

W. G. Childs
Christchurch
N. Z.

HELPS FOR WAYFARERS.

A Magazine

DESIGNED FOR THE HELP OF SOULS IN A DAY
OF DIFFICULTY.

Edited by F. W. GRANT.

VOLUME I.

“The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.”—ISA. xxxv. 8.

“Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures: then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God.”—PROV. ii. 3-5.

TORONTO:
S. W. HALLOWS,
THE GOSPEL TRACT DEPOSITORY,
364½, YONGE STREET.
LONDON: W. B. HORNER, 27, PATERNOSTER SQUARE, E.C.

CONTENTS.

EXPOSITION :

A Study of the Psalms :—

The Frame-work of the Book.....	1, 41
The Numerals of Scripture, &c.	81
The First or "Genesis" of the Psalms	121
The Second Book	161
The Third Book.....	166
The Fourth Book	170
The Fifth Book	173
Genesis in the Light of the New Testament ..	13, 53, 92, 130, 180

CRITICAL :

A Revision of the Psalms :—

Psalms I. and II.	18
Psalms III. to VI.....	60
Psalms VII. and VIII.....	98
Psalms IX. and X.	133
Psalms XI. to XV.	203
A Note on Isaiah lii., 13—liii.	199

PRACTICE :

The Power we need for Practice.....	20
The Search after Knowledge	63
"Adding"	101, 136, 190
Peter's "Conversion"	138
"Every Weight"	192
The Way through Edom	195

THE FAITH :

The Texts for Eternal Punishment	24, 66, 104, 143
"Everlasting Punishment"	205

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY :

The Ritualistic and the Scripture Gospels	30, 68
Letters to an Infidel :—	
No. I. Scripture Claims and Evidences	35
No. II. Light Shining in a Dark Place.....	73, 117
No. III. The Scepticism of Men of Science	152
No. IV. "Eyes of Faith"	234
"Is the Body All?"	76
"Dust thou art"	113
The Church—Saved or Saving?	107, 145
"Spirit, Soul, and Body"	148
"The 'Church' in the Wilderness"	209
Is Baptism New Birth?	213
The Materialistic Denial of the Spirit of God	221
"He Maketh His Angels Spirits"	229
The Scripture Record of Creation.....	239
Answers to Correspondents	159

Helps for Wayfarers.

1876.

Exposition.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS

I.

THE FRAME-WORK OF THE BOOK.

A THREEFOLD division of the books of the Old Testament is recognized by all, and has the sanction of the Lord Himself. (Luke xxiv. 44). "The law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms" is His term for the whole, and of course authoritative for the Christian. As to the detailed division of the books into these three classes we have no direct Scripture testimony, nor any universally held-to arrangement either.* We may be at liberty therefore to accept the common division, the historical books† and prophets being sufficiently distinct in character from one another, as well as from the remaining five books, viz., Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon.

* That of our English Bibles is well known to be taken from the Septuagint with the omission only of apocryphal additions. The Hebrew MSS. differ in the order of the books, although agreeing in referring Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel and Lamentations to the third class of "Kethubim," to which the Psalms belong. There is no evidence that this arrangement is more than Rabbinic and liturgical, and its apparent unnaturalness puzzles all the critics, though that in itself be but a small thing.

† Which would correspond thus to the "Law" in Luke xxiv. 44. For these historical books are all really the natural issue of the Pentateuch, and may be as fittingly classed with it as the book of Genesis, which is one of its integral parts.

Moreover these have among themselves this in common, that they give us distinctly "*man's* voice" uttering itself, as the prophets give characteristically "*God's* voice" in answer to this human utterance. To such a division the title "psalms," would be really appropriate.

A 'psalm,' according to the primary meaning of the word, is a "lyric poem," a poetical composition intended for the lyre or harp, and the "book of Psalms" is, as is well known strictly of this character. They were all sung or chanted with various instrumental accompaniments in the temple services. They furnished in fact its entire service of song, wherein all the emotions of the soul found fit and adequate expression in the presence of God, as guided and taught of God Himself. No less would befit, and not yet had the Spirit of God come * but a Divinely inspired service book here supplied the need, and man was thus taught to pour out all his soul into the unfailing, unwearied ear of Him who never slumbereth nor sleepeth.

But thus it was man's voice, in utterance graciously provided for him, still his own wants and his own emotions, told out in prayer, or praise, or penitential sorrow, or lament over evil round, and the instrumental accompaniment—harp or lyre or whatever else—rose and fell with the tide of human feeling, like the echo of creation round still linked with the various and changing fortunes of her fallen but not hopeless head.

The other books—Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon—are not psalms in the strictest sense, they are not "lyric" poems, not all of them poetry perhaps at all. They are all however, utterances of the human heart, its joys and sorrows, its musings and its questions, not always directly *guided*, but all under the *control* of the Divine Spirit. It is man permitted to speak for himself, so that out of his own mouth we may learn what he is, but still in the presence of One who is not an uninterested auditor of it, at hand amid the darkness, if unseen.

They are "psalms" in this sense, as outpourings of the human heart at least in the Divine presence and under Divine control, if not distinctly addressed to Him, while, as is fit, the full choral harmony of song is reserved, as it should be, for His more immediate service.

The division of Old Testament Scripture into these three parts, is thus a very simple and real one. And now to consider a moment the connection of these psalm-like books among themselves. It is striking to one who has learnt but a little of the

* John vii 39, xvi 7, &c

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS

3

Scripture use of numbers, (which, if it be thought a small thing, only shows how God's Word, equally with His works, will bear the microscope, having the stamp of perfection on its minutest parts), that the number *five* prevails in it. The books are five in number, a second Pentateuch, while, as is well known, the largest and most characteristic of these again, the Psalms proper, is likewise divided into five smaller books.

Now the number five derives its typical application from the five senses, and shows that in these books we are (characteristically) in the region of sense, of the world *as that*. The Pentateuch, or five books of the Law proper, in their typical and characteristic meaning will be found to exemplify this. The book immediately following carries us out of the wilderness and through the parted Jordan into the land of our inheritance. Canaan is so well known a type of heaven that I need not insist upon it, and it is Canaan as a *possession* that is now known, not as Abraham dwelt in it as a pilgrim once. The five books of Moses come short of this, and apply one way or another to the earth journey. Their separate meanings it is not the place to enter upon here.

But the Pentateuch does not sum up the historical books, which stretch typically far beyond, while in the books we are considering the number five measures the whole compass. By this I do not mean that individual expressions do not look out beyond. I speak simply of what is characteristic. Characteristically man's natural horizon is the boundary of the view, the earth which Genesis gives us fashioned in the six days' work for man's abode is the scene before us. "The heaven, even the heavens are the Lord's, the earth has he given to the children of men," (Ps. cxv. 16). Such is the utterance of the Psalms themselves, and to it they constantly adhere.

Yet within these limits do we find none the less material for the joy and praise which shall fill to all eternity the heavens themselves. *The cross stood upon earth*. Of it the Psalms speak in language too simple and plain to admit of doubt with any but an infidel. And there we find within the limits of an earthly horizon, a limitless infinite the depths of the heart of God, and towards man where the mind loses itself in immensity, but the heart rests the more because that deep of Divine love, the love of Christ, overpasses knowledge.

Enough then for heart and mind is there in the Psalms, while still it is important to remember what is *not* there. We shall return to this again. The other books which are connected with them show in a still more marked way the same features. In Ecclesiastes he that runs may read the general lesson. It is the

HELPS FOR WAYFARERS

lurge of a dead world, with one of its princes the chief mourner. The wisest of the wise, with most unquestionable skill to make whatever use could be made of abundant resources, and with the most perfect will to find all the good he could, comes forward as the preacher of vanity. *All* is vanity, from the first cry of the babe new born till the mourners go about the streets, there is nothing else for any age or condition of life. He says so, who knows it thoroughly, and "what can the man do that cometh after the king?" And is there nothing else? Just this. "fear God, and keep His commandments," for "God shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

Sad enough but true, and therefore wholesome, but this is only one picture of man, and of the world as he has made it. To furnish another, we have not the *worst* but the *best* of men. There is not a man like Job upon the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil. A fair picture indeed, but brought forward for what purpose? Just that we may see human goodness tested now as before we saw human happiness, that this good man may tell us he is "vile" and this perfect man may own that he has sinned, and that, let the most terrible inflictions come upon him, he must be dumb before his God, self-aborred in penitential "dust and ashes."

Solemn and fitting lesson again from man's own lips. But here the veil lifts a little, and when man is in his native dust, a gracious God comes in with blessing. In most perfect order, there is here relief and comfort for the heart which Ecclesiastes does not give.

In the book of Proverbs we find another thing altogether. Solomon is again the teacher, but not now of the vanity of the world. He is speaking of the path through it, which under Him who has not given up the government of the world spite of the evil and disorder in it, both leads to and abounds in blessing. It is not a law given of God, but principles of wisdom connecting man's reaping with his sowing, tracing the harmony of providential government with man's true welfare. "he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul, all they that hate me love death."

Lastly, the Song of Solomon finds a place in this section. It is essentially parabolic—a deep veil hiding its meaning from those who have not, in the divine sense, eyes to see. This use of parable the Lord explains in Matt. xiii. 13 and we must ever remember it if we would see the real meaning of many a hidden thing to which faith is the only key. It is when we apprehend it so it becomes 'the song of songs'—telling in its pregnant words of the heart's exercises with regard to the object of its love, not

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS

5

always known as possessed, nor to which it is always, alas, true, yet with growing apprehension of what He is, and what His love

I return now to the Psalms where this same human heart, with its ebb and flow of passion, finds another heart over which no storms sweep, and yet in wondrous sympathy with it. A voice more than man's is heard with man's voice, controlling, guiding, sustaining its utterance—a voice to which winds and waves are subject, a commanding voice with deep undertones of pity and tenderness,—so human, and yet divine. It is this that is the secret of that peculiar power over the soul which the Psalms have ever had. In weariness and weakness, in trial and temptation, when hope and energy have died down almost to despair, men have found suited utterance provided for them even there, words of weakness and weariness and sorrow which, so furnished to them, brought down to the loneliness of their condition the sense of a companionship which cheered and energized afresh. For us, how blessed to know that the sorrow beyond all other sorrows furnished that 'that the Spirit of Christ was breathing in these prayers and praises, and underpropping with the faith of One in His own person "Author and Finisher of faith," in circumstances of trial beyond all that man could know—the fainting ones of the Shepherd's flock. They found here the truth of that "In all their afflictions He was afflicted . . . He bare them and carried them all the days of old."

This separates the Psalms from all the other books. They *are* "psalms" therefore, never in their deepest tones without melody, because never without God, ascending up to Him from whom they came, with the song of deliverance from relieved and rested hearts.

This has, I suppose, been perceived at all times. It has not been however generally perceived, that the whole book has a prophetic basis—the spirit of Christ linking itself anticipatively with the joys and sorrows of a generation even yet to come—a people largely spoken of in the direct prophecies of the future—the Israel of the future, strictly and literally Israel, to be brought out of their graves, the graves of their buried hopes, in days which are not distant, to receive the promises made to their fathers, their land (yet lying vacant for them) and supremacy among the nations, but much more the perpetual favour of their covenant God.

That these promises, evidently to be found in the literal wording of the Old Testament prophecies, are to be as literally fulfilled to the ancient people of God, is the growing conviction, of students of the Divine Word. There are still, however, those who oppose themselves to it. For them the prophetic Israel is

HELPS FOR WAYFARERS

the Christian Church, which, spite of the failure of 1800 years, is conceived to be the spiritual heir of all Jewish promises. As a consequence the coming of the Lord (for these) is removed the distance of a whole millennium, to make room for this rilling of the earth with righteousness by the Gospel, the "first resurrection" of the saints is confounded with that of the dead for judgment before the great white throne, and not only confusion is introduced into the interpretation of the Word, but Judaism and Christianity, law and grace, the world and the Church, the sinner's and the saints' position, become inextricably entangled, and what is proper to each lost.

If this be so, it is plainly serious. I cannot enter into the proof at large, but in as few words as possible, just indicate what I am deeply convinced the Scriptures teach as to these points.

In the first place, as to the Old Testament promises, the very apostle of the Gentiles, Paul, lamenting the unbelief of Israel, yet tells us (although Christianity was fully come) that to *them* pertain 'the promises' (Rom ix 4). To *that* Israel, then in unbelief, I repeat, and though he was actually writing to Christians, the very people to whom we are now told the promises belong.

The language of these promises—the Old Testament ones of course,—abundantly confirms this. Take for instance Mic iii 9,—iv 2. Zion, Jerusalem, the mountain of the house are distinctly named, first, as to undergo, because of Israel's sin, the deepest humiliation, secondly, in the grace of God to be proportionately exalted "in the last days." The first part of this, the curse, it is readily enough allowed, has befallen the Jew actually and literally. Yet the second part, the blessing, is applied arbitrarily to the Christian Church as indeed may be seen by the heading of the chapter in our common Bibles. Where is the warrant one may ask, for such a mere and contradictory assumption? Simply, as they conceive, in the fact of Israel being cast off for ever as the people of God—the very thing which God by the mouth of Jeremiah (xxxi 35, 36, xxxiii 23, 26) solemnly denies.

Take as another instance Zech xiv. The opening words so plainly speak of Jerusalem, the actual and earthly city, that I suppose none question it. They speak moreover of a time of trouble for it linked with a 'day of the Lord,' which according to Paul's language (2 Thess ii 2, 3)* had not, plainly come, when the Jews were scattered from the city by the Roman power. In this time all nations were to be gathered against Jerusalem to

* Where the editors read, "the day of the Lord," instead of "the day of Christ."

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS

7

battle, the city taken, the houses rifled, and *half* the city go forth into captivity, while the residue of the people (as was plainly not the case when Titus took it) should not be cut off from the city. For at that moment the Lord Himself should interfere. He should come and all His holy ones* with Him, His feet stand upon the Mount of Olives, which should witness to His presence by cleaving asunder in the midst, and delivered Israel see the end of their foes under the hand of Him who fights for them.

Nor only so. The Lord becomes King over all the earth, in that day there is one Lord and His name one. The land too—places in it distinctly specified by name—is blessed and exalted, Jerusalem safely inhabited, and the worship of the Lord of hosts established there, so that all the families of the earth come up to worship Him.

The resort of commentators upon this is to spiritualize it into type and figure. Yet they allow that the first part of the prophecy, which is a continuous one, is literal enough. Jerusalem, the actual city of the beginning of the chapter, becomes *only in the latter part of it* a type, and this too variously interpreted as the Church of Christ on earth, or even the new Jerusalem the heavenly city.

It is not seen by those who have adopted such views, that on the one hand the Jews *have* a future of blessing upon the earth, so that the Apostle Paul declares, in a passage where he is speaking distinctly of Jew and of Gentile (Rom. xi), that only 'blindness *in part*' is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so *all* Israel—the nation as such—"shall be saved," while on the other hand he testifies that their salvation will *not* be by the present gospel. "as concerning the gospel, they are *enemies*"—treated by God as such—"for your sakes, but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes, for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

But this involves another thing, the warning of which is joined to this promise of blessing to the Jews. If they are not to be converted by the gospel, *the gospel-dispensation* (as we are accustomed to call it) *must have come to an end at the time spoken of*, for they are "enemies," nationally, for the sake of the Gentiles, "as concerning the gospel." Jew and Gentile are not then finally to be merged in one Christian Church. Till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, the proper blessing of the Jews is in abeyance. They are treated as enemies. But that cannot go on for ever, for they are still beloved for the fathers' sakes, and the gifts

* I put it so, and not "saints," expressly to leave it open whether angels may not be intended.

and calling of God are without repentance. The fulness of the Gentiles once come in—that is, God having taken out from them the complete number to be gathered by the gospel,—*all* Israel shall be saved. And how? Why, in contrast with the gospel message from One absent, the Deliverer Himself shall come, and turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

All is simple, if our minds are. Zechariah witnesses to Israel's deliverance by the Lord's coming, as we have seen. Paul, the Christian,* and the apostle of the Gentiles, magnifying his office, yet confirms it. The whole New Testament declares that the hope of the Christian also is this coming of the Lord. The Jew waits for his long promised blessing *on the earth*. The Christian, for resurrection glory, the Lord's presence, the Father's house, but he waits too, to see his Lord take His great power, and reign in the scene of His humiliation and rejection, and to see evil put down then with His strong hand, he waits too, as having suffered with Him, to reign with Him then.

And, up to that time, what? Simply the world in unchanged evil, and if in a Christian dress, *that* only producing the "perilous times" of "the last days" (2 Tim iii, 1)—men "having the form of godliness but denying the power thereof," "waxing worse and worse deceiving and being deceived," "false teachers, privily bringing in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them," and "many following their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth is evil spoken of." The prophecy of this has become history. It is a patent fact before our eyes. And not only so, but it was so (contrary to the thoughts of most) before the last apostle had passed away, and Scripture itself, and not any private opinion of our own, assures us of its fulfilment, even then. "Little children, it is the *last time*, and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, *EVEN NOW* are there many antichrists, whereby we know it is the last time" (1 John ii, 18). Had *he* any idea of a millennium first? Was there to be any recovery out of this condition? No, for it is the "*LAST* time." The Gospel dispensation ends, like the Jewish, in failure and apostacy.

Yet the Word of God does most simply and surely teach, that there will be a time when the "knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea." But the prophecy of Zechariah has shown us how this shall be accomplished. "The Lord my God shall come," "and the Lord shall be King"

* It seems almost needless to say, and yet for some may not be, that I use this word "Christian" throughout is applying only to believers from Pentecost to the close of the Gospel dispensation, and not to those of the Old Testament or millennial dispensations.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS

9

over all the earth in that day there shall be one Lord, and His name One "

Zechariah has also shown us that a period of suffering and trial immediately precedes the coming of the Deliverer. It will be important for us to get hold with some clearness of the position of the people of Israel at this time. A few prophetic passages put together will be all that is needed to make this plain.

Take, first of all, Matthew xxiv. The central feature in our Lord's prophecy is surely His own coming—a "coming" in the clouds of heaven with the angels, when none shall have to say to another, "Lo! here is Christ, or there," "for as the lightning cometh out of the East and shineth even unto the West, so shall the coming of the Son of man be" a coming, which in no fair way of interpretation can be made other than a literal and personal one. Now, what connects itself with this, in this chapter? First, "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place,"—the Jewish holy place clearly, for, when they should see it, those that were *in Judæa* were to flee to the mountains. Secondly, and given as a reason for their flight, "Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time no, nor ever shall be." This unequalled trouble was to be short in duration, for, "except those days should be shortened, no flesh should be saved but for the elect's, sake those days shall be shortened." Thirdly, "*immediately after*" this, they should see the sign of the Son of man in heaven. "And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

These three things are so connected together, that it is plain they all point forward into the yet future for their fulfilment—the abomination at Jerusalem, then unequalled tribulation of short duration, immediately afterwards, the coming of the Son of man. This, too, plainly links the prophecy in Matthew with that in Zechariah, where the last crisis of the tribulation for Israel is seen in that partial capture of the city, which has so remarkable an interruption in the appearing of the Lord God and of His holy ones.

But Matthew shows us why the tribulation comes. The abomination of desolation stands in the holy place. Idolatry—for that is the Scriptural interpretation of abomination*—has taken possession of the very sanctuary of Jehovah itself. Hence the pouring out of judgment, even at the hand of Jehovah's, as well

* 1 Kings xi, 5, 7, 2 Kings xxiii, 13

as Israel's enemies. But because they *are* His enemies, fulfilling their own malice merely, even in the execution of what is His judgment, He breaks to pieces in the end the rod that He has used, and destroys the destroyers of His people. Israel is corrected, not destroyed. "And it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem; when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning." (Isa. iv., 3-4.)

Let us turn now to another prophecy. Our Lord has just referred us to Daniel: "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet." We find the expression three times in Daniel, ch. ix. 27; xi. 31; xii. 11. In the first of these passages we may expect to get the root-idea as to its meaning. It is in the well-known prophecy of the seventy weeks. The prophet had he tells us, been occupied with Jeremiah's announcement of seventy years' desolations of Jerusalem. These were now nearly expired; and, in view of this, the prophet sets himself diligently to seek the Lord his God, confessing his sins and the sins of his people, and pleading for the city and the sanctuary. The angel Gabriel comes with the answer to his prayers, and to give him skill and understanding as to the future of the people and city for which he had been praying. He tells him that "seventy weeks were determined upon his people and his holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy (Place)." The expiration of this term was to see all this accomplished, (mark) *for Israel and Jerusalem*. Their sins were then to be ended, themselves reconciled to God, and, as a fruit of this, their holy place consecrated anew to God. The difficulty in realizing this restoration of the temple worship has led many to seek escape from it in the supposed necessity of a figurative interpretation. But millennial blessings are not the full Christian ones, as those must understand who are ever to have intelligence of prophetic Scripture. The words are plain, and plainly show us, too, that we have not even yet seen the end of this period. Christ, indeed, has died, and therein laid the foundation of their accomplishment. John distinctly tells us, interpreting the unconscious prophecy of Caiaphas, that He died "for *that nation*." (Jno. xi., 51.) But they refused at that time the reconciliation, and, by the rejection of the Son of God, drew upon themselves Divine judgment. Their sins were not put away, therefore, but retained; their sanctuary

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

11

was not anointed, but destroyed. All this, that there may be no question as to it, the course of the prophecy declares. Nevertheless the blessing so deferred comes in with the completed period of the seventy weeks.

