “Because of thine indignation and thy wrath,” are plain and unambiguous words—and if we could not comprehend the reason for such a relation of God to His holy and perfect Servant, it would be our place to submit our understandings and to bow.

And when we remember that there are only three ways in which suffering from God can reach any of His servants here; that it must be either because of personal transgression—or substitutionally—or because of association with others who are under chastisement, can we be at any loss to say to which of these classes we assign the living sufferings of the Lord Jesus? We agree in saying that they were not substitutional, neither were

they because of personal sin; if therefore they existed at all, and the Scripture I have just quoted proves that they did exist, it must have been because of association or connexion with others. And are not the Scriptures full of the history of such sufferings?—Did not Caleb and Joshua suffer under the infliction that had fallen on Israel, when they were turned back from the borders of the inheritance and condemned to wander forty years in the wilderness. And is there not also the present evidence of fact?—are we not all at this moment suffering from the ruin that has fallen on the scattered and chastened Church?—and if one were at this moment to arise amongst us as faithful and as devoted as the Apostle Paul, would he be exempted from the general rod? I have again and again spoken of the afflictions of Elijah and the Prophets. These afflictions were not vicarious; but they were afflictions because of association with their nation—a nation which they loved, not only because it was their own, but because it was God's people. The power of their endurance was indeed feeble and its extent limited in comparison with that of Jesus. Elijah, I doubt not, would have been ready to fly far away and to abandon Israel, if half the bitterness of the sorrow which Jesus knew had been allotted him. Indeed we read of his making intercession to God *against* Israel. But the will of Jesus, although free and unconstrained, turned not from its purpose. He drank the cup of sorrow which association with Israel brought, quite as determinately as that more dreadful cup which His final place of substitution gave.

The fact of Jesus being by birth an Israelite would have been alone sufficient to link Him in closest association with that people in the estimate of God. His was association not of position merely, but of feeling and affection. He was the Son of Abraham and the Son of David, and it was the desire of Jesus and the desire of Him whom Jesus came to serve, that He should be true to His nation and to His fathers. If Moses discerned them to be God's nation and was

willing because of this to live for them and to suffer with them, how much more Jesus. He regarded them as God's nation and they were His people; and by appropriation of soul He mourned over and confessed their sins as if they were His own. Nothing that pertained to His people did He consider foreign to Himself. Hence, as I have elsewhere said, His baptism under the hand of John. It was the acknowledgement of the condition of His people and of His association with them in that condition. His was indeed, a near association, maintained at no little cost; for every link we discover that bound Him to His people, discloses a reason why He should be exposed to the sorrows of their lot. The book of Lamentations teaches us, perhaps more distinctly than any other, how deeply He drank of their cup. The sudden transitions in the descriptions of that book from the nation to an individual show how close His association with their ruin was. He individualizes, as it were, the misery and the rebuke of Israel. "All her people sigh, they seek bread, they have given their pleasant things for meat to relieve the soul; see, O Lord, and consider, for *I* am become vile. Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?—behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of His fierce anger."*

But the Lord Jesus, it must be remembered, was not an individual Israelite merely. He was the Head of Israel—Israel's King. He was born, and even whilst in the manger, worshipped as King of the Jews. The

* I do not forget the application of this passage to the history of Israel in the latter day. It was by looking on into the depth of Israel's future woe, that the soul of Jesus measured the extent of His affliction and sorrow as one of Israel, and as the head of Israel. He thus livingly realized the future. His relation to the two Witnesses may suggest other thoughts, interesting and important—but into this I do not now enter.

very name of the nation was given to Him by God. "Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified." "When Israel was a child, then I loved Him, and called my Son out of Egypt."

But He did not find His Throne prepared for Him when He came. A servant of Satan was there, and He was obliged to flee from his destroying power. Jerusalem, the City of His glory, was trodden down. The silver had become dross. The beauty of Zion was departed—and yet for all this the anger of Jehovah was not turned away, but His hand was stretched out still.

Did Jesus the king of Israel, regard these things as no token of Divine displeasure? Did He feel that the rod that had stricken Israel had not stricken Him, the heir of Israel's crown? Let us read the latter part of the 89th Psalm. It is the record of the sorrow of one who understands and mourns over the degradation of David's Throne. "But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed. Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant—thou hast profaned His crown by casting it to the ground. Thou hast broken down all His hedges. Thou hast brought His strong holds to ruin.....Thou hast set up the right hand of His adversaries; thou hast made all His enemies to rejoice.....Thou hast made His glory to cease, and cast His throne down to the ground. The days of His youth hast thou shortened.....Thou hast covered Him with shame. How long Lord? wilt thou hide thyself for ever? Shalt thy wrath burn like fire?"

Such are the words in which the Holy Ghost has described the casting down off the Crown of Israel and the dishonour of the Anointed. Shall we say that they are unreal? Shall we say that they describe circumstances unknown and unappreciated by the Lord Jesus?

§ V.

I SUPPOSE we may with all certainty affirm that when all things shall have been made new, and when all the redeemed of every dispensation shall meet in the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, there will not be one of that countless multitude who will be able to say that he has tasted during his pilgrimage of one cup of living sorrow (sin only excepted) of which Jesus will not have drunk. Job may have felt, and felt acutely, what man in weakness is—weakness unutterable when brought into contrast with the living God. But many a Psalm will evidence that the soul of Jesus entered into this experience in a way Job never knew. It is said of the Old Testament saints that through fear of death they were all their life-time subject to bondage. “The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee, they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.” Death and Hades are naturally and rightly abhorrent to man as man. They are abhorrent also to the living God. Jesus therefore naturally and instinctively shrank from them. It was part of the exercise of His soul—for He had a human soul, and He had associated Himself with the place in which man was. Hence the words of the sixth Psalm “in death there is no remembrance of thee, in the grave who can give thee thanks?”

Moreover the exercises of soul which His elect in their unconverted state ought to have, and which they would have, if it were possible for them to know and feel every thing rightly according to God—such exercises, yet without sin, Jesus had. At an hour not yet come, one portion of His elect will have to pass through a furnace of affliction the like to which has never been, since there was a nation upon earth. They will live when every jot and tittle of the desolations described in Jeremiah and

the Prophets will in full accomplishment have fallen upon Israel. They will live when the last grasp of Satan through his great instrument, Anti-christ—shall have laid hold of Israel. They will live even through the Day of the Lord's visitation—will pass through its fires, and be refined like silver in the furnace. Here is a peculiar experience indeed of some of the elect of God. Into this also Jesus entered. Hence His bitter cries in the Lamentations. The remnant of Israel will not taste of a cup of sorrow of which He will not have drank ;—but the difference is this, they will feel partially, incompletely, wrongly, not unfrequently self-righteously in the midst of the desolations which their eyes cannot but recognise and which their hearts cannot but feel. They will see the ruin but their hearts will not be in communion with the thoughts of God, whereas Jesus beheld it with and according to God. I say beheld—for if prophetic vision enabled Jeremiah to say : “I beheld the earth and lo, it was without form and void, and the heavens and they had no light : I beheld the mountains and lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld and lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heaven were fled. I beheld and lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord and by His fierce anger,”—if the Prophet in his measure realized these things how much more Jesus—for He was not a prophet only, He was the Christ of God—whose soul could bear and was caused to bear under direct exercise from God, apprehensions of truth, both past and present and to come. And besides this, God did not send forth His Son until every principle of the latter-day evil had been sown and begun to spring. Hence His words “*this* generation shall not pass away till all these things shall be fulfilled.” It was virtually the same generation that shall live and act at the close. The difference was no more than that which subsists between a green and a more aged tree. “If they shall do these things in the green tree what shall be done in the dry?” The appli-

cation also of the second Psalm, which properly is the description of the last Anti-Christian confederacy—to the union of Herod, Pilate, and the rulers of Israel against Jesus—proves that He was virtually regarded as in the midst of the evil of the latter days.

The more we enter into the Scripture history of that closing period, the more shall we find materials supplied for illustrating the position, services and experiences of the Lord Jesus. It is not however my intention at present to dwell on the history of the remnant of Israel. I will only remark that they never stand as in union with Jesus—nor in acceptance through His name—nor receive His Spirit until after the great day of Jacob's trouble is past for ever.

§ VI.

It is very needful in such enquiries as the present to distinguish carefully between the personal and relative condition of the servants of God. Whether the Lord Jesus were living in Paradise or whether in the midst of a fallen and groaning earth, personally He would be the same. He would have the same character, the same dispositions, the same love to the Father, the same delight in Him. As regards these things, the darkness and the light were both alike to Him. Whether near or whether far off, He could not be other than that which He essentially was, the Son, that is (*ο υι*) in the bosom of the Father. And the personal relation of the Father to Him was equally unchangeable. He never could be in His sight other than the Son, One in whom He always rested with joy unchangeable.

But whilst Jesus ever retained His personal relation to the Father, for it is unalterable, yet He became

subject to the dispensational arrangements which the order of God in government had introduced into the earth. As an Israelite, He was under that holy covenant which was made at Sinai. If He had stood alone in disconnection from others, that covenant would to Him have brought only blessing. He found in it joy—for He was able to meet all its requirements, though they were holy, just, and true; and He delighted in the light which they gave. “O how I love thy law, it is my meditation all the day. How sweet are thy words unto my taste, yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth.” His dispensational place therefore, if He had stood alone in dissociation from others, would not have interfered with any of the blessings that personally pertained to Him.