This rejection of Messiah by the people whom He comes to save, affects the whole structure of the succeeding prophecy, in a way that the mass of commentators have quite overlooked. It introduces a break into the midst of the seventy weeks; for at the end of sixty-nine Messiah comes and is cut off, and the determined time ceases for a while its course. *An uncounted interval* follows, wherein the desolation of the city and the sanctuary, because of the people's sin, is the only event marked. Eighteen centuries have indeed passed, and the history of the city and sanctuary in connection with Israel has not again begun. In this interval the history of the Christian Church comes in. The Gospel is preached; and, as concerning the Gospel, the Jews are enemies for the Gentiles' sake. But this will have an end. Israel, after the gospel dispensation is over, will again come upon the scene; the seventieth week will bring for them the sorest trouble they have ever had; but thus the Lord will allure them into the wilderness, to bring them back to Himself, and speak comfortably to them. The end of the seventieth week brings them in the full blessing of which Daniel speaks.

Thus the prophecy goes on: "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after the three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, and shall have nothing (*marg.*); and the people of the prince that shall come (*lit.* the prince, the coming one) shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined."

There is the gap I spoke of. How long a time runs on, is not stated; but the prophecy begins again the other side of the break, with the actions of one, who, there is no reasonable doubt, grammatically or otherwise, is this "prince that shall come,"* just spoken of, whose "people" have already destroyed the city and

* Commentators have not been stopped by the strangeness of the expression, from applying this to Titus; but why mark *him* out as distinct from the "people" under him? "The coming prince" is in fact a reference to one whom the seventh chapter has brought already into notice in connection with the fourth or Roman Empire, "the little horn" whose blasphemies bring destruction on the beast.

the sanctuary, and who is thus marked out as a Roman prince, last head of the last Gentile empire in Daniel's vision (ch. vii).

"And he shall confirm a [not 'the']*] covenant with [the] many for ONE WEEK ; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate [*rather*, there shall be a desolator], even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

In Zechariah we saw this desolation and its consummation—what was determined finished, and deliverance come for the oppressed. In Matthew we saw further what brought the desolation pointed out. Here in Daniel we have the details given. The last head of the Gentile empire makes a covenant with the mass of the Jewish nation for one week, the remaining one of the seventy, and a week of *years*, as most interpreters are agreed. The nature of this covenant is not given ; but we gather from what follows, that it allows the Jews, partially returned to their own land, their ordinances and worship. Their sacrifices are again offered according to the law, and (as this implies) in their holy place, as of old. But in the midst of the week (at the end of three and a-half years) this is all set aside, sacrifice and oblation cease, and idolatry is established. Thereupon there comes a desolator until the consummation, and the determined time is run out.

(*To be continued.*)

* The introduction of the definite article here has misled many ; for they naturally enough took '*the* covenant' to be the same as elsewhere in Daniel, (ch. xi.) the *holy* covenant. It is not so, but simply *a* covenant, an agreement.

So, too, "*he* shall make it desolate," seems to show this same person vindicating God's holiness in judging the abomination ; it should be rather "one desolating"—a desolator.

A BELIEVER once asked me why any one should find fault with him for wanting to be a rich man. I answered him by 1 Timothy vi. 10, adding : "If you gather riches for yourself, awful sorrows will come ;" and so they did. He lost wife and child, and had other things which touched him to the quick ; showing him that God would not be a party to such a walk as that.

PRACTICALLY, God sees nothing you could not give up for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake ; and, depend upon it, He will not be in your debt ; it will all be brought out in bright daylight when Christ comes, and meantime, rays from His face will be playing on your hearts the whole way. G. V. W.

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I.

CHAPS. I., II.—GOD'S COUNSELS IN CREATION.

In seeking to develop—(as is now my purpose) the truths of the *New Testament* from the history of the Old, it is the typical meaning with which we have to do. The Divine glory, as seen in Moses' face, was veiled to the people addressed: for us the veil is done away in Christ. The words of the apostle with reference to Israel's history, it can scarcely be doubted, apply no less to that which was but prefatory to theirs: "now all these things happened unto them for ensamples (*lit.* types); and are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come."

He gives us, moreover, many of the details: Adam, a type of Christ; Eve, of the Church; Abel's offering, of the sinner's acceptance; Noah's salvation by the Ark, of our own in Christ; Melchizedek, king of righteousness and peace; the story of Abraham's two sons; and a *hint* at least as to the offering up of Isaac (Gal. iii., 16-17). Nor is this all that is commonly recognized as typical, though some no doubt would have us stop where the inspired explanation stops. But in that case how large a part of what is plainly symbolical would be lost to us!—the larger part of the Levitical ordinances; not a few of the Parables of the Lord Himself, and almost the whole of the book of Revelation. Surely none could deliberately accept a principle which would lock up from us so large a part of the inspired Word.

Still many have the thought that it would be safer to refrain from typical applications of the historical portions where no inspired statement authenticates them as types at all. Take, however, such a history as that of Joseph, which no direct Scripture speaks of as a type, yet the common consent of almost all receives as such. Or Isaac's sacrifice, of the significance of which we have the merest hint. The more we consider it, the more we find it impossible to stop short here. Fancy, no doubt, is to be dreaded. Sobriety and reverent caution are abundantly needful. But so are they everywhere. If we profess wisdom we become fools: subjection to the blessed Spirit of God and to the Word inspired of Him, are our only safe-guards here and elsewhere.

When we look a little closer, we find that the types are not scattered by hap-hazard in the Old Testament books. On the contrary they are connected together and arranged in an order

and with a symmetry which bears witness to the Divine hand which has been at work throughout. We find Exodus thus to be the book of redemption ; Leviticus, to speak of what suits God with us in the sanctuary, of sanctification ; then Numbers, to give the Wilderness history—our walk with God (*after* redemption and being brought to Him where He is), through the world. Each individual type in these different books will be found to have most intimate and significant relation to the great central thought pervading the book. This, when laid hold of, confirms immensely our apprehension of the general and particular meaning, and gives it a force little if at all short of absolute demonstration.

The great central truth in Genesis is "LIFE." It thus begins where all begins actually for the soul. God is seen in it as Life-giver, Creator : this involving necessarily also that He is Sovereign in purpose, and Almighty* in execution. This is why Genesis is, as it has been called, "the seed-plot of the Bible," because it is the book of the counsels of the Sovereign and Almighty God.

But "Life" is (so to speak) the key-note—the thread upon which all else is strung. Genesis is plainly almost entirely a series of biographies. It divides after the introductory account of creation, in chaps i., ii., into *seven* of these, in which we have a perfect picture of Divine Life in the soul, from its almost imperceptible beginning to its full maturity.

Adam gives us the beginning, when, with the entrance of God's Word, light comes into the soul of a sinner, and God meets him *as* such with the provision of His grace (ch. iii).

Then (ch. iv., v), we have the history of the two "seeds," and their antagonism,—a story which has its counterpart in the history of the world at large, but also in every individual soul where God has wrought, and where the "flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other."

Next, Noah's passage through the judgment of the old world into a new scene, accepted of God in the sweet savour of sacrifice, is the type of where salvation puts us, "in Christ, a new creation : old things passed away, and all things became new" (ch. vi, xi. 9).

Abraham's Canaan life—pilgrim and stranger, but a wor-

* Which is plainly God's revelation of Himself to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as distinct from Jehovah to Israel (see Exod. vi., 3). In the rest of the Pentateuch the word occurs only in Balaam's prophecy (Num. xxiv) and only in Ruth besides, of all the historical books

shipper, gives us the fruit and consequence of this—a “*walk* in Him” whom we have received. (xi. 10-xxi).

Then Isaac, our type as “sons” (Gal. iv. 28), speaks to us of a self-surrender into a Father’s hands, the door into a life of quiet and enjoyment, as it surely is (xxii-xxiv. 33).

Jacob speaks of the *discipline* of sons, by which the crooked and deceitful man becomes Israel, a prince with God,—a chastening of love, dealing with the fruits of the *old* nature in us. (xxvi. 34-xxxv).

While Joseph, the fullest image of Christ, suffers not for *sin*, but for *righteousness*’ sake, and attains supremacy over the world, and fulness of blessing from the Almighty One, His strength (xxxvi.-l).

All this we may more fully see hereafter. Even this hint of it may make plain what I have already stated to be the main feature of the book, with which the first section corresponds in the closest way. Like many another first section, but perhaps beyond any other, it is really a sort of table of contents to the rest of the book. It is of course much more than that, as we shall see, if the Lord give wisdom to unfold what this story of creation gives us.

It is as all else here, a type, while it is none the less on that account a literal history. Its spiritual meaning in no wise turns it into myth or fable, as some would assume. “All these things happened unto them,” says the apostle,—so the things *really* happened, but—“for types.” What importance must attach then to a “type,” to produce which God has actually modelled the history of the world from the beginning! With what reverence should we listen to the utterances so strangely given, so marvelously “written for our admonition!” Instead of setting aside the literal record of creation, it surely confirms it in the highest degree, that the Creator should demonstrate Himself the New Creator, and show how in laying the foundations of the earth which sin has cursed and death has scarred, he who seeth the end from the beginning had even then before Him, in the depths and counsels of His heart, a scene into which, secure in its unchanging Head, sin and death no more should enter—which they should nevermore defile! It is Divine, this record: true, of course then, and infinitely more,—although faith be needed for the realization of it.

I do not doubt that the story before us, is not merely even a single, but a two-fold type; finding its fulfillment in two spheres, which are very generally correspondent to one another. The world without has its reflection in the world within us. So the

steps in the Divine dealing with the world at large have their correspondence with His dealings with us as individuals. In our consideration of them this individual application will come first. It is that which is most prominent all through, and which links the whole series of types together; and this has its significance for us. In men's thoughts you will find, as what they imagine to be advanced and liberal views, the progress of the *race* putting out of sight the interest of the individual: they speak much of *man*, think little of *men*.* It is not so with God; the blessing of the race is reached (with Him) through the blessing of the individual, and not one is overlooked. Nay, "not a sparrow falls to the ground without your Father." This is what is in His heart, whatever the perplexity which sin has introduced; and oh how profoundly needful for us the assurance of this! It may do for philosophy to proclaim the grandeur of general laws, to which the individual good must give place; but the grip of this iron machinery has none of the comfort of the grasp of a Father's hand. The heart of God alone suffices the hearts which He has made.

Let us take then this individual application first, and let creation preach to us lessons which may be happily familiar to us, and yet have a new charm as preached thus, where (as all preaching *should* be) the sermon is an anthem, and the anthem is in the many voices of the universe—the revelation-chorus to which all will come at last: "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever!"

There are two smaller sections of the first natural division of the book of Genesis. The first (ch. i., 2-3) gives us the work of God and His rest. The second (ch. ii., 4-25) *God in relationship* with the creature He has made. Hence in this latter part the covenant name is for the first time introduced: it is not "God" merely, but "*the Lord God*"—Jehovah. We shall see more fully the force of this hereafter. In this double account there is an exquisite beauty, which the unbelief that cavils at it can never see.

It is necessary also to distinguish from the six days' work, what has been strangely confounded with it, the primitive creation of the first chapter and verse, and the ruin into which it had fallen when "without form, and void, and darkness on the face

* As e.g. Dr. Temple's "Education of the World," in "Essays and Reviews."

of the deep." This used to be, and I suppose still may be called, the common view; and yet the more one looks at the passage the more it seems impossible to make such a mistake. For plainly the work of the six days begins with this: "God said, let there be light, and there was light." But as plainly the earth, although waste and desolate, was there before that, not created then. Moreover the words "without form and void," for which "waste and desolate" would be preferable as a reading, imply distinctly a state of ruin, and not of development; while a passage in which the first of these terms is used asserts expressly that the Lord did not create the earth so.*

Nor can it be said that the exigencies of a geological difficulty have forced such a construction of the opening words of this account. Augustine, who knew nothing of such a difficulty, long ago decided for it from the mere force of the language used. The requirement of it by the mere typical view I am just now advocating, is independent of it also, and yet quite as urgent. For it makes the six days' work a remoulding of a former lapsed creation, the *new* birth, as we may call it, of a world. How plainly significant is that, at once! And such a view of it the words themselves necessitate.

There was then a primary creation, afterwards a fall; first, "heaven and earth," in due order, then earth without a heaven, in darkness, and buried under "a deep" of salt and barren and restless waters. What a picture of man's condition, as fallen away from God! How complete the confusion; how profound the darkness; how deep the restless waves of passion roll over the wreck of what was once so fair! "The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt."

Then mark how the new birth begins: "The Spirit of God moved (or *brooded*) upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light" From the Spirit and the Word it comes: we are "born of the Spirit;" we are "born of the incorruptible seed" of "the Word of God." And "the entrance of Thy Word giveth *light*." How faithfully this beginning of creative work depicts that more mighty still in the human soul, and assures of what was even then for us in the counsels of Divine wisdom. Truly His "delights were with the sons of men."

(*To be continued, D. V., in our next.*)

* It is the word rendered "in vain," Isa. xiv., 18. The two are found together in Isa. xxxiv., 11; Jer. iv., 23.

[18]

Critical.

AN ATTEMPT AT A REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

I THE PSALMS

BOOK I—(PSALMS 1-xli)

I

1 Happy is the man that hath not walked in the counsel of the wicked, nor stood in the way of sinners, nor sat in the seat of scoffers

2 But his delight is in the law of Jehovah, and in His law doth he meditate day and night

3 And he is like a tree planted by the streams of water, that giveth his fruit in his season, his leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doth shall prosper

4 The wicked are not so but are like the chaff, which the wind driveth away

5 Therefore the wicked shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the assembly* of the righteous

6 For Jehovah knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked shall perish

II

1 Why do the heathen† rage, and the nations meditate a vain thing?

2 The kings of the earth set themselves, and the princes take counsel together, against Jehovah and against His Anointed.

3 "Let us burst their bonds, and cast away their cords from us"

* There are three words variously translated "assembly" or "congregation" in the A V, which it is needful to distinguish. I translate *'edah* uniformly (as here) "assembly," *kahal*, "congregation," *mo'ed*, either "meeting," or "meeting place"

† *Goyim*, I translate "heathen" or "Gentiles," *le'ummim* "nations," *'am*, "people"

A REVISION OF THE PSALMS.

19

4 He that sitteth in the heavens laugheth the Lord derideth them

5 Then speaketh He unto them in his anger, and confoundeth them in His wrath

6 "Yet have I anointed[†] my king upon Zion, my holy mount "

7 "I will declare the decree, Jehovah hath said unto me Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee

8 "Ask of me, and I shall give thee [the] heathen for thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession

9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel "

10 Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings be admonished, ye judges of the earth

11 Serve Jehovah with fear, and rejoice with trembling

12 Kiss the Son[§] lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, for suddenly will His anger kindle || Happy are all they that put their trust in Him

[†] Or, perhaps, "set" The meaning has been greatly disputed, and the best Hebraists seem about equally divided between these two

[§] The use of the Aramaic form *Bar*, instead of the regular Hebrew *Ben*, has given rise to much disputation I give the following note from Delitzsch as perfectly satisfactory 'The second exhortation, which now follows having reference to their relation to the Anointed One, has been missed by all the ancient versions except the Syriac, as though its clearness had blinded the translators, since they render either *bor*, 'purity, chastity, discipline,' (LXX Targ, Ital, Vulg) or *bir*, 'pure, unmixed' (Aquila, Symm, Jerome, *adore pure*) Thus also Hupfeld renders it, 'yield sincerely,' whereas it is rendered by Ewald, 'receive wholesome warning,' and by Hitzig, 'submit to duty' Olshausen even thinks there may be some mistake in *bar*, and Diestel decides for *bo* instead of *bar* But the context and the usage of the language require 'Kiss the Son' The *Piel nishak* means 'to kiss,' and never anything else, and while *bor* in Hebrew means 'purity,' and nothing more, and *bar* as an adverb (purely) cannot be supported, nothing is more natural here, after Jehovah has acknowledged His Anointed as His Son, than that *Bar*, which has nothing strange about it when found in solemn discourse, should denote the unique Son, and in fact the Son of God The exhortation to submit to Jehovah, as Aben Ezra has observed, is followed by the exhortation to do homage to Jehovah's Son' (Delitzsch, Comment on Psalms, vol 1, pp 97 98)

I add that Gesenius, DeWette, and Rosenmüller, though Rationalistic, agree in this rendering

|| Or, possibly, as in the A V, "when his anger is kindled but a little"

NOTE—Throughout this translation, it will be attempted to maintain *as strict a uniformity of rendering as possible*, consistently with the known various meanings of words in all languages Many a link of connection in the Psalms is lost or obscured by inattention to this

Practice.

THE POWER WE NEED FOR PRACTICE.

Christianity is not a law : it is life and power. It is not God upon the throne requiring ; but God come down to us in Christ, working out in us His own requirement. If we are exhorted, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," the *ground* of the exhortation is, "for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do (or more strictly, the willing and the doing) of His good pleasure."

"The strength of sin is the law" We may turn Christianity itself into a law, and then the very perfection of it makes it only a harder and severer one than Judaism itself. It will only make us cry out the more, "O wretched man that I am," and find in us an utter inability "to perform that which is good." Before then we speak of practice, let us look at the power which is needed for practice.

Judaism was a "fold," a law of commandments which hedged in man and stopped his will. Like the sand of the seashore it gave a limit and a bound to that which chafed incessantly against it, and said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further." It stopped the will ; it did not, it could not change it. Nay, it was itself in its presence a witness that there was no change ; for to one who never had it in his mind to steal, "Thou shall not steal," would not be needed.

The Lord came to "lead out" His sheep out of this Jewish fold (John x., 3-16*), and to gather them to Himself, where, guided and attracted by His voice, they should find under His own hand and care liberty, safety, and satisfaction (ver. 9).

The sheep know Him and therefore follow Him. They know His love, who, as the good Shepherd, laid down His life for them. They appreciate the blessing of being under His care. They know the value of His guardianship, His rod, and His staff. The green pastures invite them. They enjoy a liberty which is but to give themselves to what attracts and satisfies them. The will being right, the heart engaged with good, liberty is safe.

A right walk is guaranteed, not by legal penalties or requirements, but by three powerful and efficacious principles : the three parts of Christian character—faith, hope, and love.

Faith—as saith the apostle, "purifying their hearts by faith."

* Where the second "fold" should be "flock."

THE POWER WE NEED FOR PRACTICE. 21

Faith is the condition of a soul in the light, seeing things as they are, seeing as God sees. "The entrance of Thy word giveth light," and "if thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." This begets what Scripture calls "holiness of *truth*," (Eph. iv., 24, *marg.*)—separateness from what the soul has seen in its deformity, separateness *to* Him in whom it has found its good. When the apostle counted all things but dung and loss for Christ, it was but the apprehension of these in their proper character. It was not mere resolution or energy that flung things aside, but faith that counted them for what they were, and then who would defile himself with "dung?" Who would seek and lay up "loss?"

Hope, which is but the child of faith, works in company with it. By the "exceeding great and precious promises" we are made "partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." "If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." And in proportion as the hope is bright, the unseen things abstract the gaze from earth, and give proper pilgrim-character to the heirs of heaven. Nay, more, "he that hath this hope in Him"—the hope of being like Christ when He appears—"purifieth *himself* even as He is pure." If it is really a "hope" to be like Him by-and-by, we necessarily aim to be now as much as possible like Him. Carry that out to the fullest possible extent, it can never become legality.

And then "faith worketh by *love*:" it is not the belief of such as "believe and tremble." "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment: he that feareth is not made perfect in love. We love Him because He first loved us." And the apostle says of himself, the character of whose life we know: "The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, *who loved me*, and gave Himself for me."

Thus all that is in us as Christians is so much pledge for a right and holy walk. Only we must remember that the possession of a nature which implies these things, is not in itself *power*, it is inclination; but we want power as well as inclination. Power is of God and not of us; working in us, but leaving us very conscious of utter weakness, the proper condition of a creature—dependence, and the very condition of strength, for "when I am weak, then am I strong."

This weakness does not distress or terrify, therefore, nor abate confidence in anywise, but just the contrary. For if it were *my* strength I were strong in, how carefully should I need to measure it with the difficulties of the way, and how full of fear I should

rightly be, lest I had not enough to meet them. But when I have strength for nothing, and the power is of God, I am quite sure there are no difficulties that can stand before Him; and thus faith as a grain of mustard seed, removes the mountains from my path.

People often are saying, If a man were a Christian, he could not do such and such things. It is true that if there is not good fruit we have no right to argue a good tree; "faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone." Nevertheless, it is as false to argue on the other side, that there cannot be bad fruit, yea, however bad, springing from the root of evil which remains in all. It is false, and dangerous as false; because to argue a Christian could not do so and so, is to argue that *I*, if a Christian, cannot, and that is the next step to a fall; for "let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

The instances of terrible failure and evil in believers, of which Scripture is full, are writtten for our admonition, not to teach us that we must fail likewise, but to break in us the immense self-confidence which induces failure, and make us weak enough to be strong indeed.

Power is of the Spirit : a power ours, though not of us. It is "the law," or efficacious working, "of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus," which delivers "from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii, 2.)

How—in what direction—does the Spirit of God work? By taking of what is Christ's and showing it unto us (John xvi., 14), and then by showing us *our own part* in the Christ that He reveals. "At that day," says the Lord—the day when the Spirit of truth should come—"ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." (John xiv., 20.)

Thus He quickens faith; thus He invigorates hope; thus He deepens and enforces love; not occupying the soul morbidly with itself, but with what is outside itself and yet its own; drawing, not driving; setting the will right, not stopping it; not the principle of the "fold," but of the Shepherd and the sheep. Let us remember, then, if holiness, if fruitfulness, if the glory of our Master be indeed dear to us, that Scripture, which cannot be broken, asserts as plainly as can be, that "the strength of sin is the law." To put ourselves under it, therefore, with whatever sincere intent, is none the less to rob ourselves of power, and grieve the blessed Spirit of God, the only source of power.