But He was not found in dissociation from others. He was standing in closest association with those whose dispensational relation to God was marked by the darkness, and lightnings, and voices of Sinai—a sight so terrible that even Moses said, “I exceedingly fear and quake.” Sinai marked the relation of God to Israel when Jesus came—and the worship of the golden calf (though that would but feebly represent their ripened evil) may be taken as marking their relation to God. And since God, in exercising the souls of His servants, must exercise them according to truth—and the application of truth by God varies according to the nature of the dispensation under which His servants live, we might be very sure, even if the evidence of Scripture were less direct than it is, that the Lord Jesus was caused to appreciate to the full, the relation in which Israel (and Himself because of Israel) was standing before God. We may hear of Sinai or think of Sinai, but Jesus realized it as the power of an actual subsisting relation betwixt His people and God. He had to live in the midst of Israel at a time when God’s only declared relation to it was that of Sinai. Years passed over His head thus. And unless we say that through the whole of that period He remained unexercised by God according

to the circumstances around Him, we shall not find it difficult to say what the nature of His experiences must have been.

Every experience in which He realized the condition either of man or of Israel, must have caused Him to long for that hour when the appointed messenger should go forth to prepare His way before Him. The cry of John was in the wilderness—"in the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."....."The voice said Cry—and he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field".....Such was the testimony of John. It was founded on the worthlessness of man and the ruin of the flesh—and therefore, as if in testimony against the abominations of all social life, he retired from the city into the wilderness, and lived on locusts and wild honey. The axe, said he, is laid at the root of all the trees; a figure taken from the woodman who thus guides his hand before he gives the blow. The Lord's fan is in His hand. These things Jesus knew. He had long pondered them. He knew that every tree deserved to be cut down, and that every one that did not bring forth good fruit would be cut down. But He knew also another thing—it was one of the secrets,—a mystery of the kingdom of Heaven. He knew that before He should act as the winnower He was to go forth as the sower. He was to be anointed from Heaven with the Holy Ghost to minister grace and to preach the forgiveness of sins through faith.

Jesus went into the wilderness to John and there owned the truth of his message and of his mission, but He did not, like John, remain in the wilderness. He did not merely say, All flesh is grass, or direct to another than Himself. He was able to say, "I am the Life." "He that believeth in me though he were dead yet shall he live." He did not withdraw into dissociation from human life, and leave it in its helplessness and misery. He went into the cities and sat down to eat

with publicans and sinners. His soul had proved, in a way John never knew, the reality of this ruin, but He came to open in the midst those streams which shall make glad the City of God for ever; living waters that shall flow for ever from the Throne of God and of the Lamb. How must the soul of the Lord Jesus have appreciated this? How must He have regarded it as the great era in His living service? His title to this ministry He had to purchase on the Cross. But it pertained to Him who purchased salvation by His own blood to commence its testimony. That "great salvation," said the Apostle Paul, "which began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him."

The moment that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost as a dove, God stood in a new relation to Israel. The dove belongs not to Sinai.—Sinai might remain and overhang Israel with its terrors, to be met only by the obedience and death of the Holy One. But the Spirit as the dove was there guiding the ministry of Him who was the Lamb of God. Did this make no change in the dispensational exercises of the Lord Jesus? It must have made a change, unless God exercises His servants without any regard to the nature of the circumstances in which they serve. New joys surely were opened to Jesus, even if He had new sorrows. He might have to upbraid Chorazin and other such like cities—but He could at that very moment look on some who were standing around Him and rejoice in Spirit and say, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth. He could speak to them as His sheep that should not perish. He could call them, children of the bridechamber—children of a heavenly Father—and speak to them as belonging to the kingdom of Heaven. He introduced the kingdom of God into the earth, never more to depart from it.

I trust that I have now said enough to show why I consider the baptism and anointing of the Lord Jesus for His ministry, to be the great era in His living service. On the Cross we view Him in death. We need not

confound the two periods, nor forget the one whilst we are speaking of the other. The more highly we magnify the commencement of the testimony of grace, the more we magnify the Cross—for that testimony was the result of the Cross. The anointing of the Spirit would never have come on Him at Jordan unless He had been fore-ordained and certainly known as the victim to be slain on Calvary. It was certain in all that fixedness of purpose which belongs to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. With God is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

§ VII.

It has now, I think, been sufficiently shewn, that unless we deny that the Lord Jesus suffered under the inflictions which had fallen on man as man, and unless we are prepared to say that He was not as “a root out of a dry ground,” but that on the contrary, He was, according to the promises of Deuteronomy, blessed—manifestly blessed in the sight of Israel and the nations, in His going out and in His coming in; we must admit that He suffered under the inflictions which God had laid upon His people. Moreover the fact that His crown, as the King of Israel, was indeed cast down to the ground—His anti-typical relation also to the suffering prophets, and above all, the direct testimony of the scripture, as found in many of the Psalms and in the Lamentations, must be set aside, if it be not allowed that He so suffered.

Those parts of scripture to which I have referred, sufficiently shew not only that He did thus suffer, but that He recognised the source from which that suffering flowed. Indeed how could it have been otherwise,

seeing that Jesus was perfect and estimated all things according to truth. Even Adam must have recognised his hunger and travail as coming from God; how much more must Jesus. And if He thought of His condition in the midst of Israel, the absence of any promised blessing or the presence of any woe must have led Him to think of Him who had staid the blessing and sent the woe.

When the Lord Jesus fulfilled the type of the sin-offering burned without the camp, He must have recognized in His inmost soul, the hand of God. Was it otherwise when He was fulfilling the type of the green ears of corn scorched by fire? It was indeed a different character of suffering, but that makes no difference as to the fact of its coming from God. It was as much the positive appointment of God that Jesus should answer to the green ears scorched, as that He should be the sin-offering. A type once given must be fulfilled, for not one tittle of the law shall fail. And did not the Lord Jesus know this? Did He not know that the shew-bread also, those holy loaves which, covered with pure frankincense, were placed on the golden table in the holy place, must first be passed through the scorching heat of the oven. And what was the world, what more especially was Israel to Him, but as the oven's heat? God's holy hand in stern controversy with transgressing flesh was there—The Lord Jesus was not unconscious of the presence of that hand, nor of the nature of that controversy. He felt it the more because He was the Holy One. It was not the presence of God as in Paradise, benignly resting in that which His goodness had made—it was His holiness present in a fallen world, in the midst of sinful flesh and of a transgressing people.*

* There is no one, I trust, that will read these pages, to whom it need be said that Jesus was sinless in body, soul, and spirit; as much so, after He had become flesh as when

It makes no real difference whether the sufferings that reached the Lord Jesus came immediately from God, or instrumentally through Satan or through man. If no sorrow had ever reached Him immediately from God, but all had reached Him instrumentally, He would still have looked through all the mediate agency and recognised God. He would still have said "It is the Lord."

But we should form a very inadequate conception of the living experiences of the Lord Jesus, if in addition to

He was in the bosom of the Father, before the world was. Yet He was found, not in the likeness of Adam's flesh in Paradise—but in the likeness of Adam's flesh after he had fallen: sin only being excluded. All that pertained to man's nature in Mary pertained to Jesus—its weakness, its dishonour—Sin only was excepted. "He was in the likeness of sinful flesh." *Penalties* therefore of the fall were connected even with the constitution of His human nature. Here was the early proof that He was under infliction from the hand of God. And if He were not exempt from this, even in the constitution of His own nature, how much less would He be exempt from the consequences that resulted from the external condition of human life around Him.

I entirely admit that God was able to have protected Jesus either partially or completely from the influence of these things. He might have placed Him in the very presence of the burning flame and preserved Him unscorched. There was no *essential necessity* for His being made to suffer until He took the strictly *vicarious* place. And this, I believe, is the reason why during His early childhood He grew up unscathed. God hereby *shewed* that He was able to protect, "the tender plant"—and He had a just title, because of its perfectness and excellency, to protect it always—But His wisdom had ordained otherwise—He had spoken of Him as growing up as a tender plant, but He had also said He shall *grow up* as a root out of a dry ground—He was to learn obedience by the things which He suffered. Hence the meat offering—*baked—fried—scorched*; the shew-bread passed through the oven; the frankincense bruised—and this before its burning.

the sufferings which flowed spontaneously as it were, from the condition of man and of Israel, we did not also recognise a yet more close and searching dealing of God with His servant, whereby His sensitive and perfect soul was made to feel in a manner inconceivable to us, the reality of the circumstances around Him. It belonged to the place which the Lord Jesus had taken as man to be instructed by God, (Is. l. 4,) and to be dealt with by God. "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered." It belonged to His sensitive and holy soul to feel—and it pleased God to appoint that it should feel, feel to a degree inconceivable by us, under exercise of spirit from Him. How should we feel, imperfect as our sensibilities are, if God, according to the power of His own holiness, were to press upon the apprehensions of our souls a truthful sense of the present and future condition of ruined man? And what relations were there, either of Israel or of man, that Jesus was not caused to estimate thus? "Horror hath taken hold upon me, because of the wicked that forsake thy law. My flesh trembleth for fear of thee, and I am afraid of thy judgments. Trouble and anguish have taken hold on me, yet thy commandments are my delight. I am afflicted and ready to die from my youth up, while I suffer thy terrors I am distracted." It is the thought of Jesus being caused by God to estimate the terror of His holiness in relation to the circumstances of humanity pressed in vivid realization on His soul, that alone enables me to understand such words as these.