And it is putting ourselves under law, whenever we take up, as matter of requirement and self-occupation, what can only be accomplished by Divine power working in us the realization of what Christ is and of what we are in Him. Duties there are, of

THE POWER WE NEED FOR PRACTICE. 23

course, but the question is how to find power for their fulfilment ; and commandments there are, but it is : " If ye love Me keep them." Neither the " spirit of fear," nor the endeavour to mend myself and find satisfaction in my spiritual condition, will avail for this. God has entitled me, nay, made it both duty and privilege, as a Christian, to turn away from all that I find in myself, to realize by faith what I am in Another. I cannot want to mend Christ, and " as He is, so am I," even " in this world." It is only as " abiding in Him " I am competent for anything ; only as " with open face beholding the glory of the Lord," I am " changed into His image from glory to glory."

All that I find in myself down here has been put away from before God by the Cross of His Son. I can expect nothing from it I can make nothing of it. My real self is elsewhere. " Having received Christ Jesus the Lord, I " walk in Him." This is much more than fulfilling points of duty, while it alone makes performable all duty.

As with regard to ourselves, so in our dealings with others. To put them under law, is not to help them out of evil, or give them victory over besetments. Even conscience may be roused in such a way as to drive the soul further away from God, rather than to help it near. How needful to remember, that " sin shall not have dominion over you, because ye are not under the law, but under grace ;" and that faithfulness is not always rightly measured by the sharpness of a rebuke, or the severity with which we judge men's sins. It is one thing to hold up the standard before their eyes, and show them what they ought to be ; it is quite another, to bring in the grace of Christ, to enable them for what they ought to be. It takes no spirituality to *condemn* : it is the " spiritual " alone whom the apostle expects, " if one be overtaken in a fault," to "*restore* such an one in the spirit of meekness." It is easy to rouse the flesh in another, and justify our worst judgment of him *by that which our own fleshly dealing has evoked*. The appeal of the Spirit, is to all that constitutes the Christian, that the " man in Christ," may assert his dignity, and claim the things that are his own, and rise up out of the pollution and degradation of natural things.

Satan is the *accuser* of the brethren. " The Lord, my Shepherd," the restorer of my soul.

The Faith.

THE TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

I. REV. XIX. 20 ; XX. 10.

"AND the beast was taken. and with him the prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet *are*, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

The doctrine of eternal punishment has been of late much in question. Convinced of its great importance in connection with other and fundamental points of Christian faith, I take up the texts which speak of it, for examination—examination, as thorough as I am able to give them. I propose the development of Scripture doctrine from Scripture, noticing the attacks of objectors somewhat, for the more careful inquiry as to the points attacked.

I can understand that people will think it an evidence of weakness, that I bring forward in the first place texts from the Book of Revelation. I do it advisedly; and am bold to ask what texts I could so rightly begin with, as those which bring before us, confessedly in a detail never attempted anywhere else, the very thing at which we are to look? I know men plead its obscurity, and claim it can establish no doctrine. But I know, too, that God calls it "Revelation," and I confess that outweighs with me all contrary assertions whatsoever. It is "the Revelation of Jesus Christ," upon whatever things it speaks of. Confessedly it speaks of the doom of the sinner: it is the Revelation of Jesus Christ, therefore, as to this.

As to obscurity, let us wait and see if it *is* obscure. At any rate it is the full-length and Divine Revelation of the matter. If that be obscure, it is not likely any other will be plainer.

The Book of Revelation is a book of symbols. Much has been made of this, by those who would have it teach no doctrine. The thing itself is freely granted, while the consequence is absolutely denied. If it teach at all, we must simply ask what it teaches, and whatever that is, it teaches, we may be sure, with all the authority and decisiveness which God's Word must necessarily have.

Nor does its being a book of symbols mean that every word, or phrase, or sentence is symbolic. There are interpretations

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. 25

plainly scattered through the book ; and in the most figurative parts, there are words that are not figurative. We, have in each case, to inquire what is meant, without any prior assumption as to this.

"The beast" is a figure, doubtless. It is the fourth beast of Dan. vii., and there an admitted figure of the Roman Empire. In Revelation, therefore, its meaning must be *primarily* the same. I say "primarily," for the book itself assures us that there is a modification of this meaning—slight, indeed, but of importance in its present connection. *The beast is represented*, according to ch. xvii. 11, *by his own eighth head* :* "the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth (head), and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." Now, these seven heads are "seven *kings*." This is the literal interpretation, not the symbol (ver. 10) ; and it is this eighth head that "goeth into perdition," most evidently that which the end of the 19th chapter gives us. "The beast" then cast alive into the lake of fire, is the last head of the Gentile empire, and a *man*.

The "false prophet, that wrought miracles before him," is by that mark the second "beast" of Rev. xiii. He has "two horns, like a lamb," but "spake as a dragon." He is thus marked out as the one of whom the apostle Paul speaks (2 Thess. ii., 3-10), as the "man of sin, the son of perdition," and the "wicked one," "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," and whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit (or "breath") of his mouth, "and destroy with the brightness of His coming" (or "manifestation of His presence"). This passage again is a partial quotation from Isa. xi., 4. "And He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips shall he slay the wicked (one)." The millennium follows this in Isaiah, as it does in Rev. xx.

The beast and false prophet are, therefore, *men*, as much as the "kings of the earth and their armies," with whom they are associated in ver. 19—indeed, it would be a strange association, if it were not so ; for these kings of the earth are literally that, and referred to in Isa. xxiv. 21.

People, of course, will be ready to tell us that all this is disputed. I am quite aware of it : every thing is. Popular commentaries, such as that of Barnes, make all these things *the shadow of a shadow*. They allow the marriage of the Lamb, which precedes the coming forth of the Rider on the white horse and

* As Nebuchadnezzar represented the first empire, in Dan. ii. 28 : "Thou art this head of gold."

His armies, to be a figure of a union of the saints with Christ, but then it only means "that the Church was now to triumph and rejoice AS IF in permanent union with her glorious Head and Lord.*" They allow that the vision of the Rider on the white horse, is figurative of His coming from heaven with His saints, to subjugate the world to Himself; but then it means only that "the true religion would be as triumphant AS IF the Son of God should go forth," &c.* And thus, as to the casting of the beast and false prophet into the lake of fire, "there is no necessity for supposing this to be *literally* inflicted.*" Thus is the Word of God solemnly evacuated. It is no wonder, if those led by such commentators, should find the book of Revelation practically anything but that.

Scripture, however, decisively forbids such an interpretation of these passages.

(1.) In this way the figures of Revelation become (as I have said) the figures *of* figures. The "marriage of the Lamb" figures the union of the saints with Christ. One would think the figure was there explained surely; but no: the union of the saints with Christ, figures the triumph of true religion!

(2.) This sort of interpretation destroys the purport of the pieces of true interpretation, intermingled with the figures. Thus in ch. xx., 4-6, the interpretation is carefully given separate from the vision: "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them," &c., is the *vision*; but "This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection," &c., is the *interpretation* of the vision. But, according to this sort of reasoning, the *interpretation* is as figurative as the vision itself!

(3.) The link with other Scriptures of the most literal kind forbids such mystification. Compare thus Zech. xiv. throughout; or Isa. xxiv., 21-23, where the punishment of the "host of the high ones on high," finds its counterpart in Rev. xx., 1-3; of "the kings of the earth on earth," in ch. xix., 21; the "visiting after many days," in xx., 10-12. The reign of the Lord, in xx. 6. Isa. xi, and 2 Thess. ii., I have already referred to. Compare also Col. iii. 4, and 1. Thess. iv. All the passages which speak of the Lord's second coming might be cited here.

(4.) But again, the connection of the passages in Revelation among themselves forbids it. Thus not only is the lake of fire referred to again in xx., 10, 14, 15, but in verse 10 referred to as the place of punishment of the beast and false prophet, when the

* Barnes *in loco*.

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. 27

devil is cast in also. There *is* "necessity," therefore, for understanding a literal casting in. But we shall refer to this again.

Thus, then, the passage we have been looking at remains in all its dread significance. The terms used in the description seem as if designed to impress its literality upon the reader: "These both were cast ALIVE into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

But this is not the whole account, as we have just seen. A thousand years pass on in the prophecy—a literal thousand years, for it makes part of the *explanatory statement* in ver. 6—and then we are again made to look into this lake of fire. The devil is now cast in, where, it is noted, the "beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

Plain as this language is, it also, in its obvious meaning, has been objected to, and therefore we must consider these objections. First, let us hear Albert Barnes. "*This* overthrow," he says, "of the enemies of God and of the Church, will be *final*. Satan 'will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, to be tormented day and night, for ever and ever.' The beast and the false prophet are already there; that is, they will have ceased long since, even before the beginning of the millennial period, to have opposed the progress of truth in the world, and their power will have been brought to an end. Satan now, the last enemy, will be doomed to the same hopeless woe."

Now, as I have said, the language seems as plain as need be. The devil is spoken of, not symbolically as the "dragon," as before, in xx., 2; nor have we any key, or chain, or figure of that kind. He is simply "Satan" (ver. 7), or the devil, (ver. 10), the two names given as *explanatory* of who the dragon is. Thus we have literal plain speech, not figure.

But it is not simply Satan who is now to be "tormented." The Greek word is *plural*: it is "*they* shall be tormented." This shows conclusively that the beast and false prophet *still survive*, after a thousand years, and then to be "tormented for ever and ever." This also shows that the beast and the false prophet are *men*, as before shown, and not mere symbols of systems, or what not.

Another writer,* from the extreme ranks of heterodoxy, and with another object altogether, brings yet very similar reasoning to bear. He objects to the word "are"—"where the beast and the false prophet *are*"—as shown by the italics not to be in the original. "Every ellipsis," says he, "must be understood in harmony with the facts of the case. 'The beast and false prophet' were cast into the lake of fire at the beginning of the

* Robert Roberts, in "the Christadelphian," vol. xi., pp. 567-569.

thousand years ; and, in referring to this in connection with the similar fate of the devil at the end of the thousand years, it is surely not unnatural to understand the allusion historically, and to insert 'were cast' instead of 'are' after 'the beast and false prophet.' In that case, where is the suggestion about 'two men' remaining a thousand years in the lake of fire unannihilated?"

The "suggestion"—which may be called by a stronger word than that—remains exactly where it was before. Put in "were cast," if you please : it still remains true that it is "*they* shall be tormented," not the devil alone, but the beast and false prophet also. To be "tormented" there they must *be* there ; and therefore, the "are," to all intents and purposes, remains unshaken.

For this writer also says, the "beast and false prophet" are *systems*, and he sees no incongruity in the use of the word "torments," as applied to these ; the "dragon" too is that ; and he remarks : "The thing represented by the dragon will suffer the thing represented by the torment ; and what torment is to a beast, the process symbolized by the torment will be to the system symbolized by the dragon."

But what that is, he evidently cannot put in words, nor can any one, I believe, conjecture. And it is *not*, as I have before said, the "dragon," but "the devil." Symbolism is dropped, and literal plain speech takes its place. Scripture cannot be broken, and God's Word is stronger than men's theories.

The phrase "for ever and ever," is as full an expression for eternity as is used anywhere in Scripture. It is "for the ages of ages," and is an expression used twenty times in the New Testament, and nowhere with a limited meaning.*

Thus plainly speaks the Book of Revelation. It gives us by actual example, two persons cast alive into the lake of fire, there unconsumed after a thousand years, and then to suffer for eternity. How worse than useless, to try and evade the unspeakable solemn truth.

II. REV. XX., 13-15.

"And the sea gave up the dead which were in it ; and death and hell [hades] delivered up the dead which were in them ; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell [hades] were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

Another lifting of the veil ! Another revelation ! And how plainly symbol and figure are here past. It is the judgment of

* The passages are Gal. i, 5 ; Phil. iv., 20 ; 1 Tim. i., 17 ; 2 Tim. iv., 18 ; Heb. xiii, 21 ; 1 Pet. iv., 11 ; v., 11 ; Rev. i., 6-18 ; iv., 9-10 ; v., 13-14 ; vii., 12 ; x., 6 ; xi., 15 ; xv., 7 ; xix., 3 ; xx., 10 ; xxii., 5. Rev. xix., 3, the only place questioned, will be considered shortly.

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. 29

the "rest of the dead" (ver. 5), who had not their part with the blessed in the resurrection of the just—"the first resurrection." They are judged according to their works, a thing in which no man could be justified; and the result is, that "death and hell," or hades,—death, which has ruled over their bodies, and hades,* which has received their souls—are cast into the lake of fire; a figurative way of speaking, no doubt, but a very plain and intelligible one. Death and hell are emptied into the lake of fire: all that go to make them up are cast there; every one not found written in the book of life.

Death and hades are not here mere personifications, as some have thought; nor is their ceasing to exist what is to be gathered from it. The force of the passage is, that none of those who are at that time found in death and hades escape the lake of fire, as in the last verse that none do, whose names are not in the book of life. For man standing simply on the ground of responsibility before God—for man unsaved by simple sovereign grace—there is no possible escape. Such is the solemn and intensely important lesson.

And although there is no duration given here, this is the final award; and as if to cut off hope completely, the lake of fire is defined to be "the second death." We have already seen it is not "destruction" in the sense that some would give it, but eternal torment in the fullest way. But it is a "death"—the utter and final end of all that makes life "life."

The first heaven and first earth are now passed away. The new heaven and new earth are come. He that sits upon the throne has said: "Behold, I make all things new;" and just then and there is it said: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death" (xxi., 8).

III. REV. XXII., 10-15.

"The time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. . . . Without [the city] are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolators, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."

This is the solemn conclusion to these Revelation sayings. When this time, so near from God's point of view, shall have

* It is the "hell," not of final punishment, but where the rich man is found *before* the judgment, in Luke xvi., 23.

come, the moral condition of every soul will be fixed for eternity. Instead of a gradual process of *restoration* beginning even then, and effectuated by the torment of the lake of fire (which is the fond vain dream of some), it is just then that the characters of the wicked and of the righteous are pronounced fixed for ever: the unjust to be unjust still, even as the holy to be holy still. The punishment is not corrective, the chastening of love, but, as another Scripture puts it, "judgment without mercy." Alas! for those who leave their condition for eternity to be settled then. The last glimpse at their condition leaves them "without the city" of the saints, as their final definitive portion.

(To be continued, if the Lord will.)

Questions of the Day.

THE RITUALISTIC AND THE SCRIPTURE GOSPEL.*

For the discussion of any important question it will be found of advantage to take up, not only the actual statements of writers upon the other side, but to confine one's attention sometimes to a single writer. There is thus a better opportunity afforded for those unable to have access to numerous volumes, to follow clearly the arguments of both parties, as well as greater assurance given that no link in the chain of argument will be omitted. For this purpose I take up Mr. Sadler's book. None other, that I have seen, could as well answer it. It is a work in much esteem among what is called the "High Church" party, has passed through several editions, and had a not unimportant place in helping on a movement which has had surprising success, and is of the highest possible significance. The book is clever, comparatively moderate in tone, written with much apparent candour, amiability and piety. But, what is of even more importance, it is an attempt to produce proof, *from Scripture*, of the truth of the main positions of the "Anglo-Catholic" creed, and of what they understand as "the teaching of the Prayer-Book." It puts

* Being the first of a series of papers on "Ritualism and the Word of God," in review of "Church Doctrine Bible Truth," by the Rev. F. Sadler, M.A., Prebendary of Wells, and Rector of Honiton. London. Bell & Daldy.

RITUALISTIC AND SCRIPTURE GOSPELS. 31

these, therefore, upon ground which appeals to the faith of every honest man who believes in Scripture, and at the same time furnishes at once an easy reference to what, thank God, is our real and only standard of appeal.

Controversy is a thing which many shrink from, from a feeling easily to be understood, and in some sense, surely appreciable by every Christian. The spirit of strife appeals to some of the worst passions of our fallen nature, and the "servant of the Lord must *not* strive." How easily controversy may run into this, we can scarcely be ignorant. Yet it is by no means inseparable from it; and in the passage just quoted, the "strife" forbidden is not controversy, but all that is opposed to what follows immediately,—“but be *gentle* unto all men, apt to teach, patient (or forbearing), in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves.” The care is to be that the truth be spoken in love, and a great care it should be. But then, on the other hand, it is not love not to speak, as is plain by the very passage itself; for the object of instructing (or “setting right,” as it has been rendered,) those who oppose themselves, is, “if God, peradventure, may give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth,” and “that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.”

Love, therefore, could not deny itself this privilege. It must needs “contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints,” just because it values this faith, and values the souls to whom the faith is, or should be, precious. The many that are on every side entangled in the meshes of falsehood, to their own grievous damage, and the dishonour of Him whose truth makes free, appeal to us for His sake and for their own, if we have the truth, to give it them, and in a shape in which it will meet and dispel the error.

Nor is this the only use of controversy. While it is quite true, that a saint may be kept in, and grow up in, the truth without any knowledge of the error, it is nevertheless also true, that if he desire himself to minister, as it is the privilege of all to do, to the need of souls, it is of value surely to be acquainted with the various influences which are at work upon them, and giving form and character to their condition.

Moreover, while controversy itself does not directly feed the soul—and it can hardly be too strongly pressed on those who delight to live in its atmosphere—there is no doubt that it does give clearness and precision to the truth we hold, helps to detect often some error in ourselves that traditional teaching may have involved us in, and to more appreciation of the wonderful power of that Word of God, which, sharper than any two edged sword,

"pierces even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

Let us, then, take up Mr. Sadler. The review of his book will be the review of all the fundamental positions of Ritualistic theology, a system in which thousands of souls precious in the Lord's sight are entangled. "He that winneth souls is wise." May the Spirit of truth inspire us with this wisdom.

The first chapter is devoted to a consideration of the "Scripture Gospel." It will not be hard to summarize the writer's views in his own words, and thus to get clearly before us at the outset what it is we are examining:—

"The word 'Gospel,' in the New Testament, is applied exclusively to the announcement of certain events, occurring at a particular time in the history of the world. These are the Incarnation, Birth, Baptism, Temptation, Ministry, Miracles, Betrayal, Condemnation, Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Jesus. . . . It is not given to any Church to assume to be more spiritual than God's Holy Spirit; so as, in place of the sequence of events recorded in Scripture as the Gospel, virtually to substitute a sequence of certain doctrines, beginning (say) with the secret decree of God respecting the election of the individual soul, proceeding to set forth the effectual calling, conversion, and justification of that soul so elected, and culminating in the present assurance of its salvation. . . . The Gospel does *not* appear in Scripture under the aspect of certain dealings of God with the individual soul apart from its fellow-souls. It *does* appear as certain events, or historical facts, having to do with the Second Person in the ever-blessed Trinity."

He instances the historical character of the four "Gospels," emphasizing, especially, Mark i., 1: "The beginning of the *Gospel* of Jesus Christ;" and then the preaching in the Acts:—

"All the notices of Apostolic preaching which we have in this book, bear witness to the same fact—that the Gospel of the primitive Church was the proclamation of God's love to a sinful world, as set forth in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. . . . Even if we have only the outlines of the Apostolic discourses, these outlines imply that the form of primitive doctrine resembled rather the articles of the Creed than a Calvinistic or Methodistic system. They are outlines which could not possibly be filled up with what is now called a Gospel sermon."

He proceeds to the Epistle to the Romans:—

"In this Epistle we have the Apostle practically applying his 'gospel' to the consolation and assurance of his converts, and so we have the Gospel, as applied by God's Holy Spirit, to

RITUALISTIC AND SCRIPTURE GOSPELS. 33

the assurance and comfort of the individual ; and we find that it is still represented as consisting in the record of the same outward facts, and not so much inward experience, or abstract declarations of the love of God, or of the all sufficiency of the work of Christ. . . . Let the reader mark these words. The Apostle here (Rom. iv., 23-25) asserts that righteousness is imputed to a man, not when he believes that his sins are forgiven—not when he believes he is personally justified and accepted—not when he realizes that Christ died for him in particular—but when he believes that God the Father raised up God the Son from the dead."

"The sects who, at the time of the Reformation, flung to the winds the observance of Easter and Christmas, equally flung to the winds the great outward facts of redemption, as the evidences of God's good will to the sinner, and substituted for them the evidence of inward personal experiences. I do not, of course, for a moment mean to say that they denied the facts, *but they substituted other considerations for the evangelical application of these facts.*"

I only add the following, from the end of Mr. Sadler's second chapter :—

"In conclusion, this Creed is not only a protest against past or present forms of unbelief, or misbelief : it is also a standing protest against the prevalent fanaticism of the day, which calls frantically on the sinner to trust in Christ's 'blood,' or 'finished work,' without any, or with very little reference to, His person. It is a fact that books are now written and circulated by hundreds of thousands, urging men to believe in Christ, without telling them what they are to believe about Him."*

Now, I do not quote all this to condemn it wholesale. I am sure there is not only truth in it, but truth important in its place. *The very danger of it with souls lies in the truth that it contains.* And let this be carefully noted, that there is no more successful way of introducing error than by connecting it with truth, especially if that truth be forgotten or neglected truth. Of course, I do not accuse Mr. Sadler of the least intention to teach error. I have no reason to raise a question of his perfect sincerity in the matter. But that does not alter the character of what he teaches in the least degree.