And here it is that all illustration fails. We may say, that a king's son, a beloved son, goes to share the cup of a banished family.—We may use this and similar illustrations, which are true and serviceable so far as they go, but they fall short in this, that they do not exhibit that personal exercise from God which constituted one great distinctive feature in the living sufferings of Jesus. His servants, such for example as St. Paul, may follow their Master in drinking in their more feeble measure of the cup of others' woe, they may suffer much

with others and for the sake of others, they may also have exercises of spirit; but no one excepting Jesus ever had His soul exercised in the same manner (for the dispensation was one of law) nor with the same intensity—the intensity of truth. The Lord Jesus was as much alone in His living estimate under God's hand of the circumstances of human life here, as in enduring wrath upon the Cross. He who before He was made flesh had known all the heights of uncreated and eternal glory, was also, when here, made to estimate according to the sensibilities of that nature which He had taken, the, (to us,) inconceivable distance, of humanity from God. And when thus exercised, though personally holy and beloved, He was made to feel that His association with those thus standing in the fearfulness of their distance from God was a real thing, and that it was so regarded by God. His was no mere pretended, imaginary association.

And here I would wish it to be most carefully remembered that I am writing on the sufferings of the Lord Jesus not on His joys, nor of the reliefs which met Him in the midst of these sufferings. His own perfect communion with the Father, a communion, I do not say increased but developed by these very exercises—the knowledge that the Father always rested in Him with joy and love unchangeable—the perpetual consciousness that He was accomplishing His will and fulfilling that which was written of Him—the anticipation of future joys, (I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living,) the knowledge that He had come from God and went to God, and that the Father gave all things into His hand—all these things as well as the answers to His prayers—the refreshing of His soul—the resting from time to time in green pastures and by still waters, all these things, and many more might be added, caused Him to know Heaven as well as earth—God as well as man—the Father's bosom as well as Satan's rage—consolations therefore as well as sorrow. He had

to know good and evil—man had earned this knowledge at the fall. Adam found that he had lost the good, and was in fellowship with the evil. Christ found Himself in the midst of evil, but having all fellowship with good—all understanding of and delight in it. Every exercise of His soul was sent not in anger to crush Him, but in love to honour Him. In Him it called forth faith, prayer, and power of communion with God, who heard His supplications and granted the request, and thus furnished (as the Psalms abundantly witness) continual occasion for thanksgiving and praise. He knew the meaning of songs in the night—songs in the house of His pilgrimage.* When we consider this, we shall be little disposed to consider these, His living sufferings, useless. Nothing can be useless that God appoints—nothing useless that tends to exhibit the character of Christ.

The frankincense was beaten small that its fragrance might be developed; and when the winds are commissioned to blow upon the garden, it is “that the spices thereof may flow out.” If, therefore, there were no other result, than the manifestation of the character of Jesus, that would be in itself a sufficient end. Even the natural conscience recognises the excellency of that self-denying love which led into and endured such association with those who well deserved the bitterness of the cup which had been given them to drink. But when we are able in the Spirit a little to comprehend the nature of that association—to consider its results and the bitter exercises both of soul and body consequent

* It is in this that we have to draw a marked contrast even with God’s most honoured servants, such for example as Jeremiah. There was wanting the communion with the Father that Jesus had. When Jeremiah felt the pressure—a pressure infinitely less than that known by the Lord Jesus, he was ready to say, “Cursed be the day wherein I was born,” (see ch. xx. 14.) How different from the thoughts and words of the Lord Jesus even in His greatest sorrow.

thereon, we shall then be able, in some degree, to appreciate the living experiences of Jesus, and see that they exhibited a perfectness of character that could pertain only to One.

To manifest that which was well-pleasing unto the Father, was doubtless sufficient as a motive to the soul of the Lord Jesus. But it was not the mind of the Father, that the plant which was bearing its spices in a wilderness, should spend all its fragrance there, appreciated only by Him. There is an altar in the Tabernacle of God—there is priestly ministration there. And whatever our estimate of the meat-offering may at present be, however much we may fail in appreciating the excellency that lies hid under its scorched and beaten form, yet it has been presented with oil and with frankincense on that altar, and its fragrance has ascended into Heaven. And if not before, we shall recognize at last, when we enter within the veil, that not one of the living sufferings of Christ has been in vain—the memorial of them is above—and the joy of the acceptance thereof we shall fully know, as pertaining to ourselves, when we have learned to appreciate in another world the grace given to us in Christ Jesus.

If the Author of the Tract re-considers these things, I think he will still say “these sufferings were not vicarious,” but he will not say, nor suppose that I say, that “no one was benefitted by them.”

§ VIII.

THE Scripture is not merely a record of facts—it reveals also principles. Many of these principles are such as no variation of circumstances can alter. Any thing, for example, that is founded on the revealed

character of God or of Christ—or on the equally unalterable character of evil as found in the fallen flesh, may be received as certain and unchanging truth. And thus instruction is afforded, and we are enabled to speak with certainty of many things about which we must be silent, if limited to that which Scripture has definitely recorded in the way of fact.

Some have thought, because the Gospel narrative records only the history of the public ministry of the Lord Jesus, that the Scripture affords little information respecting Him apart from this record of facts. But on examination it will be found, that both the Old and New Testaments supply a body of principles so definitely given and so unchangeable in their nature, as to afford certain and extended knowledge respecting all the years of the Lord's sojourn here. "He learned obedience by the things that He suffered" is a truth that cannot be confined to the years of His public ministry. His being "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," is founded not on His being the public servant of God, but on His partaking of flesh and blood. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth, is a fact which supplies us with many principles that cannot be confined to His public mission. The principles of the 119th Psalm could not but have been verified in Jesus as soon as He had an understanding to know, and affections to delight in God. He was early able to say, "O how I love thy law, it is my meditation all the day." The commandment, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him," must have guided the Lord Jesus long before He entered His public ministry—and as early, I suppose, might He have begun to say, "The reproaches of them that reproached thee have fallen upon me." Page after page of the Old Testament prophets detail the dark principles of iniquity that prevailed through Israel—but suddenly, in the midst of this detail of evil, we find reference made to a righteous One, detecting this evil, viewing it according to God, mourning over it,

testifying against it, and yet feeling Himself in such a manner connected with it as to be involved in results of chastening and sorrow. Read, for example, these words of Micah, "The good man is perished out of the earth, and there is none upright among men, they all lie in wait for blood, they hunt every man his brother with a net. That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh and the judge asketh for a reward, and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire, so they wrap it up. The best of them is as a brier; the most upright is sharper than a thorn hedge—the day of the watchmen and thy visitation cometh; now shall be their perplexity. Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a guide, keep the doors of thy mouth from her that lieth in thy bosom. For the son dishonoureth the father—the daughter riseth up against her mother—the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, a man's enemies are the men of his own house. Therefore I will look unto the Lord, I will wait for the God of my salvation, my God will hear me. Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall I shall arise, when I sit in darkness the Lord shall be a light unto me." Passages like this supply an abundance of principles which must have, more or less, characterized all the days of the manhood of the Lord Jesus. No official or ministerial position was needful to make Him apprehend truth—the truth of circumstances—and to act, and to speak, and to pray, as if He apprehended and felt it. Who would venture to limit the righteousness, the obedience, the trials, the sympathies, the service of the Lord Jesus, to the years of His public ministration?—and if not, we know not a little respecting the character of His ways and the inward experiences of His spirit.

He was a man and He was an Israelite, and He was a righteous man and a righteous Israelite, before He came forth on His public ministry. We know from the Scripture how such an one must act and must feel. We know from the Scripture, the condition of the world and

the condition of Israel when Jesus came. We know the relation of God to both—we know how, in such circumstances, a righteous man and an Israelite (not to speak of Him as God's own beloved Son,) must have acted, suffered, and felt, and when we turn to such a book as the Psalms, we find page after page detailing experiences and sorrows such as we know must have been the portion of the righteous One so circumstanced and so tried. How then can we say that the scripture supplies us with no information as to the early life of the Lord Jesus?

And if we turn to the types, will any one say that green ears scorched, was a similitude inapplicable to Him until He came forth to minister?—Must we say that He did not till then become “as a root out of a dry ground,” although the scripture has said that He should in that likeness “*grow up*” before Jehovah? Is the type of the Nazarite, His separation to God—His superiority alike to the seductions of joy and the defilements of sorrow, true only of Jesus when He began to minister? If not—then all these things, and many more might be added, do cast no dim or uncertain light upon the early character and early ways of the Lord. The same principle that would forbid us to gain any knowledge of His character from a Psalm, would forbid to learn any thing from such a type as that of the Nazarite.

Nor has it been at all the habit of those whose writings and ministry the Church of God have in past years valued, to omit the earlier years of our Lord's history, as if the scripture were silent respecting it. On the contrary, they distinctly teach that much is to be learned from scripture concerning it; and that it was one of chastening and suffering under the hand of God.—But then they judge that it was vicarious suffering.—They think He is always to be regarded as bearing sin.* To such a thought I scarcely need say I strongly

* See Appendix A.

object—for surely there was no immaterial difference between the place of Jesus when forsaken of God and bearing wrath upon the tree, and when the heavens were opened over His head and it was said, “this is my beloved Son.” I do not, therefore, refer to these writers, because I adopt their doctrine, but in order to show that it is not a novelty to teach that the Scripture affords much instruction respecting the whole of the life of the Lord Jesus. The Gospels themselves supply many a principle which must have been as true of His earlier as of His later years. And if we had only the Old Testament Scriptures—we must remember that they were that part of the Divine record of which Jesus Himself said, “Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think, ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me.”

§ IX.

It has not been my object in the preceding pages to speak much of the reliefs and sustainments granted to the Lord Jesus in the midst of His trials, nor of those sufferings which flowed spontaneously, as it were, from His own sensitive and perfect nature. I have desired chiefly to consider His sufferings and His exercises under the hand of God, arising from His association with man and with Israel, whilst drinking of their living cup of woe. There is only one other period of His living suffering which I will briefly notice—the sorrow of Gethsemane. Its being an unequalled hour of suffering—I mean unequalled in His living service, and secondly, its close connexion with the cross, peculiarly entitle it to our regard.

The suffering of the Lord Jesus in Gethsemane was, like all His other sufferings, for our sakes, but it was not vicarious like that on the Cross. He was not as yet accounted "sin." God had not forsaken Him—an angel was sent to strengthen Him. It was not a character of suffering that we must necessarily have endured for ever, if He had not endured it—nor would His endurance of it have freed us from eternal wrath. It was, therefore, not vicarious—and yet no one will deny that it was suffering—bitter suffering authorized by God;—for even though Satan were the instrument, yet, as in the case of Job, he was but fulfilling the purpose and will of God. The agony of Gethsemane, therefore, would by itself prove (if further proof be needed) that bitter anguish *was allowed by God to fall upon the Lord Jesus*, before He was viewed substitutionally on the Cross.

The words of the Lord to His disciples sufficiently show that He regarded the hour of Gethsemane as an hour of temptation. "Pray that ye enter not into temptation." And can we doubt what the object of that temptation was? Was it not to try the constancy of the will of the Lord Jesus? And what were the means employed in order to accomplish that end? Was it not the pressing on His weak and sensitive, though perfect, human soul, the terrors that awaited Him, not merely in dying, but in dying as He was about to die—a manner of death of which we should seek in vain to estimate the terrors. It was not, therefore, death only, nor death by crucifixion merely, but the accompaniments of that death, even all the fierceness of God's wrath poured out in the cup of His indignation, that were made in inconceivable intensity present to the apprehensions of His soul. It was not as yet the hour of *actual* endurance of wrath—neither was it simply anticipation:—it was a being caused to realize, and that whilst He was peculiarly standing in the felt weakness of humanity, the nature of the circumstances into which He was about to enter. And if under a sense of these terrors, His will

had wavered—if any thing like double-mindedness had been produced in the soul of the Lord Jesus—if He had hesitated whether He would unreservedly obey the will of God, all would have been lost. He would have failed in carrying out that word, “Lo, I come to do thy will O God”—He would have ceased to be subject to the will of God.

We all know the dreadfulness of indecision and the terribleness of the inward conflict produced by doubt. How calm the soul becomes, how steady its action, even if it be to cut off a right hand or pluck out a right eye, when once the step is seen to be *necessary*, and the resolve is firmly taken. In us such conflict is ever more or less connected with double-mindedness and sin. Jesus was tried that it might be seen whether it could be produced in Him. But it could not. It was no sin to be tempted—no sin to feel the pressure—no sin submissively to ask for the removal of any thing that could be removed consistently with the will of God; but it would have been sin if He had not been able and willing to say, “not my will but Thine be done.” As soon as He uttered these words, the victory was manifestly gained—the temptation ceased, and calmness succeeded to the storm. It is this assault upon the will of the Lord Jesus that gives, I believe, to the sufferings of Gethsemane their peculiar character. It was an element of trial unknown even on the Cross.

Of all terrible suggestions, perhaps it was the most terrible to the soul of the Lord Jesus to be tempted to yield before terror and to shrink from the perfect accomplishment of the Father’s will. But He did not yield. He endured and He overcame. His will continued firm against the pressure. Its perfectness was proved by the words, “not my will but thine be done.”—The agony ceased and He calmly proceeded to the appointed end.*

* I scarcely need say that I much regret the expressions on this subject in the notes—for which perhaps I am as

§ X.

It is the doctrine of so many whose teaching has been, and is valued in the Church of God, that all the living sufferings and service of the Lord Jesus were *vicarious* in the same sense as His endurance of wrath on the Cross, that the subject on this account alone claims our careful consideration.

Much depends on the meaning we attach to *vicarious*. If that word be defined there will remain, I believe, on this subject very little difference of judgment amongst those who really hold the faith of Jesus.

It is indeed true that all that the Lord Jesus did and suffered was for our sakes (*ὑπερ ἡμῶν*), and all His elect will reap the results thereof in glory for ever and ever. The "obedience" in which His believing people are "constituted righteous" depends on His living actions quite as much as on His death. All the results of His living service are imputed to those who believe. But would it be right to apply the word "vicarious" to this relation of the Lord to His people? I think not, in the sense in which we apply the word to the substitutional sufferings on the Cross.

His place on the Cross was one in which He suffered not only *on behalf of* others, but in the strictest possible

responsible as the note-taker. What I have now said, will, I believe, give a just view of my doctrines on this subject, and will at least prove that I had no thought of depreciating the Cross by any thing I said respecting Gethsemane.

I would further observe, that the very force of the expressions used in the notes touching Gethsemane—does of itself shew that even the notes do not exalt the sufferings of the Lord's earlier life into competition with those of its close. The notes do exactly the reverse—for they give such pre-eminence to Gethsemane—that it needs that the expressions be explained and modified, in order to preserve to the Cross its just pre-eminence.

sense *instead of* others. He there suffered wrath instead of His elect people. He was in their stead in such a sense that, not only are they entirely freed by means of that which He there suffered, but there is no possibility of their ever being brought into even *like* circumstances. They are *excluded* from tasting in the most remote way the cup which He there drank. They are shut out from imitating or seeking fellowship with Him *as there suffering*, in any degree whatsoever. There can be no resemblance to that position, much less identity with it. Whenever therefore we speak of His vicarious place in death, there is a meaning of exclusiveness in the word. It appropriates so entirely the place to Himself, that it excludes us from approaching it even in principle, in any sense whatsoever.

If therefore there are any sufferings in which the Lord Jesus can be in any degree imitated or followed by any of His servants, such sufferings are not vicarious. The Apostle Paul suffered many things on behalf of others, and in so suffering followed Christ. But He did not and could not endure *wrath instead of* others.

Again, sufferings the like to which are in any degree whatsoever inflicted on others of His elect, are not vicarious—for then His saints would not experience them at all. Such for example, as hunger, sweat of the brow, weariness, &c. or the sufferings which will come on the elect remnant of Israel in the latter day.

Thirdly, wrath vicariously incurred is incapable of being removed until it has been fully borne. Whereas many of the sorrows by which the Lord Jesus was exercised in life, were capable of being removed; and as we find from the Psalms, were sometimes removed in answer to His prayer. That which will not answer to these criterions is not, I think, to be regarded as properly vicarious. We must be careful to avoid the use of this term, where the full force of exclusiveness cannot be attached to its meaning.

The being so united to another as to be necessarily involved in the consequences of that other's actings,

suggests an idea which is very near akin to that of vicariousness. But a distinction is to be made. We were in Adam when he sinned ; we are accounted before God as sinners because he sinned ; yet we should not say that he sinned *instead* of us. We, who believe, are in Him who liveth in the heavens—yet we should not say that He lives instead of us.

The idea of being represented by another is also very like that of vicariousness. The Lord Jesus represents us in heaven. He is there for us (*ὑπερ ἡμῶν*), but it is not said that He is there instead of us. If “vicarious” in its strict sense were used, it would exclude us from being ever with Him there. He prays for us as our Priest, and we are benefitted no less than if we had ourselves uttered the same prayer. There is the full thought of representative service connected both with Advocacy and Priesthood ;—yet it is not said that He prays instead of us, for that word so applied would, in its full and proper sense, exclude us from priestly service or prayer, both here and in the world to come. In a word, any circumstances, office, or position to which “vicarious” is applied, can never be, even in principle, occupied by us. I speak of vicarious in that sense in which we apply it to the Cross.

In this sense, we should not apply the word even to His active obedience on our behalf. Truly, He obeyed *for* us. “By one man’s obedience shall many be constituted righteous.” In one sense the thought of substitution might have a place here, for who could obey as He obeyed ? His obedience has a character peculiar to itself. All that Christ did as the righteous servant of Jehovah went to make up that one righteousness in which His people are accepted. This must be fully borne in mind ; and thus in one sense, we might almost use the word “vicarious,” when speaking of the whole of His obedience in life as well as in death for us.

The poor defiled sinner who has nothing in which to stand before the holiness of God—but has resting on him all the condemnation which he inherits from Adam--

all the corruption of his own nature, and all the pollution of manifold acts of personal disobedience and defilement of soul, as estranged from God:—such a sinner having his eyes opened by the Holy Ghost to see the value of Christ as a Saviour, finds the obedience of Christ to be for him in all its value. He has no obedience of His own, perfect or imperfect; but as soon as he has received the Gospel, all the perfect obedience of Christ is accounted His: an obedience to which there has been nothing similar in kind or degree. There is a sense, therefore, in which we might speak of the Lord Jesus having obeyed instead of us.

Yet we would avoid the expression. We could not use it in that full exclusive sense in which we apply it to the Cross: for though it is true that our obedience is after a different sort and with a different object from His—yet we are not excluded from obedience in the same sense in which we are excluded from the place of wrath. He has excluded us from wrath—but not from righteousness and righteous service. In Heaven we shall serve Him perfectly—“His servants shall serve Him.” We do not, therefore, say that He has obeyed instead of us, or is righteous instead of us, in the same sense as we say that He died instead of us under wrath. Neither do we say that Adam disobeyed in our stead—although by his one act of disobedience we are all constituted sinners in the sight of God. But we are not excluded from disobeying by his act of disobedience, and therefore we do not use the word vicariously, or instead of. This may suffice to illustrate the limit I should observe in employing the word “vicarious”—It has been used often, and by myself as well as others, in a more loose and general sense, but this, whether done by myself or by others, I regard as an incorrect use of the term, and as such to be avoided.

I should, therefore, confine the word “vicarious” to His place on the Cross—and should say that wrath did not fall upon Him till then.

§ XI.