Before we look at the error in these quotations, let us lay hold, and fast hold, of the truth in them. In the first place, men *have* too much substituted for the great outward facts of the Gospel, as evidence of God's good will to the sinner, the evidence

* "I allude to such books as Reid's 'Blood of Jesus.' I doubt not God often conveys good through such books, just as He undoubtedly conveyed benefit to thousands of souls by the preaching of such men as St. Francis of Assisi ; but Scriptural they are not."

of *inward personal experiences*. It is a mistake which, in some measure, has been the result of the very system which Mr. Sadler upholds : the mass of mere ecclesiastical profession under that system forcing those who would be real to distinguish between the false and the true, by the fruits which a true faith necessarily bears ; and thus far they were justified. They went wrong when they took the rightful test of *another's* faith, and made it a test for *themselves*. Thus their own feelings, their own experiences, became the ground of assurance as to their own salvation. The eye that should have rested continually on Christ was so far withdrawn, and they necessarily fell into doubt by the very means they took to secure against deception.

This was the error, not in general of the Reformers, but of the later Puritans, earnest and godly men, as so many of them were. The result remains to the present day in the evacuating the meaning of the simple gospel message, so that the "Gospel of peace" brings no peace. That Christ died for *sinner*s is owned, of course, but in such sort read as if it were, "He died for *saint*s," so that all their hope is in being able to assure themselves that they *are* saints. For this, their works, their feelings, their experiences, must be appealed to. They ask a deceitful heart if it be changed, and cannot trust the answer that it gives them. They are always examining to see if they are in the faith,* and never can dismiss the question as a settled one. No wonder. "For he that trusteth his own heart is a fool," and they know no better ground of hope than to trust their heart.

Let us, then, lay hold of this truth in Mr. Sadler's statements, that the great outward facts of which the Gospel speaks are the evidences of God's love to us, upon which we are called to rest. Christ died for *sinner*s. My being a sinner is my title to rest in Him. There His love meets me, not as one who has good in his heart towards God, but, with "the chief of sinners" upon that Damascus road : "*when* we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. v. 10). As a sinner, not a saint, I find my rest before God in the work of His Son, and therefore need not be distressed by not being able to make myself out a saint. "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the UNGODLY, *his* faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 5).

(*To be continued, if the Lord will.*)

* 2 Cor. xiii. 5, which is rested on for this, is a *rebu*ke and not a serious exhortation to do so. The passage begins with verse 3, and verse 4 is a parenthesis. "Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, . . . examine yourselves, prove your own selves." They were themselves the proof. And then he asks, "Know ye not, &c.? Have you need to examine?"

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

I.

SCRIPTURE CLAIMS AND EVIDENCES.

To Mr. B. F. Underwood.

SIR,—As you make no secret of your disbelief of Christianity, it can scarcely be offensive to you to be styled an infidel. Did I say “atheist,” according to your own avowments, you would be not unwilling to receive that appellation, only allowing you your own definition of an atheist, as one who “does not say, ‘There is no God,’ but who says, ‘I know not what you mean by God’”—one for whom “‘God’ and the ‘Unknown’ are but two symbols, representing something of which he knows nothing.” These are your own words, and this is your own position as stated by yourself.

People owe you at least some thanks for the candour of that terrible confession. It reveals at once the length to which, with all the help of the science of the present day, you have yourself arrived, and are seeking to lead others. May it not even suggest for yourself the hope, that the sense of that awful darkness in which alone you say you believe, may, in the mercy of Him you know not, yet rouse you to cry out to Him, if haply He may hear, before it be too late for you for ever?

It would be only repeating an old question to ask, what gain you can propose to yourself or others, by converting men to ignorance and darkness as to all that it imports man most to know. It is the custom to answer that truth, inexorable truth, it is, that claims this at your hands. How thoroughly you must be persuaded, at least, that it is truth then that you advance! Is it too much to expect that what you have to tell us, will bear the most rigid investigation that can be given it?—that we shall find no imagination, no speculation, no hypothesis, introducing itself into the clear and perfect demonstration of the folly and unreality of that which has been confessedly the faith in life and death of multitudes in the present and the past? Is it unreasonable that we, whose hope for eternity is to be destroyed by your arguments, should subject them to the fullest and most unsparing examination?

It is this that I propose with regard to what lies now before me: the report of your debate at Aylmer, in June of last year—a report issued, as I believe, with your explicit approbation. I may expect it, therefore, to contain your real sentiments; and, as you are styled “the champion of the *Liberal* party in the United

States"—why "Liberal" I really cannot tell—I may further expect to find in it at least the principal arguments of the scientific infidelity of the day.

Before, however, I turn to these, I must give my reasons for not being able to accept Mr. Burgess, your opponent in that debate, as in anywise a representative of Bible Christianity. His speeches are indeed most imperfectly reported, and I should be sorry to make him responsible for all that he is made to say. Still the report has been issued, and it will be all that many will have to guide them in their judgment of the professedly Christian side of the argument. There are some things also in which he is much too outspoken to be misunderstood. In his belief "the New Testament teaches *nothing whatever about the Trinity*." He is an annihilationist, with the corresponding light estimate of sin and of atonement which that involves. His views of Scripture are of the loosest; and here I must quote from the report: "I do not know of any studied clergyman," he says, "who claims that the whole of the Old and New Testament is a revelation from God, but rather that it *contains* a revelation from God. To say that it *is* a revelation from God, and that it *contains* a revelation from God, are two distinct and separate statements."

Now it would be true in a certain sense to say, that all in Scripture is not, strictly speaking, revelation. It is plain, that the history of men's acts and their sayings, is not properly that. Job's friends did not speak of God the thing that was right. Their sayings, therefore, are no revelation, in the strict sense. Yet the writer of Job was inspired to give us these, and they were needed absolutely, in order to answer the Divine purpose of the book. The whole has been written down with Divine precision and perfectness to that end.

Nor would revelation be needed to give us facts which the writer had known, or could have known, independently of that. *Inspiration* would be, even there, that he might give us *just such* facts, and in such a way as should answer the Divine purpose. The history of creation, on the other hand, must be purely matter of revelation; and here it is that I find in what sense Mr. Burgess uses the words I have just referred to. Thus he says again:—

"In regard to science, I contend that one of the first things necessary to establish anything against the Bible on that point, is to show that it teaches anything whatever, in regard to science, or history, (!) or even professes to do so. . . . The Bible makes no pretension to scientific authority. . . . The author (of the Book of Genesis) wrote, using the current language and opinions of the day. When he spoke of the first and second

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

37

day, he used the current statement of the day, . . . but *even if that be false*, it does not affect the moral nature (? character) of the Bible. So with the sun and moon standing still at the command of Joshua. This story was only used as an indication of that feeling of faith which was assumed to say: 'Never mind, gentlemen; the day is long, and even the sun and moon and stars will wait for us' (!)"

Against all this every Christian feeling, one would think, must make emphatic protest. It is essentially immoral, as it is more than semi-infidel. It is a very easy way, of course, to meet "scientific" objections—conceding all that infidelity in that shape can demand—by a formal surrender of the authority of Scripture in such matters. If he is correctly reported (which I can scarcely believe), Mr Burgess would even extend this principle to matters of history! Perhaps, the account of the fall, as well as of creation. And all this touches not the truth of the Bible, nor affects its moral character! What can unbelief desire more than such a degradation of the Word of God? "God created," "God made," may all be untrue. It may be, He did nothing of the kind. A Scripture statement of the most positive character may dwindle down into "the current language of the day," and preserve all its interest and value for us! Why should not Lyell's "Geology," or, for that matter, Darwin's "Descent of Man," be equally entitled to respect with Scripture?

And then, for the morality Does a lie become respectable, because enshrined in the pages of what is professedly God's precious Word? Or, *just for that very reason*, does it not rather become *there* the most disastrous, the most fatal of all lies?

I refuse this doctrine, Sir, with all my heart. The Scriptures that I hold dear, are not such as for bread would give a stone, or for a fish a serpent. They do not "contain" a revelation, which man's mind is to pick out from the heap of falsehood amid which it lies. They do not even merely give me in a general way the Word, but—as the Apostle puts it of his own and others' teachings—the *words* of God: "Which things also we speak, NOT in the *words* which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Translators may err, of course; transcribers may produce imperfect copies: but the Word itself remains, after all the attacks of men, proved only the more the Word of Him who "cannot lie."

But this want of faith in the Scripture appears in the whole course of Mr. Burgess's argument. Following, I grant, the example of many writers on Evidences, he culls certain "facts" out of the New Testament, and then sets to work to prove these facts by something else—the wonderful success of the religion,

the earnestness and sincerity of its advocates, the testimony of historians, etc.,—everything in short, save the testimony most direct, most convincing, and nearest at hand: the testimony of the Bible itself! This is surely significant. He is appealed to for the testimony of eye-witnesses to the resurrection. There was one who could use, as to himself, language such as the following: "And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, THAT YE MIGHT BELIEVE," (Jno. xix. 35). Yet John's witness is quietly ignored *as proof*, while Josephus, Tacitus, and Pliny are thought credible witnesses. Mr. Burgess well knows, that the faith of no real Christian is founded on these latter; that the mass are almost ignorant of their very existence; that their witness is at best the witness of darkness to light. Why is he afraid to rest the cause of Scripture where Scripture itself rests it, *upon its own inherent credibility and truth?*

For so saith the Word. Need I appeal to it? You yourself must be aware, if you have searched its pages at all, that it is not upon this feeble-kneed "witness from *something else*" (to use Mr. B's own words in another connection), that it founds its claims to be heard and believed. No: the Bible, with the glorious and blessed Person of whom it speaks, says, in the assurance that the simple truth is its own best witness to the true: "If I say the truth, why do ye not believe Me."

Even among men, where it is never wholly unmingled, the speakers of the truth commend themselves to men's consciences. With the utterances of the living and unmixed Truth Himself, how much more so! And how could God be wanting to it, and to those who honestly are seekers after Him, by refusing them the needed assurance? His testimony is precise: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of Myself." Think of His referring men to the courtly sycophant Josephus, or the heathen Tacitus, or Pliny, for testimony to Himself!—He who said: "I receive not testimony from man." As well send them to Pontius Pilate, or to Herod the Tetrarch of Galilee.

No, Sir, it is the mere device of unbelief, or of him who, alas! works in the children of it, to beguile us from our vantage ground. Outside the Word of God what have we but the poor reasonings of our own imagination—darkness, according to your own confession, in the things of God?

And it is plain, if we are to take Scripture at all, we must base its claims where it bases them. How solemn the assurance from Him whom we rightly call Master and Lord, that "if they hear not *Moses* and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded,

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

39

though one rose from the dead !” How truly we may say it of the fuller, clearer, New Testament revelation.

It is this book, Sir, this book, in which we believe. We believe it because it has come to us evidencing itself to our hearts and consciences as a message from God. It has shown us our need, our guilt ; it has shown us His gracious provision for it all—a provision in which the heart of God has been told out to us. God Himself revealed in One who came down into this world. Son of man among the sons of men, lightening the darkness which was ours as well as yours, and bridging over the distance between us and God, and making peace by the love-offering of Himself, by the blood of the Cross. “God commendeth His love to us.” It is its own evidence. No human imagination could have conceived, no human wisdom thought out, the marvellous thought. Much less could wickedness contrive, or goodness impose upon us, so needless, aimless and profitless a deception.

On all sides it is a testimony secured and guaranteed against doubt. The first book of Scripture bears witness to the last, the last to the first ; and all between is linked together by infinite interlacement of wonderfully combining evidence—the witness of ages and generations ; a witness you can no more bribe or pervert, or escape from, than you can bribe the sun to forego its rise, or stop its chariot in the heavens. Israel, in their unbelief, holding fast the one half of this revelation while they reject the inevitable, inseparable other half, are our witnesses in that very unbelief ; witnesses too in their scattered condition, yet nationally preserved ; their land too enjoying its sabbaths and waiting still for their occupancy as they for it. The very corruption of Christianity itself is our witness : Romanism, Ritualism, Unitarianism, the divisions of Protestantism, the growing infidelity of the day—all, all, mapped out by the unerring hand which has written what in ignorance you despise—are our witnesses. Besides this, the thousand tongues of prophecy speak with one voice the omniscience of Him whose utterance they are—Him whom you know not, alas ! And why know not ? O, if He give you yet in mercy to know Him whom you deem “Unknowable,” you will be the first to confess that if men abide in darkness, it is in spite of “light” which “has come into the world,” and for the reason that “men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.” That is what the Scripture says, as you well know. This light is for you, if you will have it ; it will witness against you, if you reject it.

For this whole matter of Christianity is not simply an interesting subject of debate—one in which we may take different sides, and, though in a mistake, be blameless. If your “reason be at fault,” your *heart* is. The evidence is overwhelming. The causes

of unbelief lie all within. "How can ye believe, who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?" "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had *pleasure in unrighteousness*."

You cannot be ignorant, Sir, how common a case it is for the heart to seduce the head—for the reason or understanding to be perverted by the will. This is the secret of unbelief. "With the *heart*, man believeth unto righteousness." With the heart he *dis*-believeth to damnation. Terrible must that condition of heart be which opposes itself to light, when God's infinite mercy stoops to beseech men to be reconciled (2 Cor v. 10). Impossible, when you think of it, that God could make the reception of His Word a question of the intellect, rather than the heart. That He reveals to the teachable spirit of "babes," what He hides from the intellectual pride of the "wise and prudent," is as morally right as it is demonstrably certain. And, it would be a sorrowful thing for us, if it were otherwise;—if the knowledge of the truth depended upon ability to embark in the scientific researches of the day, or the assurance of the Bible being the Word of God depended upon the exploration of a Darwin, or a Tyndall. It is not their fault if they were born at least some centuries too late for this; nor must they complain if we assume to have, independently of them, a faith in Scripture which we believe it quite impossible for them to shake.

For that very reason we need not shirk their arguments. We are sure the science of the Bible is as perfect as all else; and while it is true, it does not affect to teach it, it is nevertheless itself the highest scientific authority there can be, on whatever topic of science it may speak. If it be God that speaks, He cannot lie.

But it would be a long way round to reach faith by this scientific research. Thank God there is a simpler and a surer way, where, though a fool, the wayfarer shall not err. There is One who says: "If any man will"—willeth to—"do God's will he shall know of the doctrine." There is One who bids "come to Him," and He will give rest unto the soul. The truth speaks to the true. The meek will He guide in judgment. Not by a blind and credulous surrender of the judgment, therefore, but by an inshining of the light that dispels all darkness, itself its own best evidence, and revealing all things else as well.

In my next I shall begin to take up your arguments. But oh, that even in the meantime you may have looked for wisdom to Him who "giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not," that it may be given you.

Yours, in most real desire for you,

* * *

[41]

Exposition.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

I.

THE FRAME-WORK OF THE BOOK.—(*Concluded*)

ONCE more, let us turn to the Christian revelation and see how these things connect themselves with what we have seen already to be the end of the Christian dispensation. 2 Thess. ii supplies that link of solemn connection:—"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together to Him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ,"—the editors read, "the day of the Lord"—"is *come*."* The "day of the Lord" at once connects this with Zechariah. The Thessalonian Christians knew it as a time of pouring out of Divine judgment, a time of tribulation for the world indeed unparalleled; and they were afraid, it seems, on account of the trouble they were passing through, and misled by false teachers, that it had already come. "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away (an apostasy) first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, *as God, sitteth* IN THE TEMPLE OF GOD, shewing himself that he is God."

Popery, no doubt, naturally presents itself to our mind, and there is no doubt that Popery has fulfilled, to a great extent, that character. There is little wonder, moreover, that those who were actually engaged in conflict with that terrible power for evil, should have been impatient of any other application of this prophecy, than to the harlot Church of Rome. The truth, nevertheless, is, that Rome has for centuries been "revealed," and yet

* So rightly Dean Alford's revision. The Bible Union leaves "is at hand," but there is no possible justification of it. The word occurs seven times in the New Testament; five times it is translated "present," once in the future, "shall come," and only in the above passage "is at hand." It is here in the perfect, "has come," or "is present."

the day of the Lord is still not come. If the Apostle Paul, therefore, wrote by Divine inspiration for us of another day (as all Christians will admit), he would not give a sign of that day coming which would go on for centuries, and so cease to be a sign. Moreover, the "day of the Lord" having already directed us to Zechariah, and he leading us to Matthew and to Daniel, the "abomination of desolation standing in the holy place" is so simply explicable of one "as God sitting in the temple of God," that an unprejudiced mind can scarcely refuse the application of the one to the other. We thus see how the sacrifice and oblation cease in Israel, how the formal worship of Jehovah in Israel gives place to an idolatry, the issue of the rankest apostasy, which brings the judgment of God down.

But the proof becomes greater still as we proceed. "For the mystery of iniquity doth *already* work,"—before the canon of Scripture was completed, mark, the thing was begun ;—"only he who now letteth (hindereth) will let, until he be taken out of the way ; and then shall that wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit (or breath) of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming."

People again talk of this being the effect of the Gospel. The truth is, it is as to the last words a quotation from Isa. xi. : "He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips shall destroy the wicked [one]." This is the prelude to millennial blessings, as the verses following show. But we have already seen how this time of trouble and sin ends with the "brightness of the Lord's coming." To this is added in the remaining verses in this passage in Thessalonians :—

"Even him whose coming is after the power of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved ; and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

These words predict the solemn close of the present dispensation. They moreover reveal the fact that the Christian apostasy will at the last unite itself with the idolatry set up in Judea ; and the two will end together at the appearing of the Lord.

Now, if in the last place we turn to the Book of Revelations, we shall find a remarkable corroboration of what has been stated.

We have seen in Daniel that the last period of the definite dealings of God with Israel, in order to her final blessing is just

"one week"—the last of the seventy. The prophecy does not state indeed what sort of a week this is ; so that some dispute even its being intended as definite time at all, and contend for a figurative interpretation altogether. It is very true that the general calculation of the period is embarrassed by inattention to the break which I have already mentioned—the long gap of more than 1800 years, filled up with the Christian dispensation. But Scripture actually decides this question so far as the last week is concerned, in the simplest manner, and in this way decides as to the whole period.

The last week is divided into two halves, as we have seen. At the beginning of it the "prince that shall come" confirms a covenant with "the many," the mass of the returned Jewish people. They repossess the city and sanctuary, and commence again, in unbelief as to Christ, their sacrifices to Jehovah. This goes on quietly for the first half-week. Then all is changed. He causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease. Idolatry takes the place of the worship of the true God. The mass apostatize. The faithful ones are persecuted, a little remnant whom our Lord addresses in Matt. xxiv., and who, we must conclude, have some knowledge of Himself. Beside this, there is a desolator from without because of the idolatry. This state of things lasts for the second half-week, that is, for three years and a half.

Now this precise period comes up in Revelation ; not once nor twice merely, but in several connections, and stated in several ways. We have a "time, times and a half," "forty and two months," "a thousand, two hundred, and threescore days," all evidently equivalents of one another, and of a half week of years ; and all connected with the last crisis of "Jacob's trouble," out of which he is to be finally and gloriously delivered.

I can but briefly point out this connection. I would premise, however, that the Book of Revelation never can be understood until we see that chaps. iv. and v. divide it into two parts. The first part is prefaced by the vision of Christ among the candlesticks, judging the churches : that is, as the responsible bearers of light upon earth. Then follows His message to each and all, to which every one that hath an ear is called to listen. This ends solemnly with Laodicea adjudged without remedy to be spued out of His mouth. Then in chap. iv. there is an entire change. A voice from Heaven calls the Apostle up there, and there he sees, around a throne of judgment, yet girt with the bow of promise too, four and twenty thrones, upon which four and twenty crowned elders sit, who, when the Lamb comes forward to take the book, fall down and ascribe to Him the glory of redemption. Thenceforth there is no address to, nor mention of the Church on earth ;

but the Lamb takes the book as "Lion of the tribe of *Judah*, the root of David." The seventh chapter sees 144,000 of the tribes of Israel sealed, so as to escape the judgments coming; and then also an innumerable company of Gentiles are seen with palms in their hands, as victors come out of "*the* great tribulation."

The conclusion is plain, that after chaps. iv. and v. we are entering upon the last week of Daniel's 70. The saints have been raised or changed at what the Revelation itself calls "the first resurrection" (ch. xx.), or what other Scriptures call "the resurrection *from* the dead." (Luke xx.; Phil. iii.--[Greek].) They are caught up to meet the Lord in the air" (1 Thess. iv.), in order to be with Him when He appears; for "when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory" (Col. iii. 4). The rest of professing Christendom is left, alas, to fall under the power of Antichristian delusion and apostatize from the faith. Darkness, deeper than ever yet, falls, and justly falls, upon those who, having the light, loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. The day of grace is closed, and the day of long-tarrying retribution come.

And now the people beloved for the fathers' sake come once more upon the scene. At first, however, impenitent and unbelieving still, restored (as it would plainly seem) to their own land by Gentile policy and the power of the now once more united empire of the West. They return to establish their own worship at the first, but receive one who "comes in His own name," with the formal denial of the Messiahship of Jesus, and of the Christian doctrine of "the Father and the Son" (1 John ii. 22), crowning at once the unbelief of Israel and the apostasy of Christendom. Therefore there is no more delay, but judgment takes its course.

With this brief but solemn period the larger part of Revelation (vii.-xix) is concerned. There are those indeed, and many, who question it on this very account. They deem it impossible that the book of New Testament prophecy could pass over the events of the world's history for so many centuries to occupy itself thus minutely with the details of but a week of years. But the world, lying in the wicked one, has surely little in its dark and troubled history to give it place in the records of inspiration. All that is of the world is not of the Father. If the Church of God has linked herself with it, as indeed is but too true, she has but defiled herself, and not rescued the world from this reproach. Her conduct in this has not escaped the eyes as of a flame of fire of Him who walks amid the candlesticks. Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, have already announced His judgment of it all to

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

45

him that hath an ear to hear. The full ripened fruit *is* seen, moreover, in these chapters now before us, with the fruit too of all earth's produce. And for us even, before it come (and how soon it may, no one may tell), what more profitable than to have before us just the full and ripe result of all now working, yet not of *divine* working, in this busy scene through which we pass? Surely the moral and the use are plain in dwelling thus upon the end of all.