It has been my desire in the preceding observations to say no more than was absolutely requisite for the purpose of defending myself against accusation or of affording the necessary explanation of my sentiments. It would, however, be scarcely fitting that I should close these remarks without referring to some of the statements of the tract before me, which I regard as erroneous. But before I attempt this I will recapitulate some of the doctrines in which the author and myself agree.

I agree with the author in believing that the hour of the Cross was the great hour fixed and settled in the eternal counsels of the Godhead for which the Son of God came into the world—that Jesus was from the cradle to the grave a Lamb without blemish and without spot—that the standing of believers before God, through the death of Christ on the Cross, is not vague and uncertain, but fixed and unalterable—that to teach any doctrine of redemption or deliverance from sin, in any form whatever that is not redemption by bloodshedding, is soul-destroying heresy—that the personal relation of Christ to God was in no wise altered by His baptism by John, and that the text, “it pleased Jehovah to bruise Him,” is one which belongs exclusively and only to the Cross. I believe with Him that of all the periods of His *living* service, Gethsemane was that which exceeded all in sorrow, but that the Cross was a new and unequalled scene of suffering greater than Gethsemane, for that on the Cross, and on the Cross alone, He endured vengeance—the vengeance due to our sins. To all these doctrines I firmly adhere.

But there are other points which I would earnestly beseech Him to consider. He admits that a man may

be subjected to suffering from the hand of God, because he is personally a sinner. From this of course Jesus is necessarily exempt, for He was sinless.—He admits also substitutional suffering—that which Jesus experienced on the Cross. These things he admits—but he does not admit, what is equally true, and again and again revealed in the Scripture as one of the principles of the Divine acting, that we may be subjected to suffering and to penalties, even though personally blameless, *because of connexion with others*. The consequences of not admitting this become very serious, especially to one who believes, that the Lord Jesus was not punished vicariously until the Cross. He is obliged to say that Christ never suffered at all *under the hand of God* until His death. No experiences that brought anguish on His spirit are allowed to have come on Him from God, either instrumentally or immediately, until then. Hence the plainest declarations of Scripture are explained away—the typical place of the prophets not acknowledged—the penalties which attached to man as fallen not recognised as inflictions from God—Israel not allowed to have been under chastisement—the thought of God as the Author and Appointer of events lost—and the mere instrumental agency, whether of Satan or of man, or the operation of circumstances regarded instead—and thus many principles are insensibly introduced into the mind which lead it very far from that which God has revealed and fill it with thoughts and conclusions of its own. No place is found for a large body of the types as well as other parts of Scripture, and thus a great portion of the word of God becomes unused—or if not unused, is so erroneously applied as to rivet error on the soul with the apparent sanction of truth.

The author will also, I think, see reason to regret what he has said respecting the personal relation of the Lord Jesus to God, when He suffered on the Cross. His words imply that *there* His personal relation to God

changed, [see pp. 56 and 57.]* But is it so? Surely the personal relation of Jesus to God *never* changed.

* The argument is, that while a man and a Jew in the midst of men and of Jews, His relation to God was essentially distinct, because of what He personally was. This, of course, is true.

But that on the Cross this relation changed; that His relation to God was no longer essentially distinct—but that He there took the “*actual* relation” of man to God.

Now what is the “*actual* relation” of man to God? It is this, that they are not only “children of wrath” in the sense of being exposed to wrath, but in the sense of being by constitution of nature as well as practice, depraved and abominable. This is what the words as used in Eph. ii. mean: If Jesus on the Cross or at any other time had come into the *actual* relation of man to God: then substitution would have been over. He would Himself have been personally hateful to God and enmity to Him, and would Himself have needed redemption. The verse in Eph. ii. could then have been applied to Him, and this the author seems to imply.

So far from Jesus coming into the actual relation of man to God, He, to whom it was an *essential* impossibility that He should ever come into their actual relation, endured instead of His people the results to which that actual relation would finally have brought *them*. This is substitution.

The definition of “actual relation,” as used by the author, may be gained thus:—first, by his use of the word “*traverse*” connected with his accusation of me. Indirectly, but very plainly, he accuses me of saying that Christ was by incarnation one to whom Eph. ii. 3 would apply, a thought truly at which my soul shrinks, (p. 58)—and in p. 57 states that my views “*traverse*” the order of the incarnation and Cross: in other words, that I represent Christ as being at incarnation what I might justly represent Him as being on the Cross.

Secondly, the cessation of His *essential* relation to God is made cotemporaneous with His taking the *actual* relation of sinners.

It is evident that in this case there could be no substitution, and, therefore, no salvation: for the very circumstance of the essential relation of Christ to God not changing, and

Did He cease to be the Son which is in the bosom of the Father? Did He cease to be the object of the love of that bosom? Did He cease to abide in that love?—Is manifested favour to be taken as the measure of the reality of love,—and when that manifestation is withdrawn, are we to say that love and favour have alike departed?—No! the relation of the Son to the Father was an essential relation and therefore unchangeable, and there are consequences, such as love, flowing incessantly from that relation which are equally unchangeable. Whether viewed as with the Father before the world was—or when found in fashion as a man, or when He took the place of sin on the accursed tree, He was personally the object of the Father's love. The Father's delight was still in His only begotten Son. His obedience in that terrible hour, how precious was it in the sight of God—"Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again." The change from Heaven to the Cross, immeasurably great though it was—a change truly that passes knowledge—for it was change from rest and light and glory and ineffable consciousness of love in full manifestation in the Father's presence—to the extreme distance into which sin brings the creature under wrath, was nevertheless circumstantial and not essential, for it wrought no alteration in that which He personally was, and severed no link that bound Him personally and in affection to God. His circumstantial relations changed infinitely—but His personal relations were as unchangeable as Himself.

His *not* being in the actual relation of men to God was that which enabled Him to be the substitute.

I do not doubt that these statements in the case of the author arise from want of consideration, and not from any intention of subverting the atonement. At the same time, it is clear to me, that he does deliberately hold that Christ's essential relation to God altered on the Cross. Hence, I think, he has unconsciously fallen into this train of reasoning.

And if the unchangeableness of His personal relations did not prevent Him from knowing the bitterness of wrath upon the Cross, why should it hinder His being the subject of those lesser inflictions which mark the previous portion of His way? If sorrow sent on the Lord Jesus by God, be inconsistent with His being, during all the season of such sorrow, the object of the Father's love, complacency, and delight, then the Lord Jesus could never have known even Gethsemane—much less the Cross. Will any one say that Jesus did not suffer, and that by the appointment of God, both in Gethsemane and on the Cross—or will they say that He ceased to be the object of Divine love, approval, and delight, as soon as He began to suffer? No—they will say neither; they admit the compatibility of suffering and favour.* In other words they admit, that suffering, and suffering more bitter than our thoughts can conceive, may be sent on one who is yet even to the very person who sends the suffering, the object of ceaseless delight and love. May I request the author to reconsider these things? It is a want of drawing the necessary distinction between personal and circumstantial relations, that has led him into his own erroneous statement as well as into mistaken accusation of me.

And as regards dispensational position. Is there any thing more important in tracing the history of the servants of God than a due regard to the dispensational circumstances in which they serve. The dispensational arrangements of God are not to be lightly regarded. They are the result of His inscrutable wisdom, arranging

* Favour is not necessarily *manifested* favour—Jesus was always the object of favour—but the manifestations were different when the Heavens were opened over His head, or when He rejoiced in spirit and said, I thank thee O Father—and when with strong crying and tears He offered up supplication.

for the development of His own character—the character of Christ and the character of man—a development manifold indeed in its connexions, and not to be fully traced as to its results until the dispensation of the fulness of times, when it shall be seen how He hath for Himself “headed up” all things in Christ. Then the words of the apostle will be fully appreciated by all “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out.....for of Him and through Him and to Him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen.”

And can we suppose that the Author of these dispensations—the Framers of these arrangements, would in His own actings violate their principles? Would He not act towards His servants, and therefore towards His Son if He became a servant, according to that order which His own wisdom had prescribed? And if any change or modification in such arrangements occurred during the life of any of His servants, would they be unaffected thereby? I would earnestly press the consideration of these things on the author of the tract. He would not, I believe, have written as he has, if he had regarded them. He seems to merge in the thought of the Lord's personal condition, which was unchangeable—or rather to confound with the Lord's personal condition which he appears to think was changeable, the differences dependent upon dispensational variety. We may behold Christ as the beloved Son—we may rejoice in recognising the unchangeableness of the relation and of the love indicated by that word—yet we need not on this account refuse to consider His dispensational relations. Because we see Christ as the beloved Son, we need not refuse to regard Him as an Israelite with God's dispensational relation towards Israel, marked by the terrors and darkness of Sinai—and because we know that the relation of the Son to the Father is unchangeable, we need not refuse to consider that wonderful

change which the mission of John and His own mission, as the Anointed Servant sent forth to minister grace and to bring in the kingdom of God, must have produced in the path of the Lord Jesus.*

And does the author indeed think that no ground dispensationally new was opened to Israel by the mission of John—that there was no difference between the law and the prophets and him?—and that Jesus after His baptism and anointing did not gather into blessings emphatically new? If the Lord Jesus did not minister grace—if He did not bring to the Rock and to Life—and to the certain, fixed, inalienable inheritance of all those blessings which His death, resurrection, and ascension have since substantiated—if the kingdom of God which He preached and which He delineated prophetically in His parables, gives us no aspect of the Church, nor of the Church's blessing, nor of the Church's failures—if we may be united to Christ, as the Son of Abraham, and yet this union have no place in our proper Church position, if Jesus is again to be known to Israel, not as we know Him in the power of the new creaaion, but after the flesh—if these and such like things be true, then indeed all that I have said respecting John and respecting Jesus must be false and dangerous delusion. Whether the author has given his adherence to the system which maintains these and similar doctrines, I do not know. If he has, I do not

* It must not be supposed that because Jesus as the servant came under the dispensational arrangements of God, and was so treated—that therefore He could not also be regarded and treated, and that manifestly, in a manner suited to His own intrinsic excellency. Witness—the star that guided the wise men of the East—the mission of the heavenly hosts at His birth—the opening of the heavens, &c. A king may send his son to serve in his armies, he may act towards him as a soldier under the regulations which bind his soldiers—but He is not thereby precluded from owning him and honouring him as his son.

wonder if he refuses to recognize the ministry of John, as a dividing point, either in the dealings of God or in the life of Jesus. Respecting that system, he well knows my judgment. He well knows the sorrow, I might say the anguish, with which for years I have watched its withering course. It would be useless therefore to say more, and I forbear. There is one that judgeth, and there is a day coming that will throw light on all.

The Tract refuses also to allow that the Lord Jesus had, during the years of His living service, any exercises of spirit under the hand of God; and appears to think that such exercises are inconsistent with a condition of favour from God. I cannot well conceive how any one should suppose that He whose distinctive allotment was "to learn," should be a man without being caused to feel what man was, or an Israelite without being taught to feel what Israel had become before God. It would have been strange indeed if God had been pleased to exercise His Servant by the exhaustions of weariness and hunger outwardly, and yet had never exercised His spirit—the only spirit that could feel adequately and truthfully according to Him. Even if there had been no results to the Lord Jesus Himself, in learning through that which he thus inwardly apprehended, the exercises of such a spirit were in themselves too precious to be neglected by God. And did not Jesus appreciate and long after this instruction? Did He shrink from it because he who increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow? No! He longed after it as for hid treasure. He recognised God as one, who, though He might afflict, could not but minister to His servants blessing and only blessing. "Blessed art thou O Lord, teach me thy statutes. Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law. I am a stranger in the earth, hide not thy commandments from me. My soul breaketh for the longing it hath to thy judgments at all times. Make me to understand the way of thy precepts: so shall I talk of thy wondrous works. I know, O Lord, that thy judgments are right and that thou in

faithfulness hast afflicted me. Let thy tender mercies come unto me that I may live, for thy law in my delight." It is impossible that one who uttered such supplications should not have been answered. It is impossible also that the answer should not have brought sorrow as well as blessing—blessing because of the truth and knowledge of God, and sorrow because of the condition of the earth and all things therein. The hour known by Ezekiel had not passed when lamentation, mourning, and woe was written on the roll—nor had it passed when Jesus Himself afterwards caused His own most beloved Servant to eat a book of which it is said, "as soon as I had eaten it my belly was bitter."—And when believers now are exercised in spirit, when they are caused to feel—to feel perhaps keenly the present ruin of the Church—or man's lost condition—or the character of the advancing hour of evil, or things, it may be, more nearly connected with their own individual service—when St. Paul had to say "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart"—are such exercises esteemed contrary to blessing—are they inconsistent with the closest abiding in love? So far from being tokens of Divine displeasure towards the individual, they may be, and in the case of Jesus always were, tokens of highest honour. They came on Him through and because of others. They called forth in His bosom prayer and confidence towards His Father—and caused many a breathing from His heart to ascend towards God which was as the frankincense, pure, fragrant, and precious in His sight.*

* It is not mysticism to speak of such exercises of spirit. If it were said that they made the Lord Jesus more perfect than He essentially was—or if it were implied that such exercises, whether in the Lord or in ourselves, had any thing to do with atoning for sin—then it would not be mysticism merely, but direct heresy and sin. "Without shedding of blood is no remission," Even in Gethsemane, the great instance of His spirit's exercise, there was no

I cannot but think that those who object to these things must find much difficulty in receiving that verse, "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered;"—if it had been written, He taught obedience by the things that He suffered—or He learned obedience by the things in which He was comforted, it would have been more in consistency with their views. Doubtless God might have caused Him to obey in a path abounding only with comfort. He might have removed *every* sorrow and gathered around Him every blessing—He might have made Him like Solomon on the throne of His greatness—and still called on Him for obedience, and He would have obeyed, and obeyed perfectly. There was no essential necessity for His being laid in a manger—nor for having a destitution allotted to Him such as even the foxes and the birds never know—for He had not where to lay His head. But shall we judge God in this, or seek to understand all things before the time? No! It is a little thing for God to ask us to exercise some confidence in His character, His goodness, and His wisdom—and to know that He shall be justified in His sayings and overcome when He is judged. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?—And observe in this the perfectness of the faith of Jesus. In the very same chapter which says, "He hath bent His bow and set me as a mark for the arrow; He hath caused the arrows of His quiver to enter into my reins. I was a derision to all my people and their song all the day,"

atonement; yet who would say that the exercises of Gethsemane were in vain? And as regards ourselves—though our experiences are very unlike to His—perhaps few things tend more to health of soul than a degree of exercise of spirit under God respecting present realities in the Church and in the world. The bitter book cannot be eaten without a measure of such exercise—but who would scorn it—who, because they valued John's place when leaning on the bosom of the Lord at the last supper, would despise his place in Patmos eating the bitter book?

we find His vindication of God—"The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeketh Him—He doeth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men."—May we cultivate the same confidence. It is yet but a little, very little, season and we shall see Jesus glorified in the very place which has witnessed His sorrows. In the very place where He was a derision to His people, and their song all the day, it will be said to Him—"Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty; and in thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth and meekness and righteousness, and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things.—Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre:—Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, *therefore* God, even thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Then we shall understand the end of the Lord. Then we shall see Jesus—even Jesus of Nazareth, comforted and exalted even in earth—the heavens also being full of His praise.*

I have again and again said that because the circumstances which enveloped the Lord Jesus here were dark—dark as the night in which His servant was tossed up and down in Adria, and though He was taught to appre-

* The instance which I have referred to in the Lamentations, wonderfully shows the beauty and excellency of the character of Jesus. I have elsewhere observed on the great importance of not confounding His natures. But though His divine and human natures were not commingled—and although the power which was inherent in Him as God was not put forth, (save His Father might desire,) to relieve Him from one pang, either in body or in soul, yet in all the manifestations of character—we see the blending of divine and human excellences. The veil which represented His flesh, had no metal in its contexture—no type of divine nature—but it had heavenly colours and cherubims embroidered on the pure white linen that formed its basis. There was no exhibition of character in Christ in which there might not be seen something heavenly and divine.

ciate these circumstances according to God, yet He was not left comfortless. He had the perpetual consciousness that He was fulfilling, and that perfectly, the Father's will. He loved the Father with a love un conceivable to us, because perfect. He confided also in the Father's love to Him. He knew that it would never appoint to Him one sorrow that was not necessary for carrying out the purposes which Eternal wisdom had designed. Not one cry ever escaped His lips—not one thought was ever conceived within His bosom, that was not based on the deepest conviction of the Father's ceaseless love. The adhesion of His soul to this knowledge of the Father was as unchangeable as His own essential nature. And the adhesion of the affections of the Father to Him were equally unvarying. Who can tell what it cost Him to see the sorrows of His Son? There was sympathy and feeling in His Heart, and this Jesus knew, and it comforted Him. Moreover, seeing that He was walking in obedience, God could meet Him in the circumstances—sanction, help, and succour Him. He could speak to Him also and comfort Him. There is a Psalm of which it is written that it is “the prayer of the afflicted when He is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord,” but it does not end either with the words of the afflicted or with affliction. He who has been describing His sorrows, and saying that He had eaten ashes like bread and mingled His drink with weeping—that His strength had been weakened and His days shortened—suddenly and abruptly pauses.—Another speaks and it is God—God speaks to the mourner and says “Thy years are throughout all generations”—what a contrast to the “weakening of the strength” and the “shortening of the days.” “Thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish but thou shalt endure: yea all of them shall wax old like a garment—as a vesture shalt thou change them and they shall be changed. But thou art the same and

thy years shall have no end. The children of thy servants shall continue and their seed shall be established before thee." Jesus, therefore, had not only experiences of sorrow. He was also comforted by God—He had also the anticipations of faith. He believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living—yea, He is to change the Heavens as a vesture and to say "Behold, I make all things new."

The Lord has now entered into His glory—He is now the beginning of the new creation of God. He has associated us with that glory and with more than glory. "The glory which thou hast given me I have given them, that they may be one as we are"—marvellous words, which indeed indicate a love whose height and depth passeth knowledge. He reveals His own fulness in the Heavens, and teaches us thus to judge of our future condition in glory. The Spirit leads us into the knowledge of these things, for they are our portion. We are able, even now, to say "seated in heavenly places in Christ Jesus;"—and when He returns—when He arises upon this dark earth as the bright and morning Star—when it shall be said, "let all the angels of God worship Him," at that moment we shall be like Him—we shall be changed and brought even into the likeness of His own glory. "To Him that overcometh will I give the morning star."

The Spirit is the witness of these things.—It teaches of this glory and of the love of the Father and of the Son. But shall we, because we are called to know Christ in Heaven, refuse to know any thing respecting Him in the earth? Are His past living experiences and His living sufferings no subject for our knowledge? Does the Spirit who has been sent to glorify Him teach nothing—and does the Scripture reveal nothing respecting the depths out of which He has been brought as well as respecting the heights of glory into which He has been raised? Our souls will not love Him less by considering His sorrows—nor will conversance with them unfit us for the knowledge of His glory—though

it may awaken in us an appreciation of the honour and blessedness of suffering. To know the fellowship of His sufferings as well as the power of His resurrection, was the desire of one who was wise in Christ, wise in seeking the true riches—one who has told us to imitate him as he imitated Christ.