Nor only so. For if, as we have seen, these 1800 years have been in the wisdom of God taken up with the calling out and education of a heavenly people, and His direct dealings with those through whom the blessing is to flow out to the earth at last, have for the time ceased, what more simple than the lapse therewith of earthly history? what more simple than the return to it, just when, the heavenly people being gathered home, God is again at work in a world which has made light of grace, to teach in judgment the inhabitants of the earth the righteousness He seeks from them?

The fact remains, that chaps. iv. and v. interpose between the addresses to the churches and the after-prophecy a vision of saints in heaven,—of a throne of judgment, yet girt around with the token of God's covenant with the earth,—and of the coming forth of Judah's Lion, the Root of David, although as the Lamb slain He takes the seven-sealed book.

But what marks further the exact place in Divine history at which we have arrived is the specification of time before mentioned. The last half-week of Daniel again and again comes before us, with the rehearsal too of the very things which the former prophecies have already linked with it.

Thus in the vision of chap. xii., the woman who gives birth to the man-child is most conclusively Israel, as the child caught up to God and to His throne is Christ. It is He that is to "rule all nations with a rod of iron" (Ps. ii. 9; Rev. xix. 15). Yet very plainly here again we find the prophetic gap of time, and the catching up of the man-child covers as it were the taking up of His people yet to come. They are, too, to share this rule over the nations. (Rev. ii. 27). But what makes plain this application is, that *when* this child is caught up unto God, there follows war in heaven, and Satan and his angels are cast finally out. But these are, while the Church is down here, "principalities and powers in *heavenly* places" (Eph. vi. 12), and we have "the earnest of the inheritance, until the *redemption* of the purchased possession."—(Eph. i. 14). Thus our heavenly inheritance has yet to be redeemed; the heirs made ready, that redemption is effected. But then this is the beginning of the earth's

deepest woe, for the devil is cast unto the earth, and his angels with him. A result is the persecution of the Jewish people, who are preserved of God, though in the wilderness, "for a thousand two hundred and threescore days" (xii. 6), or a "time, times and half a time," that is three and a half years, or half a week.

But we have further details. The next chapter shews us, afresh rising out of the sea, the last beast of Daniel vii., that is to say, the last Gentile empire. It is imperial Rome revived; but mark, upon its heads are the names of blasphemy, and he receives his power and authority no longer as at first from God, but from the dragon. He makes war with the saints and overcomes them, rules over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations, and has power to practise "forty and two months"—again just that half-week of years.

This is the civil imperial power; but in connection with it another beast is seen, not with ten, but "*two horns, lamb-like.*" Here is the spiritual Antichristian power, in which we see the powers, and signs, and lying wonders of the man of sin, the wicked one. I notice this by the way, for there is no further note of time here.

In ch. xi., on the other hand, we have God's witnesses in this time of evil and trouble, and in connection with the city "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt," but in fact "where our Lord was crucified," that is, of course, Jerusalem. These, miraculously protected from the power of the beast during that time, "*prophesy a thousand, two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth.*"

Beautifully it has been remarked how variously this time is counted. *Every day* of the afflictions of the people of His choice; every day of the prophesying of His witnesses; while the time of the beast's power is given in months, the days not separately noted, as of somewhat passed over as rapidly as might be. But still those numbers come up, linked with the events of the last half-week of Daniel's seventy, and in immediate proximity to that coming of the Lord from heaven, with which, thank God, the trial and the evil end.

We have then plainly in all this a remnant of Israel in the last days prepared more and more to receive Messiah when He comes; but the mass of those returned to their own land going over into idolatry, and receiving Antichrist instead of Christ. Hence to the faithful ones the bitterest persecution. The western empire on the one hand, in league with the Antichristian false prophet. On the other hand, an oppressor from without, a desolator from God because of the height of iniquity,—quite distinct from both, but of whom the prophets are full, under the

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

47

names of "the Assyrian," the "King of the North," and "Gog." These give us the separate elements in the prophetic future of the last days, before, in the very extreme of Jacob's trouble, the deliverance comes.

But I can well understand the question, and am prepared both for surprise and incredulousness in the asking, why the Spirit of Christ in the psalmist should link itself thus with the feeble remnant of a yet future day, in this close and peculiar manner? * And the unbelief would be still more natural, nay, justifiable, if it were implied that in linking itself thus with these, the intervening generations of God's saints had been forgotten. Their own hearts are, and have been witness in all time, that this is not so. Nay, in the wonderful wisdom and goodness of God, this link with a latter-day remnant of His people is made in a very simple and intelligible way to minister only *the more* effectually to the comfort and blessing of every generation.

A people are taken up at the lowest ebb of hope, and into whose cup of sorrow every bitter thing is crowded. All the foundations of the earth are out of course. God's four sore plagues are there; death in all that makes death terrible; the enemy without, intestine strife within; seduction, and the open hand of violence; the wrath of man, the dread of Divine wrath; the consciousness of sin aggravated and accumulated. Surely the hearts that bear this burden have need of special comfort, and from God; while that which *can* be comfort in the darkest and bitterest hour of human trial, will be comfort at least equally in any other. Hence the gracious provision for those in such peculiar need is no less gracious consideration of all lesser need. He who stoops to have mercy on the *chief* of sinners is not thereby refusing but *showing* mercy unto *all* sinners. And He who stoops, as here, to the need of the neediest, is surely showing resources and a heart abundantly equal to the need of the less needy.

Looked at in this way, the Book of Psalms gets thus its full character, and the widest possible application to saints everywhere and in all time. While the actual predicted deliverance for those in that unequalled tribulation lies so near at hand, is so mighty, so complete, so altogether of God, that the prophetic anticipations of it which will support the faith of the remnant of that day, furnish for the day of trial everywhere those strong and blessed expressions of hope and confidence which faith in all

* For the proof, however, that this is so, I must refer to the exposition of the Psalms themselves, especially, Ps. i.-viii., xxxvii., xlii.-xlv., xciv.-ci., &c.

ages has laid hold of as God-sent for its need, and found no delusion. For what are all mornings but the assurance of that final one whose brightness shall never end? And what is the light of that eternal day but just the full and unclouded manifestation of a love which, not then beginning, but spanning, as it does, eternity, is as true for faith now as for sight by and by?

Let us once more notice, as the pledge and proof of this, whose are the sorrows really, the sorrows beyond all other sorrows, in the Psalms. Surely we know they are His, who, now ascended, descended first into the lowest parts of the earth. His, whose cup contained indeed the full and perfect mixture of what no other heart could have known, or knowing could have sustained, but His. What an assurance that not the poorest that ever was could be forgotten in the Psalms—of Him who dignifies in them the place of most perfect weakness and most perfect poverty, Himself “a worm and no man!” One pure human heart has known the full depth of human sorrow, and to faith it is bottomless no more.

Slight, mockery, scorn, He knew. Persecution of enemies, denial and desertion of His own, betrayal. If He knew no sin, and could know none, it only made Him the more profoundly, infinitely conscious of what the sin was which He met in every form and shape around, and then bare in His own body on the tree. The forsaking which mental darkness and feeble faith might lead His people to dread at the hands of God, He knew and endured as a reality; drank the cup of wrath, His soul being made an offering for sin. Thus was He proved, and was found perfect in it all; “heard for His piety,” His perfectness; delivered; and “Leader and Finisher of faith” in His own Person, could furnish with the perfectness of His own confidence and rest in God, the hearts of those for whom in grace He stooped so low.

These sufferings and sorrows of the Lord often blend most intimately and blessedly with the sorrows and sufferings of those with whom His heart had linked itself, but often on the other hand come out into a distinctness which would serve to show to the attentive mind Who it is that has thus taken His place as Son of Man among the sons of men. Thus at all times, and before the removal of the veil from off the Old Testament by the death of Christ, many of the Psalms were owned as plainly Messianic. And in these we find the deepest breathings perhaps anywhere to be found of the inmost soul of the “man of sorrows.” They are here breathed as it were into the ear of faith, which has been taught to discern Christ’s voice from every other.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

49

On the other hand, it is most important to remember that the whole horizon of the Psalms is distinctly earthly. As to the Lord Himself, while we have Him here as a living man upon the earth,—as One dying to make atonement,—and even also as One risen from the dead, the Holy One who could not see corruption in the tomb, He is never seen as uniting His people to Himself in heaven, never as opening a way into the holiest of all, and giving us liberty of access there. He sits at God's right hand, waiting for His foes to be made His footstool. He waits in long-suffering grace, soon to rule the nations with a rod of iron. Or He is seen coming to execute judgment ; or come, and sending the rod of His power out of Zion. In any case, as I have said, the horizon, so far as we are concerned, is an earthly one. Judaism looked no further. And thus all that is *distinctly* Christian in its character is inevitably shut out ; so much so, that there is no cry of "Abba, Father" even anywhere throughout the book. The Spirit of sonship plainly had not come. Those who were really sons (as true believers ever were, born of God as truly as ourselves) were yet "under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the Father." (Gal. iv.) The very fact that God *did* say, "I am a Father to *Israel*," is the clear proof that the time had not come for the owning the proper title of the true sons. If Israel had "the adoption" (Rom. ix. 3), and they had,—any and every Jew, born of God or not, had part in that ; and none but the Jew had, however much he might be really born of God.

The death of the Lord in this way is given by the apostle in his interpretation of Caiaphas' unwitting prophecy, as not only for the nation of Israel, the foundation and justification of all their promised blessings as such in millennial times, but also (while maintaining these) "that He might gather together in one the children of God which were scattered abroad." (John xi. 52). Judaism was, as we have seen, inconsistent with such gathering. *Its* congregation was the nation, with no question raised as to conversion as the title to belong to it. The true saints were thus scattered by the system. But Christ having died, "to as many as received Him, to them gave He *right*"—*exousia*, not "power"—"to become sons of God, even to those that believe in His name ; which were born"—and here for the first time in Scripture the full truth comes out about them,—"which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 13).

Thus in the Gospel of John, where we are already in spirit outside Judaism, although historically of course the end of it has not yet come,—when the Jews plead their sonship, "we be

not born of fornication, we have one Father, even God," the Lord already replies, "If God were your Father, ye would love Me," disproving their title upon moral grounds (John. viii. 41, 42). For if Christianity had not yet come, God had long since by Hosea disowned the nation as His people, and they had never yet returned, save a feeble few, out of the captivity in Babylon, which was the judgment consequent upon this sentence. The way thus prepared, John the Baptist comes and singles out the penitent remnant from the mass of ungodly. These receive Christ, and He can say to the rest, "If God were your Father," &c. The last step in this entire change in the outward order, is when Christ having redeemed this remnant from the curse of the law, that they might receive the adoption of sons, by His being made a curse for them upon the cross,—because they were sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts—this began at Pentecost,—crying, "Abba, Father!"—(Gal. iv).

This cry then is not, could not be, uttered in the Psalms. We have not the peculiar language of Christianity clearly here. If there *be* anything peculiar to Christianity, if it be different in any respect from Judaism, then we may not expect to find the characteristics of the New Testament dispensation in the very midst of the books of the Old. And such characteristics are, the believer's *knowledge* of his sonship, access to God in the holiest, and the heavenly calling, to say nothing of membership in the body of Christ. As to the first, the children of God, though heirs, differed nothing from servants, as the apostle teaches (Gal. iv). As to the second, the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest, as we are told in Hebrews (ix. 8). The third point is involved in the second really, for the holy places made with hands were the figures of the heavenly, and the Psalms throughout say nothing more than that "the heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's, but the *earth* hath He given to the children of men." While as to the last, the "body of Christ" was a mystery revealed only to apostles and prophets of New Testament times, as the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians distinctly asserts (ch. iii. 5).

Nay, we must go further still, and maintain that even as to justification itself, the law made impossible the simple and full announcement of it. God was in His forbearance "passing over" sins, indeed (Rom. iii. 25, *marg.*) forgiveness or putting away of this or that sin was positively announced. Nathan could say to David, "the Lord hath put away thy sin." David himself could say, "I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin" (Ps. xxxii. 5).

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

51

The sacrifices spoke continually in the same way, too, and yet the apostle takes up these expressly in Heb. x., to show how opposite was the thought in them of bringing sins continually to remembrance and putting them away little by little, to the "perfecting for ever"—or "perpetually," without interruption again,—of the Christian now by that *one* Sacrifice, by which "the worshipper once purged" has "no more conscience of sins."

The present favour of God the Psalmist might know. In his happier times he might argue even, that it would never be withdrawn. But, though the argument was a good one, he might, and did, lose assurance of it again, and pray God not to enter into judgment with him, not to take His Holy Spirit from him. "Perfecting for ever" clearly was not known then: "the law made *nothing* perfect." God had His own thoughts and purposes of grace, and acted according to these all through; but the time for the revelation of these purposes and this acting had not yet come.

What then do we find in the Psalms? The ways of God in government: ways of infinite goodness, as well as perfect righteousness, though often unfathomable to His creature, man. Hence where there is truest faith, there is at the same time exercise of heart, and a process of discipline wherein "tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope." We find how "blessed is the man that endureth temptation." The will broken, and the soul forced to wait in patience upon God, it is then we see who and what is the God on whom we wait. Patience works experience of unfailing goodness and tender mercy; and where patience has its perfect work, we are made "perfect and entire, wanting nothing." We are still; we know that He is God; and it sufficeth us.

It is not only that His way approves itself to us, and that deliverance in due time is reached. Both things are true. The trial is not for ever, or it would cease to *be* trial. "The end of the Lord," as with Job, shows that "the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy." Nor only so, but "God is faithful, and will not suffer us to be tempted above that we are able, but will, with the temptation, make a way of escape, that we may be able to bear it." Deliverance *from* the trial, and deliverance *in* the trial, are both provided; and this surely manifests in whose hand the trial is. But beside this, the ways of God are good and holy. "His way is in the sanctuary;" blessed to know and find; and none the less so, that we ourselves must be in the sanctuary to learn this.

And there is still that other thing of which I have already spoken, the Divine sympathy with us in the affliction itself, of which the Word made flesh is the full and only adequate expression. It is not only doctrinally that we are told, "In all their affliction He was afflicted." Nor is it even the grace of One who goes with us in the pillar and the cloud we know. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we have beheld His glory. In all the tenderness and nearness of man with man, that glory is at the same time "glory as of the Only-begotten with the Father, full of grace and truth." "Forasmuch also as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same." How this meets us ever in the Psalms we know. And what blessedness lies in thus finding companionship in a common path of trial with the One who was perfect in it, and all whose perfection was brought out by it, as well as the depth of the love which brought Him into it, "the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." Not alone here, but when we come to look into His face in glory, what joy will there be for us in this experience of Himself, fruit of the toil and sorrow of our path down here!

CAN you say, "I am a called one—one with Christ?" And what is the hope of such? Nothing less than reaching the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. It is a *real* thing that Christ is sitting at the right hand of God in all His beauty and glory, and our expectation is the seeing Him as He is, and being like Him. The Father of glory, who looked at you in all your weakness and failure, will not cease working till, one by one, millions of vases shall be made like that pattern vase at His right hand. He is moulding all to the likeness of that One, and when we shall see Him as He is, these bodies of humiliation shall be like unto His glorious body. What a thought! each believer being a vase full of glory; thousands of thousands of vases all to be filled with His glory. God will make you—will make me—to be one of them.

There are two things: the first, God dealing with every individual heart; the other, His taking you as part of a building, a city where every stone is bright and polished, and each one reflecting the glory of Christ. There every saint will show forth to the eye of God, the Lord Jesus, because they will all reflect His glory.

G. V. W.

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I.—(*Continued.*)

CHAPS. I., II.—GOD'S COUNSELS IN CREATION.

THE first day gives us then the entrance of the Word giving light. The state of the creature is manifested by it, but as yet it shines on nought but desolation. Nothing is changed save the darkness ; there is nothing that God can find of good but the light itself. *That* He pronounces so—severs it from the darkness and gives it a place and a name : but the darkness too is named, and has its place, and is not all removed. For not in the earth itself is the source of light, and when turned away from this it is still dark. Practically the day is not all light, but “evening and morning” make it up ; yet, though darkness is in itself “night,” it is well to note that it is never, now that light has once come in, simple and absolute night any more, but “evening ;” some rays of the day there ever are ; and in God's order, too, an evening surely giving place to morning. And then again as to the “morning,” its promise of the perfect “day” is never realised until God's work is wrought out and His Sabbath is reached ; then, indeed, there is no more evening, or morning either, but “day,” without mixture or decline—God's great finality—is fully come.

I do not believe this needs interpreting ; the significance of its voice is not hard to apprehend. And thus not only “day unto day uttereth speech,” but also “night unto night sheweth knowledge.” Dear reader, if perchance one there be who may read this down into whose desolate soul the light has shone, revealing not good but ill, when good has begun to have attraction too, but there is none—you are learning but this first day's lesson. Spite of all that is disclosed, the light is good. Welcome it as from God, the beginning of His gracious work in you, the promise of the day that yet shall come.

The second stage of this Divine work is the making of the “firmament,” or “expanse,” by which a separation of the waters is effected. Strangely misunderstood as it has been by some, it is, one would think, self-evidently, the formation of the atmospheric “heavens,” which draw up now (as they have been doing ever since) out of the deep below, waters which, purged of their saltiness, become the still inexplicably balanced clouds.

The spiritual stage it represents is scarcely more difficult to

- follow. A separation is now effected, not in the external condition merely, but more inwardly. The unseen things operate upon the soul, and attract affections and desires upward to them. That which was "lust" and "corruption" in a heart away from God is thus purified by the new object. It is the "kingdom of heaven" spiritually begun. The heart is under Divine government. And while the general state of the creature remains apparently the same, there is still no fruit nor solid ground—while still "in me, that is, in my flesh, dwells no good thing," yea, while "how to perform that which is good I find not"—still we can say, "to will is present with me," and "with the mind I myself serve the law of God." Peace is not come, nor liberty, nor power; but the heart drawn up to God, that intercourse with heaven is begun, which at a further stage shall bring down showers of blessing to fertilize and bring forth fruit to God.

Still, by the Word is every stage produced. Each time God speaks. It is not mere development of what lies unfolded in the earliest germ. Step by step the forthputting of Divine power accomplishes counsels that are all Divine. "We are His workmanship"—the patient, perfect elaboration of the wisdom of God—"created in Christ Jesus." Happy we, proportionately as we are yielded into His hands, and cast into the mould of His efficacious word!

The "third day" speaks to the Christian heart of resurrection. It is marked here by resurrection-power: the earth comes up out of the waters. That which can be wrought upon and made fruitful is now brought up from under the irreclaimable waste of sea. This is not removed, but bounded and restrained; it cannot return to cover the earth. Its existence is indeed distinctly recognized; it gets for the first time its name from God; in the *new* earth there will be none. (Rev. xxi. 1). Meanwhile He lays the foundations of the earth,* that it never should be moved at any time.

This is only the first half of the third day. It is a *double* day, as we may say, with God. Twice He speaks; twice He pronounces His work good. In the first half the earth is separated from the waters; in the second it brings forth the "grass," the "herb," and "the fruit tree yielding fruit." Let us examine the spiritual meaning of all this.

"Risen with Christ" is the truth that inevitably connects itself with such a figure. Christ having died and risen again for us, His resurrection no less than His death is ours. His death is

* Not the *world*, but that "dry land" which He has just named "Earth."

our passage out of our old state and condition as sinners—as children of Adam. His resurrection is our entrance into a new state and sphere. “In Christ”—“if any man be” *there*, “he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.”

The attempt to read this by experience has been the loss (practically) of its blessedness. Unable to look within and say “*all* things are new,” men have been reduced either to modify this as if it were too extreme a statement, or else to doubt if they were really Christians. Moreover, the trying to produce such a state of things within them has resulted in constant disappointment and real loss of power. They have sought to mend self and produce there what they might find satisfaction in, instead of turning away from self altogether, to find in occupation with Christ and with His love true power over it.

But it is not “if any man be born again” or “be converted.” It is not the result of the work within us that is stated, but the result of the new position before God in which we stand. Acceptance *in* Christ is acceptance *as* Christ. It is no question, therefore, of what is in us at all, but of what is in Christ for us; thus viewed, old things are indeed passed away, and all things become new.

Christ’s resurrection has put us in this new place; we are risen with Him. The acceptance of this blessed fact brings us into rest and peace, and sets us on vantage ground above the water-floods. It is for us spiritually God’s bringing up the earth from under the waves and settling it upon its everlasting foundations. True, the waters are not removed, the flesh is not become spirit, nor done away; on the contrary, it is now for the first time fully recognized as there, and incurable—has its place and its name defined; but the man in Christ has risen out of it—is “not in the flesh.” It is in him; but he is not *it*, nor *in* it.

This is the first part of the day of resurrection only. The second part gives us the fruitfulness which is the immediate consequence of this; for being now “made free from sin,” we are “become the servants of righteousness.” Notice some features here.

God calls the dry land “Earth.” In the original this is a word derived from one which means “crumbling,”* and it is manifestly a chief condition of fertility that earth *should* crumble. The more continually its clods break up into ever finer dust, the more its promise to the husbandman; and this is a simple lesson and a great one. The brokenness of spirit which makes no re-

* *'Eretz* from *Ratz*, according to Parkhurst, Heb. Lex.

sistance to the Father's hand is a main element of fertility in souls wherein He works. It is not power He seeks from us, but weakness; not resistant force, but "yieldingness" to Him. All power is His: His strength is perfected in weakness.