I trust, that I am not an enemy to the Cross of Christ nor “minding earthly things” (p. 47) because I thus teach. It is true, indeed, that the sorrows and exercises of the Lord Jesus of which I speak preceded the Cross, but they are not, therefore, to be numbered among those earthly things from which the Cross of Christ separates. Meditation on the ways of Jesus as revealed in the Scripture, is neither a return to earthly elements nor a minding of earthly things. Things which take place on earth are not necessarily earthly in their character—nay, there may be in them the highest exercise of glorious power as well as heavenly blessing.—The resurrection of the Lord took place upon this earth, yet it was not earthly in itself or in its results. I know indeed that it is the habit of that system to which I have above referred, to depreciate it as well as many other things which are connected with the highest and essential blessings of our calling. On another occasion I hope to offer some evidence of this. It will be seen, I trust, by many, to be a system which we cannot too earnestly depreciate, and against which we cannot too anxiously warn.

It is indeed true that the Cross separates. The Cross and the Resurrection of Jesus separate us from the earth, and separate us to God and to Heaven. We sit in heavenly place in Christ Jesus. But we who are thus separated, are yet in the world—We have received His Spirit in the world—we are under the precepts which He gave in the world—and He has set us as His servants to serve Him in the world—“As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.” We are heavenly persons acting for a season in an earthly, and in a ruined sphere.

When we read of the consecration of the priestly household, we find that the value of all the sacrifices was placed on their persons. Anointed with blood and with the holy oil and clothed in priestly garments, they were rendered meet for the service of the sanctuary. But their service did not terminate there. They served in the sanctuary and fed from the altar; but they had also to walk abroad in the midst of Israel—to discern betwixt the holy and the unholy, the clean and the unclean. Their lips, instructed in the word of righteousness, were to keep knowledge. And it is not otherwise with us. We are the true priestly household. We are yet in the earth. The hour of evil has not yet passed—and therefore we still need senses exercised to discern between good and evil.

The Disciple who knew most of the Lord Jesus—who leaned on His bosom at the last supper, and who has recorded most respecting Him as heavenly and divine—was not suffered to remain exclusively conversant with these heavenly things. Not only was he long detained in earth, (“If I will that he tarry till I come,” &c.) but he had there to learn not God only, and the ways of God—but Satan’s works also. He lived to see Satan corrupting the Churches—and afterward beheld him in vision governing the nations. Seven diadems were upon the Dragon’s heads. In Patmos we see John like a second Daniel commissioned to record the history of the nations—and like a second Jeremiah ordained a prophet against them and against Israel too—yet having a knowledge of glory and a knowledge of grace, such as Daniel and Jeremiah never knew. Was there ever a heart (one only excepted) in which were placed such stores of wondrous and blessed knowledge as in that of John? And are they not all open to the Church in these last days? Does not John, the last of the apostles, tarry as it were amongst us, in order that his thoughts and knowledge and peculiar testimonies might be transferred to us and live in us, as the power of *our* ways and *our* testimonies till Jesus comes? O

that we might humbly covet such a place, and seek to abide in it with God.

The soul while it holds fast the fit remembrance of its priestly consecration, will not find itself weakened by its knowledge of evil. It will rather find in it that which associates it with God and enhances its appreciation of the food of His altar. It was the privilege of the priests to feed on the meat offering—one of the chief types of Christ in His living character and ways. Priests only could feed thereon. It pertains only to those who have known His Cross—who have been sanctified by His blood and received of His Spirit, to understand the ways and character of Him who alone, of all who have been born into this earth, has passed through it harmless and undefiled. It belongs only to such to contrast His ways with those of man and of Satan—to know their acceptableness in the sight of God and to appreciate the fragrance which has ascended as a memorial before Him. The holy fire fed on that offering, but the priests fed also. They had communion with that which satisfied God. And as they fed on it they learned to appreciate the difference between the salt that was its savour, and the leaven or the honey that would have caused its rejection from the altar of God. They shared, as it were, the discriminating power of that holy fire, as they fed on that unleavened, unsweetened offering. Could our souls prosper if heedless of these things? Again and again we need to meditate on the living character of Jesus,—to consider the meaning of salt—the meaning also of leaven and of honey—and to watch against the subtle insinuations both of nature's evil and nature's sweetness into our habits of thought and of action. It will not make Christ less precious—it will not make us less thankful that in Him we have been quickened and raised into a sphere of heavenly being, where such discrimination will be no longer needful, because the flesh will be gone and Christ be all and in all.

There is in all knowledge a danger of exclusiveness. Even the knowledge of the Cross may be so held, as to exclude other knowledge of God. How many have said, that they will know *the Cross*, because it is necessary—necessary to their safety, and then virtually refuse to know any thing more. Has not this been a feature, a marked feature, even in true Christianity? And what has been the result? Ignorance of the Scripture, and not only ignorance, but departure from its testimonies, so great, that it may be truly said, that any thing and every thing has been used as a lamp to the feet, except the simple declarations of the word of God.

To say that we will go alone to the Cross for comfort, *may* be a godly and right expression of the sense, which every saint and every awakened sinner must have of the exclusive power of the Cross in purging the conscience and giving peace with God. But it *may* be otherwise. Our knowledge of the history of the Church and the experience of our own bosoms will alike teach us, that it may be the language of those who seek to avoid knowledge which may increase responsibility, or entail sorrow. Naturally, we shrink from that which, however certainly from God, is in the belly bitter. We like not the labour of searching after truth—and dread, perhaps still more, the results of its acquisition. I say not this of individuals—I apply it neither to one nor to another. It is a common feature in the experience of us all—something against which we have to guard others and watch ourselves.

And now I conclude. I would humbly trust, through His grace, that painful as the circumstances are which have called for these remarks, yet that they may be overruled to the elucidation and establishment of truth. So out of the eater would come forth sweetness. It is not impossible even for controversy to edify, if it be undertaken in honest pursuit of truth.

APPENDIX A.

In page 75, the Author observes—"to turn the soul to regard Jesus as under the wrath of God at any other time than the Cross, would be to subvert it." There are few Christian writers that would not fall under the condemnation of these words.

The following quotations are from Dr. Hawker and Witsius. The Italics are mine.

"And first, every sinner, by virtue of being a transgressor, is exposed to the curse of GOD; and that curse is upon every thing belonging to him, as Moses told Israel; "Thou art cursed in thy basket, and in thy store; in lying down and rising up; in going out and coming home." Deut. xxviii, 16, &c. Now Jesus, as the sinner's surety, is, by way of peculiar emphasis, called "the man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." He endured, in his person, the very curse denounced upon the sinner. *All was poured upon Jesus, through every part of His life:* and as the curse, but for Jesus's interposition, would follow the sinner into death; so Christ was followed by it to the Cross." (Evening portion, Feb. 19.)

"Jesus—wearied with his journey," John iv. 6. "Behold Jesus wearied with HIS journey! As part of the *curse*, this, among other consequences, *seized upon the*

Lord of life and glory, *from the moment he became flesh.* "In all things, it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren." All the sinless frailties and infirmities of our poor nature ; all the calamities to which human life is exposed, in the thorns and thistles which the earth is made to bring forth to man, and the dust of death ; into which as Jesus spake by the spirit of prophecy he knew Jehovah would bring him, (Ps. xxii. 15 :) these were the very conditions to which the Redeemer subjected himself, in the days of his flesh, when "he was sin made for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him ;" and hence his whole life was a life of weariness, sorrows, and affliction. And he not only felt in himself the common wants, and was exposed to the common miseries, of nature ; but, living as in an hospital of woe, amidst the sick and wounded, he participated in every groan he heard, and, as the prophet spake of him, "himself bare our sicknesses, and carried our sorrows." (Evening portion, September 26.)

"Standing thus, though holy, in our nature, and the representative of all his people, the moment he entered our world, *the consequences of the curse attached itself to Him, and seized upon Him.* Hence, he took all the sinless infirmities of our nature ; was born a child ; became subject to misery and sorrow ; to labour and travail ; and as *Adam's* doom for sin was pronounced upon him, and all his children, Christ in putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself, subjected himself to eat bread, in the sweat of his brow, until he was brought into the dust of death. Ps. xxii. 15.

“Hence, therefore, this explains at once, wherefore it became necessary for Christ to stand in the very state and place of the nature he came to redeem. It was as the representative and surety of his Church and people. The mere taking of our nature into union with the Godhead without this, would not have answered the purpose. It would have been indeed a wonderful act of condescension in the Son of God so to have done; but then, had he come forth as the first earthly Adam came forth, in the perfection of His manhood at once, this would not have suited our case and circumstances; neither would it have answered for us in removing the curse. No! the Son of God, if he will be our surety, must put himself in our circumstances, must be born an infant; must gradually advance to manhood; must wax strong in spirit, and be filled with wisdom, and have the grace of God upon him.

“And these things blessedly prove to us, that it was a real and true body, the Son of God took into union with himself, in all points like ours, yet without sin: so that both in body and in soul he was manifested to be the same as we are.” Hawker on Luke ii.

“I remember to have learned, in the communion of the reformed Church, to the following effect: 1st, that the death wherewith God threatened man for sin, comprises in its whole extent all that misery, which by the justest displeasure of God, has followed upon sin, and to which the sinner man is obnoxious all his life, and whose principal part consists in the want of the favour of God, and in the keenest sense of the divine curse, to be chiefly inflicted, when it shall so please God. 2dly, That Christ, by the interposition

of His engagements for the elect, took upon himself *all that curse*, which man was liable to on account of sin ; hence it was, that, in order to the payment of the debt he engaged for, *he led a life*, in the assumed human nature, subject to many vicissitudes of misery, just like the life of a human sinner. 3dly, That, as God uses much forbearance with respect to sinners, and moderates the bitterness of life, with some sweetness of patience, till the day of vengeance, and of the retribution of his righteous judgment ; when the whole weight of the curse shall light upon the condemned sinner ; so also Christ, when in the form of a servant, had not always a sense of the painful effects of the sins, that were laid upon him, but sometimes rejoiced in an eminent mixture of favour ; till the hour and power of darkness came, when being called to the bar, he had every thing dreadful to undergo.....In fine, that as all those miseries, taken together, are what sin deserves ; so Christ, who, by his engagement, took upon himself all the debt of the elect, did, by all these miseries, *to which he was subject all his life*, satisfy divine justice ; so that taken all together, they constitute the ransom, which was due for our sins. This, if I mistake not, is the common opinion of our divines, which our Catechism has also expressed, quest. 37 ; namely, that all the sufferings which Christ endured both in soul, and body, *through the whole course of his life*, constitute his one and perfect satisfaction ; though it be certain, that those were the most grievous sufferings, with which he encountered on the last night and day ; and that what he bore in his body, were far exceeded by those that oppressed his soul : just as the whole of Christ's most holy obedience is imputed to us for righteousness, though he gave an eminent demonstration of it, when he was obedient to his Father to the death, even the death of the Cross."—*Witsius on the Covenants, vol. 1, page 275.*

I have already said that I do not unite with these sentiments. But what has led these writers to these conclusions? Surely a regard to the word of God. They see that there are many passages in the Psalms and other parts of scripture, which describe Christ as suffering *in life* as well as in death—and they see that in these passages Christ Himself recognises these afflictions as flowing from the hand of God. They feel that it would be a perversion of these passages to say that they do not apply to Christ, or that they belong to the period of His death, or that they are simply anticipatory.—They have preferred to say that He was bearing wrath vicariously all His days.

The doctrine of the Tract as opposed to this is, that Christ was never under any infliction from the hand of God until the Cross—a statement that would lead our minds so very far from that which scripture reveals respecting Christ—that if I were constrained to choose between the two opinions, I would greatly prefer that of the writers just quoted. But when it is once seen that there may be inflictions because of *connexion with* others—as well as wrath incurred by standing *in the stead of* others, there remains no difficulty.

B.

The following quotation from Bishop Horne on the Interpretation of such Psalms as are not directly quoted in the New Testament, is worthy of perusal:—

“It would be unreasonable to suppose, that no part of the Psalms may by us be spiritually applied, but such as

are already expressly applied for us by the inspired writers. Let any man consider attentively a New Testament citation; then let him as carefully read over, with a view to it, the Psalm from which it is taken, and see if it will not serve him as a key, wherewith with to unlock the treasures of eternal wisdom; if it will not 'open his eyes,' and show him wonderful things in God's law. When we are taught to consider one verse of a Psalm as spoken by Messiah, and there is no change of person, what can we conclude, but that he is the speaker through the whole? In that case, the Psalm becomes at once as much transfigured, as the blessed Person, supposed to be the subject of it, was on Mount Tabor. And if Messiah be the speaker of one Psalm, what should hinder, but that another Psalm, where the same kind of scene is evidently described, and the same expressions are used, may be expounded in the same manner? It is very justly observed by Dr. Allix, that 'although the sense of near fifty Psalms be fixed and settled by divine authors, yet Christ and His apostles did not undertake to quote all the Psalms they could quote, but only to give a key to their hearers, by which they might apply to the same subject the Psalms of the same composure and expression.'

"The citations in the New Testament were made incidentally, and as occasion was given. But can we imagine, that the Church was not farther instructed in the manner of applying the Psalms to her Redeemer and herself? Did she stop at the application thus incidentally and occasionally made by the inspired writers? Did she stop, because they had directed her how to proceed? We know she did not."—*Horne on the Psalms, vol. 1, Preface, page 18.*

It would indeed be a serious error—and would to my mind amount to a virtual denial of the Spirit's presence in

the Church, if we were to say that we were not authorized in applying to Christ any Psalm or chapter in the Old Testament, that has not been so applied in the New. What then would become of the historical types and other types of Scripture in which the Church has so long learned to see Christ ?

I most readily admit that I may err—and indeed in this any one may easily err, who seeks to determine the precise subject and period of particular Psalms, or of particular verses in a Psalm. Both attempts require care, especially the latter.

When we have determined that any particular Psalm belongs to Christ—either because of its being so quoted in the New Testament, or because of its describing super-human excellencies—or super-human sufferings, we have next to enquire whether the period to which the Psalm as a whole belongs, is that of the Cross or a period previous to the Cross. I say as a whole, because Psalms which belong to the Cross may have verses in them which refer retrospectively to previous sufferings—and Psalms which as a whole belong not to the Cross may have verses in them which look on to the Cross ; or if not to the Cross, to the sufferings of Israel in the latter day.

The xxii. Psalm in the second verse contains a very clear reference to past experience—and suppose it were admitted that the 88th Psalm belongs as a whole to the Cross, yet the 15, 17, and other verses have clear reference to other previous sufferings—so that the fact of these previous sufferings is not disproved hereby, but established.

Or if the 88th Psalm, as a whole, be taken, as I believe it should be, to refer to a period previous to the Cross, I do not therefore say that in the midst of the descriptions of present anguish, there is no reference to the great final issue. This

would always be a question depending on the minute explanation of particular verses. In some Psalms also questions would arise, as to whether the sufferings of Israel in the latter day, or those of the Cross were contemplated.

That such Psalms as the sixth, and yet more markedly the 102, belong to the living sufferings of the Lord, is so distinctly proved by the expressions in them, that I cannot see how there can be a shadow of a question respecting them. "I water my couch with my tears." How can this be applied to the Cross?

It will also be important, and not always easy to determine, whether any particular Psalm or passage applies primarily to the Lord—or primarily to some typical person, such as David. In the latter case the language is of course adapted to the type, and in its application to the Antitype will need modification or even change. Typical persons may fail or shew infirmity or sin—witness Aaron—Samson, &c. And in these cases we draw contrasts not parallels. So in expounding a typical chapter, such as Lev. xvi. we draw contrasts not parallels, when we speak of the offering once made.

These and other principles are important when we attempt minute interpretation—but the question before us stands on wide ground and may be sufficiently determined by the 102 Psalm only.

C.

It has been asked by some whether the words "vicarious" and "substitution" are met by corresponding expressions in the scripture.

The scripture, for the most part, rests little on the mere force of individual words, especially if they be particles. The context or the known nature of the subject must often definitely fix the signification of the terms employed, which often fall short of being, if I may use the expression, full expositors of their own meaning. While the idea conveyed by a word can never be *less* than the sense which really belongs to it, the context may shew that there are other added ideas, which in such places are necessarily attached to it. To illustrate this in English:—the word “*for*” may be “on behalf of,” “instead of,” “in consequence of,” &c.—the context shewing the particular signification. The precision with which scripture is written, is shown quite as much with regard to combinations as with regard to separate words.

Substitutional suffering stands forward so prominently in scripture, as a leading principle in all the divine acting, that we need not be taught it by minute words—nor depend upon the precision of their definition for the truth. We can fix their definition by their relation to the *great fact* to which they are applied.

Who, after he had read the account of the ram caught and offered *for* Isaac—would doubt the fact of substitution, or that the word “*for*” if employed, would be used in the sense of “instead of?” The word used in this passage (Gen. xxii. 13) is in the Hebrew *tachath*, in the Septuagint *avri*—All will say, that whatever meaning these words may have in other connections—yet that here they simply imply substitution. “Abraham offered the ram *for* a burnt-offering *instead of* his son.” Thus we are guided to their meaning in other similar connections.

Again, if we had seen an Israelite lay his hand upon the head of his sin-offering—next had seen its blood shed—

next had seen part of the victim burned on the altar for a sweet savour, and had then heard the Israelite say—"these things have been done on my behalf" (*υπερ*), should we doubt that the idea of substitution was included in his use of the word "on behalf of?"

Accordingly, we may safely say that whenever the words *αυτι* or *υπερ* occur in the New Testament in relation to the offering of Jesus for His people, they always include the notion of substitution. As used in the New Testament, *αυτι* has always the sense of equivalent value given in payment. It is applied to the life or blood paid as a ransom (see Matt. xx. 28 and Mark x. 45) which connects our thoughts with the second part in the ceremony of offering the sin-offering just referred to. In this application therefore it of course includes the preceding fact, namely the substitutional place of the victim, whose blood is made the price.

Υπερ—"on behalf of," includes all—and especially directs the mind towards the resulting benefit. As being the most comprehensive word, it is used most frequently in the New Testament, when the sacrifice of the Lord is spoken of;—*Αυτι* is only used twice. *Υπερ* answers to the Hebrew *al*—Latin *super*. See 1 Kings ii. 18—"I will speak for thee unto the king." The primitive idea in both these words appears to be the doing something that covers over or rests upon him for whom it is done, in the way of blessing. The same thought is found in the words, "to make atonement for him"—literally to make a covering upon him.

The Hebrew *tachath* (sub)—most nearly answers to the Latin substitution. It is the placing one under the responsibilities or circumstances that are due to or resting on another. Here the mind is directed chiefly to the condition

of that which receives the consequences, not so much to the resulting benefit to the other.

One passage that proves how distinctly *υπερ* is used in the sense of substitution is this:—"If One have died for all, then all have died." I should therefore say, that if we translate *αυτι* "for"—in the sense of a price paid for the ransom or purchase of another thing—and translate *υπερ*—"or behalf of"—yet that whenever employed sacrificially they involve in their meaning the full force of substitution.