The character depicted here is beautifully illustrated in this very "third day" state in Rom. viii. Up to the very end of chap. vii, in the well-known experience already alluded to, the man in question is profoundly conscious of two "I's" in opposition to each other; "with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin." There is the struggle that convulses him; one part for God and good, the other always contrary—alas, always the stronger too. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" delivers him "from the law of sin and death." Then there are two contrary parties still. But there is a change. The flesh is there indeed yet, and nowise altered, but its now victorious antagonist is not "I myself." That is sunk; it is now "flesh" and "Spirit" that conflict—the Holy Ghost in place of "me."

Oh for constant realisation of this! the dropping (not of the flesh—that cannot be here), but of that good, and right-minded, and holy "I" which is ever weakness, ever inability, with all its pious resolution and good will! "I live—not I—but Christ liveth in me."

Even thus is the fertile earth produced. Out of weakness, out of nothingness, out of infirmities which make the power of Christ to rest upon us, and leave us clay in the potter's hands. The more we know the reality of resurrection, the more shall we know of this.

Then as to the fruit. There is progress; from grass and herb to "fruit tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself upon the earth"—another beautiful figure that. The fruit bears within itself the capacity of self-perpetuation. Itself for the Master's use (and it is well to remember that), the seed is in this fruit according to its kind,—love to produce love, and so on. If we want to find love, we must *show* it. And the riper the fruit is for the Master's taste, the riper the seed is also; the best ripe fruit is that which has hung in the sun most.

All this is simple; and it shows there is a real voice in creation round, to be understood if we have will to understand. The works of His hand bear witness to Himself,—creation to redemption—things seen to the unseen; the thoughts of God's heart, the depths of His love. It is not a mere *accommodation* of these things we are making; they are *designed* witness, though Christ must be the key to all.

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF, &c.

57

And now we are come to the fourth day. Here the entire scene is changed. It is not the laying the foundations of the earth any more, but the garnishing of the heavens. Sun and moon are ordained as light-givers to the earth now made, and for signs and for seasons, for days and years.

And we are not only "risen with Christ," but in Christ, heavenly; "seated together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." This truth necessarily follows that of resurrection, and no view of our new creation could be in any wise complete which left out this. Here it follows then in very natural order, and the language of the type is not hard to apprehend. "Heaven" is, I doubt not, its own symbol, as indeed the firmament, the lower heaven, gives its name to the unseen and spiritual heaven, God's dwelling-place. Applying it in this way, the first object seen in it speaks for itself. Scripture too applies it (Mal. iv. 2). The great luminary of the day, the source of heat and light to the earth, its light self-derived, unchanging, constant as the day it brings,—clearly enough presents to us the "Heavenly One" back in the glory whence He came. The secondary light, light of the night, a light derived from His, yet oh how cold and dull comparatively at the best, changeful—full-faced or dwindled according as it fully faces or is turned away from Him; how easily we read that too, as we read such words as the apostle's here:—"We all with open face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Let us learn the lessons that the moon teaches, for they are serious and yet helpful ones. What more serious lesson than her changefulness? She belongs always to heaven according to God's ordinance. Practically, you cannot always find her there; nay, she is more often (to man's sight, of course) out of the sky than in it. Then when there how seldom full-orbed; how often turned away from Him from whom all her radiance comes! For so it does come; her part is reception merely; she shines perforce when in His light, not by her own effort in the least. And could you go up, attracted by her brightness, to see how fair and glorious she was, you would find yourself *there* not in the glory of the moon at all, but of that sun which was bathing her with brightness.

Then notice her from this earth new risen from the waters. Fair she may be, and "precious fruits be brought forth" by her; yea, "abundance of peace as long as the moon endureth;" still the direct sun-rays are another thing, and are the real fructifying, life-giving influence after all. It is one thing to be occupied even with what we are in Christ—and it is our guide in the night,

too (Gal. vi. 15, 16)—it is yet another to be in the glory of His presence, where moon and stars are hidden in the day.

There is much more here, but I leave it and pass on. The fifth day brings another change of scene ; and here, when we might have thought that we had left them finally behind, we are brought back again to the barren waste of waters. But now even here the power of God is working ; the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and birds fly in the open firmament of heaven. It is still progress in the great creative plan, and new and higher forms of life are reached than heretofore. It is not now grass and herb, but the "living soul," and God blesses them, and bids them multiply.

Can we give this expression ? I believe so. There are harmonies elsewhere that will guide us to an understanding of it.

Take one in the order of the Pentateuch itself, where the same thing occurs—a real progress by apparent retrogression. For if Genesis begins (as we have seen it does) with "Life," Exodus gives us very plainly the *redemption* of God's people ; while Leviticus leads us into the sanctuary of God, to learn in His presence what suits Him to whom we are brought and whose we are. Thus all is progress ; but at the next step this seems ended, for in Numbers we pass out once more into the world to face the trials of the wilderness and the still worse exposure of ourselves that meets us there.

This seems retrogression : still it is progress after all. There is no dislocation of His plan who is ever working onward to perfection. For the world is surely the place where, after we have known redemption and the God that has redeemed us too, we are left to be practised in what we know, that we may be "those who by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."

There is *discipline* in this ; and failure comes out plentifully too ; still we are chastened to be partakers of His holiness ; the new life in us gets practical form and embodiment, as we may say ; in other words—the words of our type—the "living soul" is produced out of the midst of the waters.

For the waters are, as we have seen, the restless and fallen nature of man ; and it is this (whether within or without) that makes the wilderness the place of trial that it is ; yet out of this evil, Divine sovereignty produces good. And again, the "living soul"—since the soul is the seat of desires, appetites, affections, &c.—may fully depict the living energies which lay hold of eternal things amid the pressure on every side of what is seen and temporal. *

* Take Phil. iii. as the vivid portrayal of this.

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF, &c.

59

This, I believe, is the fifth day scene. One day alone remains, and God's work is complete.

And this day, which is a second "third," has its two parts likewise, as the third day had. First, the *earth* (and not the waters now) brings forth the "living soul." It is not now the fruit of discipline, or the chafing and contact of sin and evil, but the development of what is proper to the new man apart from this. Jacob's and Joseph's lives show us this contrast fully, as we may see more afterward. And like Joseph's too, this sixth day shows us next the rule of the man, God's image. I can but little interpret here, it is true, but the outline is not the less plain because of the meagreness of the interpretation. The mere indication may attract some to look deeper into this final mystery of creative wisdom.

For what remains is rest, and only rest, God's rest in love over His accomplished work. Seven times He has pronounced all "good," the last time "very good." Now "evening" and "morning" come no more, but full, ripe, unending "day"—a day blessed and sanctified of God as the day of His rest.

The fuller exposition of this, however, will come more in its place after we have glanced at the dispensational application of the six days' work. For they have their fulfilment also, as I have already said, in the sphere of the world at large, in the progressive steps by which from the beginning Divine power and wisdom have been moving on to the accomplishment of that of which eternity alone can fully tell.

Is Christ looking on you or me, saying, "There is a poor thing as unlike Me as Saul of Tarsus was, but through grace he has learnt to cast away his own righteousness as filthy rags, and become a debtor to God, to have all his sins washed away in My blood ; and he is identified with Me by the Spirit of Life flowing down to him, and I shall soon come down to change and conform him to My own glorious body." It is not enough to the Lord Jesus that His blood has freed our conscience from guilt and saved us, but He must have us with Himself, our bodies fashioned like His own. Whose counsel and plan was to give power, that a poor sinner, kept here for a time in continual weakness, should come forth in the end, having a glorious body, conformed to the image of God's dear Son? Oh, it is a plan altogether above man! There is an answer in Christ's body, for all the weakness in ours.

[60]

Critical.

AN ATTEMPT AT A REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE PSALMS.

III.

A Psalm of David when he fled from the face of Absalom his son.

1. How are they multiplied that straiten me ! Many are rising up against me.

2. Many are saying of my soul, " There is no salvation for him in God." Selah.

3. But Thou, Jehovah, [art] a shield about me ; my glory and the lifter up of mine head.

4. I cry unto Jehovah with my voice, and He answereth me out of His holy mount. Selah.

5. I laid me down and slept ; I awaked ; for Jehovah sustaineth me.

6. I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people, that have set themselves against me round about.

7. Arise, O Jehovah ; save me, O my God ; for Thou hast smitten all mine enemies upon the jaw ; Thou hast broken the teeth of the wicked.

8. Salvation [belongeth] unto Jehovah : Thy blessing [is] upon Thy people. Selah.

IV.

To the chief musician, upon stringed instruments : A Psalm of David.

1. Answer me when I call, O God of my righteousness ! In straitness, Thou didst enlarge me ; be gracious to me, and hear my prayer !

2. O ye sons of men, how long shall my glory be for shame ? Will ye love vanity ? will ye seek after falsehood ? Selah.

3. But know that Jehovah hath set apart the godly one for Himself ; Jehovah heareth when I call unto Him.

4. Tremble, and sin not ; commune with your heart upon your bed, and be still. Selah.

REVISION OF THE PSALMS.

61

5. Offer the sacrifices of righteousness, and put your trust in Jehovah.

6. Many are saying, "Who will shew us good?" Jehovah, lift up the light of Thy countenance upon us.

7. Thou hast given gladness in my heart, more than in the time that their corn and their wine increased.

8. I will both lay me down in peace, and sleep; for Thou, Jehovah, only makest me dwell in safety.

V.

To the chief musician, upon wind instruments[?] A Psalm of David.

1. Give ear to my words, O Jehovah, consider my meditation.

2. Attend to the voice of my cry, my King, and my God; for unto Thee will I pray.

3. My voice shalt Thou hear in the morning, O Jehovah; in the morning will I set in order [my prayer] before Thee, and will watch.*

4. For Thou art not a God† that hath pleasure in wickedness; neither shall evil dwell with Thee.

5. The boasters shall not stand before Thine eyes; Thou hatest all workers of vanity.

6. Thou shalt destroy them that speak falsehood; Jehovah abhorreth the bloody and deceitful man.

7. But as for me, I will come into Thy house in the multitude of Thy mercy; in Thy fear will I worship toward Thy holy temple.

8. Lead me, Jehovah, in Thy righteousness because of those that watch me; make straight Thy way before me.

9. For there is nothing certain‡ in their mouth; their inward part is an abyss,§ their throat is an open sepulchre; they make smooth their tongue.

* "*Set in order*"—the prayer is spoken of as a sacrifice, "*and will watch,*" i.e., for the answer.

† "*El*"—the Mighty or Strong One.

‡ *Lit.*—"Established."

§ "*Havvoth.*"—A plural form from "*havvah,*" to yawn, gape—hence—"lusts."

10. Let them bear their guilt, O God ; they shall fall by their own counsels . cast them out in the multitude of their transgressions ; for they have rebelled against Thee.

11 But all those that put their trust in Thee shall rejoice ; they shall for ever sing for joy, and Thou shalt protect * them ; and those that love Thy name shall exult in Thee.

12 For Thou, Jehovah, wilt bless the righteous ; with favour† wilt Thou compass him as with a shield.

VI.

To the chief musician, on stringed instruments, upon Sheminith · A Psalm of David.

1. O Jehovah, rebuke me not in Thine anger ; neither chasten me in Thy wrath.

2. Be gracious to me, O Jehovah, for I am wasting away ; heal me, O Jehovah, for my bones are terrified.

3. My soul is also greatly terrified ; and Thou, O Jehovah how long ?

4 Return, O Jehovah, deliver my soul ; oh save me for Thy mercy's sake.

5 For in death there is no remembrance of Thee ; in Sheol‡ who shall give Thee thanks ?

6. I am weary with my sighing ; all the night make I my bed to swim ; I make my couch flow down with my tears.

7. Mine eye is consumed with vexation ; it is waxed old because of all my oppressors.

8. Depart from me, all ye workers of vanity ; for Jehovah hath heard the voice of my weeping.

9. Jehovah hath heard my supplication : Jehovah will receive my prayer

10 All mine enemies shall be greatly ashamed and terrified ; they shall return, they shall be ashamed in a moment.

* *Lit.*—"Cover," as Ps. xci. 4 ; cxxxix., 13 ; cxi 7.

† A word which can only be expressed variously in English : "pleasure" "acceptance," "favour," "desire."

‡ The equivalent of the Greek *hades* · the place of the departed.

Practice.

THE SEARCH AFTER KNOWLEDGE.

THE two verses to which I would refer my readers on this matter will be found upon our title page. They contain principles at first sight involving contradiction, in reality in perfect harmony, and of the deepest importance to harmonize in practice. The consideration of them comes in the fullest sense under the head of practice, as relating to the condition of soul needed in order to it.

The passage in Isaiah (xxxv. 8) gives us the simplicity of truth for souls that are in the way. "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the *wayfaring* men, though fools, shall not err therein."

This is a principle of sweetest assurance to those conscious of the folly which is inherent in us all. How precious the plainness of the "way of holiness!" Clearly it is not the subtlety of the wise of this world that is needed for a path to which "not many wise" are called. Nay, it is the first requisite for receiving the Word of God, that if any one be "wise in this world," he should "become a fool, that he may be wise." "Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, *as new-born babes*, desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby."

A powerful intellect is not then what is needed to receive God's thoughts. Nay, the multiplicity of *human* thoughts apt to be entertained by those who have this, is often the most effectual hindrance to their doing so. "Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer"—the reasoner—"of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"

We have but to receive God's thoughts, not think our own. Nor does He communicate His thoughts in other than plain words. It is at least the distinctive style of the New Testament, as the apostle puts it,—"*Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech*" (2 Cor. iii 12). God is speaking to us face to face, with the most earnest desire that we understand Him. How impossible for Him to use hard words and mystification then! Surely it is. "Hidden things," for us in the light of Christianity now, are "hidden things of *dishonesty*," or at least "shame" (2 Cor. iv. 2, *margin*).

But while this is all true, it is not the *whole* truth. This does not mean that Scripture truth lies all upon the surface. It does not mean that there are not "things hard to be understood." Such there are, and things "which they that are unlearned and unstable *wrest*"—alas, it may even be "to their own destruction" (2 Peter, iii. 16). Scripture is simple—not necessarily so *to us*. God's "ways are not as our ways, nor His thoughts, as our thoughts;" hence the difficulty to our minds of receiving them. They *cross* nature. They require that we be not "natural," nor yet "carnal," but "spiritual" men. For "the *spiritual* man," and he alone, "discerneth all things" (1 Cor. ii. 15, *margin*.)

We may perceive thus how often the apostle has to labour to make his hearers (saints though they might be) understand what he was saying. "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you, as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able" (1 Cor. iii. 1, 2). "Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing" (Heb. v. 11). Thus we see the plainness of the Word of God does not by any means necessarily imply *that we shall find it so*. For that a spiritual condition is needed. Hence the "laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings," is in strictest connection with, "as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word." *If the soul is not self-judged before God*, no searching after knowledge will at all avail.

Now look more closely at our first text. Folly shall not cause the wayfarer to err. True, for he has not to think out a path for himself; he has only to receive God's thoughts. But we must not overlook the very plain fact, that this applies to the "wayfarer," and ONLY to the wayfarer. It is not the man not upon the road, but it is the man upon it. Like Israel's pillar of fire which marked out their path, it was not hard for the least intelligent of these to know the way that pillar led, but he must be with the camp and on the march, to know it. There was no "king's highway" along which it moved; no mere chart could reveal the path it travelled; you must MOVE WITH IT, and it would be simple work to know.

Are you a "wayfarer," dear reader? not a mere learner of the geography of the "way of holiness," but a traveller on it? Happy are you! Yea, "blessed is the man in whose heart are *the ways*; who, passing through the valley of Baca, make it a well, the rain also filleth the pools: they go from strength to strength, every one of them in Zion appeareth before God" (Ps. lxxxiv. 5-7). Yes, there is no failure there.

THE SEARCH AFTER KNOWLEDGE. 65

This then makes way for our second text, so contradictory at first sight, so simply consistent and harmonious in reality. "If thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for *hid treasures*"—if there were such a hidden hoard in your garden, reader, *how* would you search?—"then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God" (Prov. ii. 3-5).

Answer to your own soul, believer: did you ever really apprehend that you were to search the Word of God like that? Alas, the carelessness, the lightness, the superficiality everywhere, do readily answer for most, it is not their thought. The characteristic of the day is at least not earnest devoted attention to the words of God. There is much stir and activity in other ways, doubtless. And God is giving out to us, with a clearness and fulness which has no counterpart short of apostolic times, the blessed truths of His Word. This is His grace—rich and precious it is: but what responsibility does it correspondingly lay upon us? How are we answering to it? Is it by a whole-hearted "giving ourselves" to the apprehension and enjoyment of them? Is it not, on the other hand, rather the case, that souls are found lingering upon the very threshold of wisdom (Prov. ix. 1-6),—content, if they know forgiveness, to rest there,—or at least making the acquisition of God's treasure-store a thing by the way, the employment of unoccupied moments merely? Where is the "cry?" where is the "lifting up the voice?" where is the "seeking as silver," the search as for hid treasures?—in a word, the energy of soul in pursuit of things which are all our own, and our only portion—energy to which God has attached the assurance of understanding, of finding knowledge?

Is this a light thing? Does it not rather reveal how little the heart is really engaged with God? Surely it does. Indolence here, whatever excuse we make, is spiritual torpor and indifference every way.

With a multitude, and in very different degrees of actual enlightenment, it will be found at bottom, the thought of God's Word is at best but of a creed which they have got to learn; and he is most acceptable who can give that to them in the simplest way, with the least exercise of soul about it. They learn it as such. Every fresh truth added to the former stock is so much gain to their theological knowledge. It is catalogued as known, and takes its place as a new plant does in the botanist's herbarium; alas, transformed from a living growth into a thing of little beauty and manifestly dead. But God has not written a creed; His words are spirit and they are life: given us in such

a way, that by the very searching into them which we are called to, occupation with them should give them practical power over us. Just as occupation with the world, the *having to* employ our minds, our thoughts upon it in the way we have from day to day, tends to absorb us and assimilate us to it,—so is it designed that similar needed employment with the Word and its eternal truths should counteract this constant tendency, and faith fed by it be the overcoming of the world. The mere creed is powerless for this. The soul *unexercised* by the Word, while it may learn many truths, is proportionately a stranger to their power.

I would press then the consideration of these two texts, advisedly chosen as the motto for our title page. The Lord give us such an earnest “search after knowledge” as may put us in possession of the “hid treasures” of God’s blessed Word : things which “eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man,” but which “God hath revealed to us by His Spirit ; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.”

The Faith.

THE TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

IV.—REV. XIV. 9-11.

* And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation ; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in presence of the Lamb ; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever ; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.”

THE testimony of Revelation is not yet exhausted even with the complete series of passages we have already looked at. The passage before us is, by itself, absolutely decisive of the whole matter. The objections of unbelievers only make the more manifest how decisive it is. Thus Mr. Morris’s argument* is, that this passage only relates to a special class of sinners, and therefore cannot speak of the doom of all. As if the adjudging those that worship the beast to a certain doom proved that others could not share this ! Let Mr. Morris only look at Matthew

* “What is man ?”

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. 67

xxv. 41, and he will find that "everlasting fire" was "prepared," not for men, but "for the devil and his angels," and yet that does not hinder that men should be sentenced to it in the very passage.

Mr. Roberts* enumerates four objections to the orthodox view: 1. That its "'wrath of God' is a wrath always operating in hell from generation to generation, whereas 'the wrath' of the Apocalypse is a wrath that comes at a particular juncture of affairs on earth, when the dead are raised."

As if wrath could not "come" at a "particular juncture," and yet *abide* when it does come!

His second objection is that, according to orthodoxy, the "sufferers of hell fire are immortal souls, while the Apocalyptic drinkers of the wine of the wrath of God are 'men' with 'foreheads' and 'hands.'"

Which Mr. Roberts knows is not a true representation of orthodoxy in the matter, any more than of the text in question. For neither do any believe that people will be *mere* "immortal souls" in hell, but that *body* and soul will suffer together there; nor does the text even speak of men's "foreheads and hands" in connection with their suffering, but with their receiving in them the mark of the beast.

His third objection is, that "hell fire is endured in hell, in banishment from the presence of Christ and the angels, while the Apocalyptic torment in fire and brimstone is inflicted '*in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.*'"

But granted it is inflicted in their presence, it is no reason why the punishment should not involve also the "banishment," as it surely will. I may see one suffering his penalty in prison, and yet his penalty involve that he and I are separate for ever.

Lastly, Mr. R. objects that the orthodox "hell is away from the earth, in some distant transpatial region without solid standing ground; whereas the scene of Rev. xiv. is enacted in the presence of the Lamb, after the Lamb has come to Mount Zion, and taken up his position thereon, with the 144,000 redeemed from among men."

Which is again a misrepresentation of the fact, the *fact* being that in chap. xiv. 9-11, the angel merely announces a thing in the indefinite future, which has no necessary connection with Mount Zion or the earth at all.

All such objections do but tend the more to establish the unutterably solemn truth, and prove it too plain for objection or evasion.

* "Christadelphian," vol. xi. 570.

Questions of the Day.

THE RITUALISTIC AND THE SCRIPTURE GOSPELS.

(Concluded.)

QUITE true also is it, that "righteousness is imputed to a man not when he believes that his sins are forgiven—not when he believes that he is personally justified and accepted [clearly he must be justified and accepted first, before he can rightly believe it of himself]—and not when he believes that Christ died for him in particular." He "died for *all*," and this is what gives any one a title to rest in Him. It is quite true that righteousness is imputed to a man (to quote the Apostle's words somewhat more closely than Mr. Sadler) when he believes "on Him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

But Mr. Sadler goes too far altogether, and shows *for what* he is preparing the way, when he asserts the outlines of the Apostolic discourses in the Acts to resemble the articles of the Creed, and to be such as "could not possibly be filled up with what is now called a Gospel sermon." How many Gospel sermons, I wonder, are continually being preached upon the very words of the Apostle Peter in Acts x. 34-43? How many, in like manner on those of the Apostle Paul in Acts xiii. 32-39?

I shall ask attention to these discourses a little presently. In the meantime it is surely right to ask why Mr. Sadler should prefer the articles of the Creed to the articles of even "a Calvinistic or Methodist system?" For he himself tells us he is not (yet at any rate) objecting to these as untrue in matter, but as unscriptural in *manner*. And spite of the careful words which he generally uses, it is not hard to see that it is the too prominent bringing forward of *doctrines* (even such doctrines as that of the atonement itself), * that he speaks of as "unscriptural." "In Scripture," he says, "what is now called 'doctrine' almost invariably comes in incidentally." An extract before given suggests still more painfully the meaning of this preference of the creeds—I mean that in which he speaks of the "prevalent *fanaticism*, which calls frantically on the sinner to trust in Christ's

* "The comparative space in the sacred volume occupied by these two things is the reverse of what many would have expected. Instead of little being said about the atoning sufferings and much about the doctrine of atonement, little (comparatively speaking) is said about atonement, and much about the sufferings which purchased it."

RITUALISTIC AND SCRIPTURE GOSPELS. 69

'blood' or 'finished work.'" From this "fanaticism" the creeds are indeed free. Sound enough in statement as far as the statement goes, they characteristically and uniformly omit what faith in Christ or in His blood—and *both* are Scriptural expressions—secures to the believer. Neither the so-called Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, nor the Athanasian once intimates what both the Apostles, whose discourses are given in the Acts, are careful to maintain: "The forgiveness of sins" is spoken of in the Apostles' Creed; "*Baptism* for the remission of sins" in the Nicene; in the Athanasian it is told us what it is "necessary to everlasting salvation to believe;" that Christ "suffered for our salvation;" and furthermore, that "they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire." All true and Scriptural; but where is the Apostolic proclamation, "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 38, 39)? Alas! in the days of these creeds this was already very generally ignored. Justification by faith, which no Calvinistic or Methodistic creed could possibly omit, had dropped out, to be replaced,—fatally for the souls of men,—by the ecclesiastical system of Mr. Sadler, and men's works. The atonement, not denied, was (as Mr. S. suggests) left in the background, or allowed to give efficacy to baptismal water, and to put men on the old legal footing, by which (the Apostle tells us) none could be justified.

One intimately acquainted with the writers of the Nicene age, and moreover a member of the religious body to which Mr. Sadler belongs, has described it briefly thus:—"The florid orators, bishops, and great divines of the fourth century, we find, one and all, throughout the East, throughout the West, throughout the African Church, lauding and lifting to the skies whatever is formal in religion, whatever is external, accessory, ritual, ecclesiastical. It was upon *these* things that they spent their strength; it was these that strung their energies, these that fired their souls. Virginity they put first and foremost; then came macerations of the body, tears, psalm-singing, prostrations on the bare earth, humiliations, alms-giving, expiatory labours and sufferings, the kind offices of the saints in heaven, the wonder-working efficacy of the sacraments, the unutterable powers of the clergy—these were the rife and favoured themes of animated sermons and of prolix treatises; and such was the style, temper, spirit, and practice of the Church from the banks of the Tigris to the shores of the Atlantic, and from the Scandinavian morasses to the burning

sands of the Great Desert—such, so far as our extant materials give us any information.” *

Thus we can tell quite well what “baptism for the remission of sins” meant in the thoughts of the Nicene theologians: “Although a man should be foul with every vice, the blackest that can be named, yet should he fall into the baptismal pool, he ascends from the divine waters purer than the beams of noon.” “Those who approach the baptismal font, although fornicators, &c., are not only made clean, but holy also, and just.” So speaks (alas!) John Chrysostom.† So speaks in him the current sentiment of the day. And so completely did baptism avail to wash away all sin; and so painful and uncertain was the purification of sin after baptism, by penance, &c., that many (as is well known) deferred their baptism to a dying bed, that the sins of a life might be washed away together.

In presence of such a system, no wonder if what the Apostle declared in the synagogue at Antioch could find no utterance. In atonement (in some sense) they might believe, but it is plain it could have no prominence. “The pool of regeneration and justification” had displaced practically the blood of the Cross. And to this Mr. Sadler would bring us back. He would have us repeat the articles of the Creed, keep doctrines in the background, and while speaking reverentially of the person of the Lord, and bidding people believe in Him also, would check the frantic fanaticism which speaks too loudly of trusting the blood of Jesus, and stop the circulation of a book which carries that “blood” upon its title page.

And why? It is not hard to fathom, any more than why the Nicene “Fathers” should do a similar thing. In both cases it is to bring in a ritualistic system, and make the Church and church-ordinances the channel of salvation.

Tested by Scripture, this will not stand a moment. If in the Gospels you find the great basis-facts of Christianity, in the Epistles you find no less its doctrines—not in the background, but in the fore front there; and Christ is “set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood” (Rom. iii. 25), we are “purchased with His blood,” “justified by His blood,” have “redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;” are made nigh by His blood;” obtain “peace through His blood;” have our “conscience purged by His blood;” “enter into the holiest by His blood;” are sanctified by it; cleansed from all sin by it.

* “Ancient Christianity,” by Isaac Taylor. American Edition, pp. 363-364.

† Quoted, *ibid*, p. 325.

RITUALISTIC AND SCRIPTURE GOSPELS. 71

There is no mere vague, misty teaching that in some way or other He "suffered for our salvation;" but the clearest possible statement that by simple faith in Him we are justified and forgiven. The wonder-working "pool of regeneration and justification" is nowhere. We are "justified by His blood," through faith, not baptism. We are "born again of the word [not in baptism, but] which by the Gospel is preached unto us" (1 Pet. i. 23-25.)

The question of baptism will come up fully in another place. Meanwhile, let us turn to the two accounts of Apostolic preaching before referred to, and see how far the outlines can be "filled up with what is now called a Gospel sermon."

First, let us again listen to Paul's words in the synagogue of Antioch. He has dwelt upon the person of Christ truly, His life, His death, His resurrection. Does he end like the Creed there? In truth, he does not. "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Oh, for a voice like that to break the death-like silence of Nicene theology! No Ritualism, no ordinance does the Apostle preach; no works of men, no keeping of law. Law cannot justify. Neither doing one's duty to God, nor to one's neighbour. "By Him *all that believe are* justified from all things." Blessed, blessed news! The faith of a poor sinner in the sinner's Saviour justifies at once, without baptism or work of any kind. Beloved reader, *this* is what we call the Gospel now. It is really "gospel"—God's "good news," giving you Christ as your immediate Saviour, and filling your heart with peace and joy in Him in a way no ritualism ever can.

But "the testimony of two men is true." The testimony of Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, and of Peter the Apostle of the Circumcision, ought to be sufficient for the convincing of any. The ritualistic Church of Rome denominates Peter first Pope, and great head of Ritualism. Let Peter then tell us the Gospel that he preaches.

In the centurion's house Cornelius and his friends are gathered together, to hear "*words* whereby they shall be saved." Of what has the Apostle to speak? Of the Person of Christ, no doubt, of His death and of His resurrection. Does he stop there?—develop no doctrine?—make no application of these wondrous facts? No: but once again we hear: "To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name, *whosoever believeth in Him* shall receive remission of sins."

And yet again there is no baptism, no ordinance, no Church, in all this. And at this point, the Spirit of God puts the seal on

Peter's testimony : "The Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word" They were sealed with the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father, they were baptised by One Spirit into the "one body," the Church of God : children of God, and members of Christ, *without* baptism or ordinance at all : apart altogether from church ministrations.

" *Then* answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptised, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we ?"

The first Gentile converts were baptised, not to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, but because they had received it

God had spoken, and separated the gift of His grace from the suspicion of being tied to ritual and ordinance, for all that have ears to hear, for ever.

Beloved reader, "if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater." Will you receive it, if yet you have not, and the peace preached by Him, through Jesus Christ—remission of sins and justification from all things, by simple faith in Him who died for you? Do this, and you will have the rest which He promises to those who come to Him. Do this, and the shadows of ritualism will disperse before the living beams of the Sun of righteousness.

Mr Sadler's "gospel" lacks then that application of Christ and His work to the sinner's need, which gives point and power to the Apostle's preaching. And in the very first instance of salvation being brought to the Gentiles, God Himself must, according to his thought, have set aside His whole plan of dispensing it by church ordinances. And for what purpose? Not even to convince an incredulous apostle, for already had *he* said : "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons," and even if not, it would have been a marvellous way to take to do so, to depart from His method of saving souls, and leave us the full length record of having done so, to be a sword in the hands of anti-ritualists against the true interpreters of His holy Word.

If He have not done this, then Mr Sadler must himself confess, that what he would bring in under cover of his undoctinal and historical gospel, is the mere and sad perversion of all Gospel truth.

[73]

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

II.

LIGHT SHINING IN A DARK PLACE.

To Mr. B. F. Underwood—

SIR,—Viewing the matter in the way I have already stated, you will easily perceive that your scepticism as to the facts of Christianity affects me very little. The Bible being for me true and divine, I confess I do not want any proof that Jesus lived, or died, or rose again from the dead, other than this, which you will not question, that *it teaches it*. You must shake my faith in its teachings, if you can. It is only here that you will draw forth a reply from me.

Understand fully why I take this course. It is not because I believe that nothing can be proved by the style of argument which Paley and Lardner have helped to make so fashionable. My objection to the historical proof is not that it is no proof, but simply that it *is* historical; and I have a great objection to wandering so far in search of what lies so much nearer at hand. I am glad to know that there are witnesses in abundance who speak in other tongues than those of the learned, and are capable of being consulted by both classes of those to whom we, in our sphere, are as much “debtors” as the great apostle of the Gentiles—“Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise” alike. Blessed be God! He ignores none, overlooks none; when He speaks, heaven and earth bear witness, and the simplest soul can understand.

I open Scripture. I look upon the world around. I find on every side—and within myself also, but I do not now speak of this—a hundred witnesses to Him who speaks in Scripture. It is not the dead past that I need disentomb even. The present speaks to me of the ever-present, of Him who has seen the end from the beginning, and to whose eyes all things are naked and open—Him with whom we have to do.

The world, Sir, is His witness; the world—Christian, heathen, infidel, or what else. Wherever one’s lot may be, no place so desolate but it is peopled by these proclaimers of His being and truth; none where the voices of the prophetic Word awake not on every side the confirmation of His omniscience, whose word it is.

I know that you have elsewhere adduced the present condition of Tyre and Babylon in disproof. Tyre was to be made like the top of a rock, a place to spread nets on, and not to be built any

more (Ezek. xxvi. 14). You claim that inasmuch as it has at present a population of 5,000, "there is not a clearer proof of the failure of prophecy in the Bible." I may easily grant there is none clearer; but who told you that its *present* condition was its final one? Until you have settled this, you may as well prove that the destruction of the world is disproved by the fact that it still stands untouched.

And so precisely as to Babylon. Grant that it was never to be inhabited, no Arab to pitch tent, no shepherd make a fold there, and yet that the town of Hillah stands in the centre of the ancient city. What then? Of course, if Scripture has said that in 1875 this was to be, it is convicted of mistake. It does not say *this*, as you well know; therefore, the mistake is your own.

But more than this: it is a mistake made in the presence of so many of those witnesses for God I just now spoke of, as to make it a serious and solemn one indeed. If already Babylon lies a desolation—heaps—a possession for the bittern, and pools of water,—if already the Arab trembles to pitch tent there,—if already the wild beast has its haunt there,—if so many parts in the prophetic picture are already filled up, should you not be afraid to speak against Him who can thus make the slow lapse of centuries to fulfil His word, merely, forsooth, because that Word be not yet perfectly fulfilled, as it surely shall be? I see nought that that little town of Hillah, still left upon the otherwise deserted site of the world's ancient metropolis, should preach to you more earnestly than the patience of One who has eternity in His hands, and is in no haste to justify His truth against the cavils of the child of yesterday.

But to come nearer home. There is a people we need not travel out of our neighbourhoods to see; they are to be found everywhere amongst us, never *of* us: in race, in appearance, and in faith distinct; a nationality, broken, scattered for centuries, yet mysteriously preserved; claimants of a land which has been lying under the hand of God and man, vacant or well nigh so, as if expecting their return. You well know to what people I refer. But although they are, as to Christianity at least, as stubborn disbelievers as yourself, and although their disbelief is made more significant by their being the very people from whom the Word of God came forth, I do not find you summoning the incredulity of Israel to help your own. I will not say, you are afraid of such allies. I will say, you have at least cause to be. But however this be, I will do what you have omitted. I will summon Israel to bear witness for their God.

Alas, that it should be their shame that should be witness!

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

75

yet let God be true, but every man a liar. That through their lie the truth of God abounds yet the more unto His glory is indeed the case, yet in nowise to their excuse. I call in evidence :

1. *Their dispersion.* It is notorious that they are exiles from their own land, and dwellers amid every nation under heaven ; that their city and land are possessed by strangers and enemies ; that they have been the constant victims of persecution, a by-word and a reproach, and in various degrees and different places are so still.

But all this was long since written down by the finger of God. concerning them. When they were first planted in their land, they were expressly warned that if they hearkened not to the voice of the Lord their God, they should "be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth," that they should "become an astonishment, a proverb, and a by-word among all nations ;" that the Lord would bring against them "a nation from afar," "a nation of fierce countenance," who should besiege them in all their gates ; and that He would "scatter them among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other" (Deut. xxix). Jeremiah assures them definitely that this was now determined as to them because of their sins" (xvi. 13). Micah distinctly specifies the ploughing up of Zion as a field, Jerusalem becoming heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest.

This is from the book which they accept as God's word to them. The book which (alas) they reject commits itself to the positive prediction of how long this dispersion is to last : "They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations ; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled" (Luke xxi. 24). It is plain that the time of Gentile domination still lasts ; Jerusalem is still trodden down by them, and the Jews are still dispersed. Nearly eighteen centuries have already tested the truth of the remarkable prediction of *a thing which has not anywhere its like* in the history of nations.

2. I adduce in evidence their *national preservation.*

If I take Scripture, it is plain that they have the promise of national continuance. Jer. xxxi. 36, 37 is alone sufficient proof of this. But how unlikely a thing in view of all the circumstances ! Their land, too, is to be theirs again, and in perpetuity, as the last verses of the same chapter witness. I need not tell you how it lies, though under the heel of the Gentile, almost vacant for their occupation still. This fulfilment of Scripture cannot be a fraud ; is it a chance, or what ?

3. I call to witness their *national unbelief.*

Scattered through a host of Christian nations, and with every

worldly motive (for we must not assume others) to conform to the prevailing creed, they have remained proof at least against persecution and allurements alike. In no one of these countries have they been absorbed by a religion before which every form of heathenism disappeared: and where wisdom, and riches, and union, and imperial might availed not in the struggle with the rising power of Christianity, they, scattered, and broken, and impoverished and enfeebled, have held out undismayed and unenticed, and even under the very eyes of pontiffs, and in the capitol of Rome itself.

This is the one side of the picture: now for the other. Take the New Testament,—ay, or the Old. “Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For He shall grow up before Him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him: we hid as it were our faces from Him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not.” So the prophet, for the people. “They shall smite the judge of Israel,” says another prophet; and the next verse shews this is the King born in Bethlehem, but “whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting;” “they shall smite the Judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek . . . *therefore shall He give them up*” (Mic. v. 1-3). This is from their own inspired book.

(To be continued.)

“IS THE BODY ALL?”

THE acknowledged leader of the “Christadelphian” section of annihilationism has been reviewing the arguments against it as put forth in “Life and Immortality.”* The subject is of such exceeding importance in the present day, that it cannot but be of use to take up his review in the main points of it, especially as Scripture is throughout appealed to, and the examination of Scripture can never be attempted in vain by one really desiring to be in subjection to it.

The first section of the book Mr. Roberts is reviewing, raises the question at the head of this paper, “Is the body all?” and

* Published by R. L. Allan, 73 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow,

brings forward the Scripture phraseology, "in the body," "out of the body," "in the flesh," &c., to show that the Word of God declares the body to have a tenant which in many passages is identified with the man himself—the body being compared thus to a tabernacle or house in which the man dwells, and which he puts off or leaves at death. While on the other hand, many passages using the common language of sense identify man with his body; but that this language cannot imply (as materialism would have it) that the body is all, is shown by the name "Jesus" being given to His body when laid in the grave. This could not be taken to mean that the Lord was "all body," as similar words are held to do as to Stephen, &c. For being God and man, this thought is in His case precluded.

Mr. Roberts first objects that it is not defined whether a "living" body is meant or not. "If so," he says, "we admit the charge of holding that the (living) body is the whole man, and are wondering what objection Mr. Grant himself can have to this view; for even with his immortal soul theory he cannot avoid regarding the living body as 'the whole man,' since the living body contains (!) that which his theory teaches him to regard as the principal part of man."

So that if the house "contains" the man, the man and the house are all one, with Mr. Roberts. I need not discuss that, I am sure.

In answer to the passages quoted—"in the flesh," "in the body"—he tells us that he finds the "apostles using phrases inconsistent with Mr. Grant's explanation of them." He adduces Rom. vii. 18: "I know that in ME (*that is, in my flesh*) dwelleth no good thing," and says, if Paul had believed in immortal soulism, he would have said, "my flesh is not ME." Moreover, that Paul attributes sin to the flesh here, and not to the soul.

All this, of course, springs out of the error that "flesh," as used by the apostle here, means "body." In fact he with Dr. Thomas takes the expression "carnal mind" in Rom. viii. 6, which he translates the "thinking of the flesh," as a proof that the *flesh thinks*. On this supposition, it is hard to understand how the apostle opposes (in vii. 25) the "*mind*" to the "*flesh*:" "With the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin." Here he identifies "himself" with the "mind" which served God, and not with the flesh at all. If, as with Mr. Roberts, the mind is only the working of the flesh, no such distinction is possible. Therefore the apostle's words are all against him, and conclusively so.

Every Christian of the least intelligence knows, that there is a use of the word "flesh" in the Scriptures of the New Testa-

ment, according to which it stands for the evil nature derived from Adam. When the Lord says "that which is born of the flesh *is* flesh," he uses the word the last time to characterize *morally* all that naturally comes of us. Therefore the absolute need of the communication of a new nature, "ye must be born again :—" "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." When born again, and possessors of that spirit-nature, the flesh lusts against and is contrary to the Spirit. And in the words so misunderstood by Mr. Roberts, "the mind of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be ; so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God."

Hopeless indeed would be man's condition, if Mr. R.'s interpretation were the true one, and man in the BODY was ever and only opposed to the law of God, and could not please Him! And strange enough would be that which the apostle affirms of Christians, that they are "*not* in the flesh." The whole use of the language here is foreign to materialistic speech.

The only other Scripture that Mr. Roberts dwells on, is 2 Cor. i. 8. His use of it is, if possible, still more singular. From the apostle's speaking of "having the sentence of death in *himself*," he asks, What self is that? and answers that since an immortal soul could not die, it must be Paul's body, and then he calls his body "himself." Supposing that to be so, it would be quite in accordance with the teaching he is opposing, and no argument at all against it. To quote from the book he is reviewing:—"Neither body, nor soul, nor spirit, is the man exclusively, but 'spirit and soul and body' (1. Thess. v. 23), make up the man ; *in such sort, that he may be, and is, identified with either, according to the line of thought which is in the mind of the speaker.*" This is a distinct recognition of the fact, that man is identified with his body in Scripture, while it shows how pointless is Mr. Roberts' argument.

As to what he still further objects, that "Paul looks to the resurrection for hope," which he would not have done if he had recognized "immortal soulism," he is mistaken in both respects. Paul looked to *the God* of resurrection and got present deliverance ; and moreover, we may fully recognize that the soul is immortal, and yet look for resurrection (or the change of the body), as the only complete and proper salvation.

The list of texts which follow, no Christian has any difficulty with at all, and we must wait till Mr. R. can point out what it is. To look at them is to get another impression than he would give us, and that is that none but a drowning man could catch at them to support himself by. Think of quoting "MY DECEASE" (2 Pet. i. 15), literally "my *exodus*," or "DEPARTURE," for

IS THE BODY ALL?

79

such a purpose! Think of supposing that "*I was unknown by face,*" or "whatsoever a *man* soweth, that shall HE reap," or "avenged the *blood of HIS SERVANTS,*" with all the emphasis that italics and small capitals can give them, will convict immortal soulists by their bare citation! We thank Mr. Roberts sincerely for these proof-texts. They are abundant proof of the utter baselessness of his views as to the points in question.

After all this he comes to the passages which he has to meet. In "the life which I now live in the flesh," he says, the apostle "merely gives practical definition to his present existence in contrast with the life that is to come." Very well; but that is not at all the question. The question is, why such an expression as "in the flesh" at all, if he were nought but flesh? This is what Mr. R. can never answer. He does not pretend to.

Again, "when he says, 'in this (body) we groan, being burdened . . . not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon (with our house-body from heaven), that MORTALITY might be swallowed up of life,' it is a wonderful treatment of language to understand him to mean he is anxious for the (supposed) immortal to quit the mortal, and mount to 'realms above.'" This is *not* the way we understand him. Mr. R. knows well enough that "unclothed" is our synonym for the disembodied, and "clothed upon" for the resurrection state. It is this the apostle *longs for*, not death. But why these expressions, "unclothed," "clothed upon," &c.? *Who* or *what* is clothed or unclothed, Mr. Roberts?

I follow on: "When, therefore, in the following out of this idea, he says in immediate connection, that while at home in the body he is absent from the Lord, it is doing violence to the subject to understand him to mean that he must die to be with the Lord." This is again only Mr. Roberts' supposition, which he follows up with the assertion that in 1 Thess. iv., Paul teaches that it is *only* when the Lord comes we shall be with Him. This is quite true for those whom he there speaks of as those "who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord," and quite untrue as to those who die before it. For while the apostle *need* not die to be with Him, and *longs for* the clothing upon with the resurrection-body, he expressly states that, "knowing that whilst at home in the body we are absent from the Lord," he is "*willing rather* to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." And then the question again, What is the force of these expressions? Absence from the body cannot be resurrection, by any possibility whatever. It is disembodiment. And who or what is absent?

Mr. Roberts has no answer, but turns to 2 Cor. xii. 3, to say

that "Paul's doubt is as to whether the things he saw were real or merely visional. If it was in a body he saw them, they were actual; because to see things actually a man must be bodily present. If without the body the things were seen as in a dream," &c. Now, mark the consistency of all this. Further on Mr. R. will tell us Paradise is a future thing, and has no present existence. Here, however, he will have that he did not know if he actually SAW WITH HIS EYES this thing that does not yet exist, or not: Truly, "the legs of the lame are not equal."

But the apostle is in no such doubt, and leaves us in none. "Such an one caught up to Paradise"—that he *knew*. Paradise had real existence, and he was there! That he affirms; but whether in the body or out of it, he never knew. Did Mr. Roberts, with his theory of "thinking flesh," ever even *dream* "without the body," and then awake and be ignorant ever after of whether or not he had been carried bodily to a place which he knew had no existence?

Once more: as to Job's saying, "In my flesh shall I see God," the real question is, what about this expression "in my flesh?" How else could Job see God, if Mr. R.'s theory is true, but in his flesh, save haply, as Mr. R. has suggested in the previous case, "dream of Him?" But that will scarce do here.

Finally, Peter's "putting off his tabernacle" is indeed his "decease" (departure) and his "death." These are three synonyms for the same thing. Mr. Roberts is a little bolder here, as the word "tabernacle" will allow him to call this "figurative." No doubt it is; but figurative of what? Listen to Mr. Roberts: "All that constitutes our individuality dwells in the body of our humiliation; but the destiny of the saint is to have 'this corruptible' 'clothed upon' with a 'subduing energy' that will change it from flesh and blood nature into spirit nature." (Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54).

In neither place is that said. It is industrious patch-work to cover up a hole, but which only makes it worse. We are not clothed upon with an *energy*, but with a house from heaven. Mr. R.'s dilemma is apparent. Even according to a figure he wanted *something* to "clothe." He could not clothe one body with another body: so he clothes it with a "subduing energy," instead. In Scripture the body is the clothing—I grant the figure—but what, Mr. Roberts, does this body clothe?

I close for the moment here. But oh that He who alone is able, may awake some that read this, out of this snare of Satan. His it is, however subtly disguised. Let us remember how once he said, "It is written," and how He to whom He spake it answered, "It is written again."

[81]

Exposition.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

II.

THE NUMERALS OF SCRIPTURE AND THE BOOKS OF MOSES IN RELATION TO THE PSALMS.

NEXT to the Jewish character and latter-day reference of the Psalms—points we have already been considering—it is of the greatest importance to understand, as an external aid to the right conception of them, two things which are closely connected together, and which have been generally overlooked. The first is the parallelism of the five books of the Psalms with the five books of Moses, book with book, in their main characteristics. The second is the significance of Scripture numerals, which, while seen and admitted in a general way, has never (to my knowledge) been given any place in connection with the interpretation of the Psalms, while it does really afford great light as to the structure and connection of the five books which compose, as we have seen, the book as a whole.

For the Book of Psalms, like all other books of Scripture, *is* a whole, and a divine whole ; not a mere human collection even of divine songs, but (whoever might be the collector) a *divine* collection , inspired of God as to the internal arrangement of its several parts, as well as in all else. Man might be the instrument, but under a divine control which would admit of no discordant note in all the wondrous harmony of praise which he is here made to give forth.

And the acrostic or alphabetic psalms may prepare us for a kind of condescension to man's ways which we should perhaps be slow to anticipate in connection with the book of inspiration. Every one knows, for instance, that the 119th psalm is arranged in octaves throughout. The first eight verses each begin with the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the second with the second letter, and so on to the end of the alphabet and of the psalm. We may be able to perceive the meaning of this, or not. that is not the question. It is very certain that we should never have thought of the Spirit of God writing an acrostic. Yet He has been pleased to do so. Is it too minute to affirm that there must surely be

some reason for this regular recurrence of the number eight all through the psalm, as well as for the alphabetic character of it? We may rightly dread lest fancy should intrude into the interpretation of this; but interpretation there must nevertheless be. And the minuteness of it, if such it be, may prove no objection but the contrary, to him who has been accustomed to trace the beauty and glory of divine workmanship.

Again, let any one but glance at the last New Testament book and ask, is there no significance in this number "seven"—seven churches, seven stars or angels, seven spirits, seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials—which again and again recurs in it?

He who admits this will soon find that he cannot stop with it. If he look more closely at these sevens, he will find that they commonly divide themselves into four and three—too commonly for him to doubt that there is meaning in this also. Of the seven churches, *three* give the promise "to him that overcometh" *after* the call, "He that hath an ear to hear;" *four* reverse this order. The first four seals are opened by the "beasts" or "living creatures" crying "come," and in each case a horse and his rider come before the seer; in the last *three* it is not so. So the last three trumpets are distinguished as special "woes" from the first four (ch. viii. 12, ix. 12). In the *seven* parables of the "kingdom of heaven" in the 13th chapter of Matthew (similarly *four* are spoken in the presence of the multitude, *three* to the disciples in the house.

The more we inquire into this, the more we shall be convinced that there is a very constant use of numbers in Scripture, in a way which cannot but have spiritual significance. This significance we may now attempt to trace. And although the attempt may have but imperfect success, it will nevertheless do all that will be needed to convince the humble student of the Word of the treasures that may reward his search in perhaps to him a somewhat new direction.

The number *one* will be seen without much difficulty to stand for "unity" and "supremacy." It is the number of the One God as Sovereign Master of the whole scene of His creation; the first elementary truth is that God must *be* God. It is thus manifestly that the first book of the Scripture, Genesis, represents Him sovereign in counsel, almighty in power.

Two is the number of competent testimony: "the testimony of two men is true." So in the law, "*two* tables of the testimony." So God's "*two* witnesses" in Revelation. The Word, God's witness to man, is thus divided into *two* Testaments; and the *second* person of the Trinity is "the true Witness" and the

"Word of God." The second book of the Pentateuch moreover, Exodus, the book of redemption, speaks thus of the Son, the Redeemer.

Three is the number of the persons in the Godhead, therefore of divine fulness and completeness, as well as manifestation ;* for the one God (unknown in his proper character when known only as that), is unveiled to us in these three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Thus the *third* person is also the Revealer, the Teacher of all things. And the third book of Scripture, Leviticus, leads us into the sanctuary, as priests, to learn there what suits his presence. So too, because God manifests Himself in resurrection from the dead, coming in where all hope from man is absolutely gone, the "*third* day" is the day of Christ's resurrection, and the number is very often connected with this forth putting of divine power, whether in physical or spiritual resurrection.

Four is the number of "the four corners of the earth" or the "four winds of heaven." It is the *world*-number, looking at the world as the scene of trial and probation, where on every side he is tested and tried by that which comes upon him from without, and what he is comes out. He is taken on every side, surveyed and exposed—looked at from every point of view. The *four* gospels give the Lord in this way tried, and all His perfectness brought out by it. And it is evident how the fourth book of Scripture, Numbers—Israel's probation in the wilderness—gives just this side of things. The parallelism of the books of the Pentateuch with these numerals is so far manifest.

The next two numbers are somewhat more obscure to trace in Scripture. The number *five* I have already spoken of as the *human* number, characterising man by his possession of those five senses by which he is in connection with the scene around. We have seen how the books which are distinctly man's utterance in the Old Testament, are stamped with this number: five psalm-like books, five books of the Psalms proper, and these end too with a fivefold hallelujah, the full utterance of praise at last from the full heart of man. Deuteronomy, moreover, the fifth book of the Pentateuch, so far at least corresponds, that it is the *people's* guide book as Numbers is that of the Levites, and Leviticus the priests'.

The number *six* will seldom come before us, and is much more difficult to trace. To me it seems characterised as the number of the work-day week, and often used in a bad sense as a week without a Sabbath. The sixth tribe in Jacob's blessing, Dan, seems pro-

* And thus "witness," over-abundant (as three is more than two) and therefore divine, is not excluded, (comp 1 John v. 6-9).

phetical there of Antichrist ; and is the only tribe omitted from the sealed ones in Rev. vii. So the number of the beast is 666, six in continually higher powers, as if man were working continually to reach the perfection of divine work and continually failing, and proving only his profanity thereby : the six never becomes a seven. Yet there is another side to this number, for the week may have a Sabbath. In itself thus it only points out the measure of man's work and may be good or evil, but inclines (as man's work, alas, does) more to the evil than the good.

Seven, on the other hand, is the well-known symbol of perfection, not indeed of divine perfection *in itself*, but that of divine *work*, as in creation ; the accomplishment of the will and purpose of God in the sphere of the world. To this the numbers that make it up correspond. We have seen that it divides very generally into 4 + 3—the divine and the world-number, and this confirms the previously given significance of each. Nor is this division merely a formal one, but one to which the internal meaning will be found, often at least, strictly to correspond, as in the parable of Matth. xiii., already mentioned. Here the first *four* parables, given in the presence of the multitude, give the kingdom of heaven in its outward aspect ; the last *three*, spoken to the disciples in the house, give the internal and spiritual side, the divine meaning, understood by faith alone.

Seven, then, is the perfect cycle, the week of divine accomplishments. In the highest form nothing can succeed it ; its Sabbath is an unbroken eternity ; and so the apostle evidently applies that seventh day wherein " God ceased from all his work " to the " rest " or " sabbatism " into which finally his people enter, and which is perfect rest because it is His (Heb. iii. 4.) In lower forms, however, it may be succeeded by other cycles, and hence the significance of the number *eight*. The eighth day is the first of the new week, and our " Lord's Day " is a " first," an " eighth," or a " third," according to the point from which we reckon. As a " third " it is the resurrection day, the day of manifestation of God's power in our behalf when to man all was over. As a " first " day, it tells how all begins for us with Christ risen from the dead. While as an " eighth " day, it speaks of a *new* beginning, a *new* creation in contrast with the old. The number eight seems constantly to have this character, bringing us through the complete series of God's dealings with the present world into the world to come, the beginning of the eternal. In the Psalms indeed, according to what we have already seen, we never pass either into the heavenly places, nor even into what is strictly the " new earth " as Rev. xxi. 1, depicts it. The " world to come " of Heb. ii, and the *eighth* psalm stop short of this. Yet the " kingdom

and patience" has run out—"the kingdom and glory" come; the things that can be shaken have begun to give place, that the things which cannot be shaken may remain. The *eighth* psalm, as I have said, already brings us to this.

The number *nine* has, so far as I am aware, no other significance in Scripture than what it obtains as a multiple of three by three. It illustrates the truth that as to the larger numbers, their meaning is generally, so far as traced, derived from the smaller ones of which they are compounded. Thus *forty*, for example, is a 4 by 10, as we may shortly see; and even twelve is a 3 by 4.

The number *ten*, too, seems to fall under this rule. As shewn in the ten commandments of the law, it is the measure and mark of responsibility to God. And then it is simple enough that this is the effect of divine testimony (in whatever way given) to man upon him. Two is the number of testimony, as we have seen, as five is the human number, and ten is 5 by 2.

Ten times did Pharaoh harden his heart against the divine word, and ten times did God in judgment harden it, and the ten plagues which fell upon the land were judgment measured by their responsibility. So God says in the wilderness of those "who have tempted me now these *ten* times, and have not hearkened to My voice, surely they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers." (Num. xiv. 22, 23). We need not wonder to find thus the measure of man's responsibility to be the measure of his sin, and, if grace interfere not, the measure also of his judgment.

The number *eleven* I have no light upon; but *twelve* I have already stated to be a 3 by 4. And herein we may see the precision and definiteness of these numbers. Twelve is the number of divine government, although administered, it may well be, by man. Twelve apostles to regulate in the kingdom of heaven with twelve corresponding thrones, when the Son of man takes his throne. Twelve gates and twelve foundations for the royal city, New Jerusalem; twelve tribes correspondingly of the royal people upon earth. The numbers that make up twelve are the divine and the world-number; but then so are the numbers that make up seven. If the one is 3 + 4, the other is 3 by 4. In both it is thus divine acting in the sphere of the world; but in the former more directly and manifestly than in the latter. In this faith recognizes the Almighty hand surely working out its own purposes, but in the meanwhile the world goes on and there is no outward transformation of it, at least until the close; in the former there is a direct manifest work upon and transformation of it. The one traces the steps of secret government; the other speaks of open and publicly exercised authority.

This closes the regular series of symbolical numbers, so far at least as I am able to follow it. There remains but one number of which in this connection we may fitly speak. *Forty* is the well-known number or measure of perfect probation ; and here again the numbers of which it is compounded speak for themselves. It is plainly 4 by 10. Ten, the measure of responsibility to God ; four, the testing of man on every side in this world where he is placed ; the product of these two, perfect probation of man in the full measure of his responsibility. This was the character of Israel's forty years sojourn in the wilderness ; of the Lord's forty days temptation ; of Esau's forty years which ended with his marriage with two Canaanitish wives and the loss of the first-born's place and blessing (Gen. xxvi. 34—xxvii.)

It must then, I think, be admitted by all who will give the subject proper consideration, that there is a consistency and harmony in this symbolism of numbers, which removes it altogether from the supposition of being mere imagination. Yet imagination may come in here as elsewhere surely, and good reason we have to dread it in the things of God. With many who have followed me thus far, it will be the attempted application of this symbolism beyond the limits ordinarily imposed on it, which will be viewed with suspicion. At this point, therefore, and before we come to consider the Psalms themselves, it will be not without use to give some examples of the prevalence of it to an extent beyond all that might have been anticipated.

To those who know the dispensational significance of the cross of Christ, it will be no new assertion that it divides all past time into two contrasted periods. *Up to* the cross the world was under trial. As innocent yet liable to fall—as fallen and without law—under human government after the flood—under divine government, as Israel under law—man, tried in every possible way, was found alike “ungodly and without strength.” “When we were yet without strength, *in due time* Christ died for the ungodly.” That was the due time for Christ to die, when we were *yet*—after so long trial—only that. Thus, with that death before Him, the Lord can say, “*Now* is the judgment of this world.” Trial was over, the enmity in man's heart to God fully in the cross declared, the verdict given, the whole question of man's righteousness at an end for ever.

But just then and there, where every mouth was stopped, God opens His to give the full and sweet revelation of Himself in the Gospel. By that same cross His righteousness is declared, and not against the sinner but on his side. Christ died for sinners. God is righteous in making over to them, therefore, all that that death has gained. Just, He justifieth the ungodly. In the gift

of His Son for man, He has told out Himself in love—for God is love.

This contrast, then, meets us in the books of the Old Testament (or covenant), and of the New, speaking of course of the letter of the Old, for the precious things of God's grace were hidden there indeed, and in Christ we have the key; but they *were* hidden.

The books of the Old Testament are 36 in number.* The simplest division of 36 is into 3 by 12. Put this into meaning according to the symbolism of these figures, and what do we find? Three is the divine, and twelve the governmental number; taken together they give you "God in government." What preciser definition could we have for the books of the Law?

But the books of the New Testament are 27 in number. And this is the cube of three: it is 3 times 3 times 3; the most absolutely perfect number that can be, the only one into which none but the symbol of divine fulness enters or can enter. Thus it is God and only God—God in His own absolute perfection—revealed in the New Testament pages—in the Gospel of His grace.

Is this a chance or a trick of fancy? Those would do well to pause a little, who might incline to think so. If it be neither, then the symbolism of numbers is carried very far in Scripture; and being there, is there in divine wisdom, and not beneath our notice. But we have not finished even here. We can adduce chronology itself, if I mistake not, in proof of this.

According to the common reckoning in our Bibles, Christ was born into the world in about the 4,000th year of it. Now examine this date according to already established principles. For *forty centuries* then, (less or more) the world's probation lasted, and this forty as we have already seen to be the mark and measure of full probation.

But whence the other factor? Whence the century? Let us only consider that Isaac was a type of the true "child of promise," and then we shall easily remember that *his* birth took place when Abraham's body was "now dead, when he was about a *hundred years old*," and that God left him to this that Isaac might not be "born after the flesh." The flesh thus in Abraham had its probation for that hundred years; and when it was seen as dead in the issue of that probation, the power of God brought life out of death in the birth of Isaac. How significant and easily applic-

*Counting Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles as one book each, as is really the fact, the division of these into two having first obtained in the Septuagint version.

able to One greater far ! born in the fortieth century of the world's probation, when all flesh was seen as dead, and in the power of God new life began for man in Christ.

Is this still fancy ? If not, it cannot but deepen our sense of the way in which the symbolism of numbers pervades the Word of God. Take, as another instance from chronology, the period already brought before us from the book of Daniel. The seventy weeks are strictly chronological, and, as almost all take them, weeks of years I doubt not. Still that does not hinder another significance. Here seventy sevens at once remind us of the steadfast if, secret, working out of divine counsels. This is emphasized by the double power of seven ; while the ten, which is the other factor in the number, assures us that we have also here responsible man, with the sins, alas, which come so surely from him.

This is the character of the whole period. But the separate parts are no less strongly marked. The first portion, of seven weeks or seven sevens, is thus marked as one in which divine energy is working in a high degree, and if any one will but glance once more at the margin of his common Bible, he will find that "from the going forth of the commandment to rebuild and restore Jerusalem" in Neh. ii., (B.C. 445), forty-nine years will bring us to B.C. 396, and turning to Malachi, Israel's last Old Testament prophet, he will find 397 B.C. as the date of his prophecy. Thus these seven sevens cover indeed the time of prophetic ministry in Israel till its close.

The 62 weeks that follow are symbolically silent, but their silence is itself significant. It is a time of expectation for Messiah. Inspired history and prophecy lapse together. The deepest of the night precedes the dawn. But even that dawn is not yet for Israel. Messiah comes and is cut off.

The last week again tells us in its simple seven of divine power once more at work ; but the week is violently broken in upon and interrupted. Opposition to God is at its height, spite of which it runs out to its conclusion--only broken in upon and not broken off, and the divine purpose is consummated with the close of the seventieth week.

In the Psalms the significance of numbers is to be seen throughout the Book. It is in taking it up in regular course that the conviction of this will impress itself more and more upon us, and along with it the importance of it also. Here it will be sufficient to refer briefly to the structure of the first book in proof. It divides into three parts : Ps. i.-viii., introductory to the whole ; ix.-xv. ; xvi.-xli. The first of these gives the counsels of God in connection with the exaltation of Christ, and their relation to the trial and deliverance of the righteous. This again divides

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

89

into three smaller sections. First, two psalms give us, 1. The blessing of the righteous whose delight is in the law ; 2. the rejection and exaltation of Christ and the blessing of the one who trusts in Him. In the second section, *five* psalms give us the experience and trial of these blessed ones during the time of Christ's rejection. The *third* section, one psalm (viii.), the setting of the Son of man over all, and the stilling of the enemy and the avenger. This eighth psalm I have already brought forward as showing the significance of numbers. I only notice here that it is a plain *third* section too, and how God is indeed revealed in His nature and power in this exaltation of the Son of man.

The second part (Ps. ix.-xv.) gives us more specially the rejection of the testimony of God, and the detailed character of those who reject it. Two psalms (ix., x.) give us the circumstances ; and then again, *five* (xi.-xv.) the experience of the righteous remnant in the midst of these. The human number five is thus a second time the number of these experience psalms.

But the third part, as might be expected, leads us into the penetralia, the recesses of the book. It divides again into three sections, the first of which contains *nine* psalms—the divine number emphasized by multiplication with itself—and these contain the larger part of the Messianic psalms of the Book, an evident cluster really of *three threes* : (xvi.-xviii.) Christ identifying Himself with the godly remnant ; “ the excellent of the earth ; ” (xix., xxi.) the godly identifying themselves with Him ; and thirdly. (xxii.-xxiv.) atonement and its results, in present shepherd care (xxiii.), and final entrance to God's holy place. These psalms, surely vindicate the divine number stamped upon them.

Experience-psalms again follow, but with a difference from all before. The grace manifested in the preceding psalms affects the whole character of those that follow. This will be plain to any who will compare Ps. xxv. and xxxii. for instance, with any in the previous series (iii.-vii. and xi.-xv.). But it is shown also in the very number of the psalms themselves. Instead of being a simple series of *five*, the divine three just introduced combines with this, and there are thus 3 by 5 or *fifteen* psalms, (xxv.-xxxix.)

Lastly, the third section of this 3rd part contains two psalms, than the first of which none can be diviner, that 40th Psalm which opens the heart of Him who says, “ Lo, I come : in the volume of the book it is written of Me ; I delight to do Thy will, O my God.”

Details would be out of place here ; they must be reserved until we come shortly to the study of the Book at large. What I have adduced will be enough surely to indicate a little the place that the symbolism of numbers has in the very structure of its.

parts. Let us now turn to consider a little the other thing of which I have spoken in connection with the interpretation of the Psalms, the parallelism of their five books with the five books of Moses.

This is perhaps involved in what has been briefly hinted already, the connection of the books of the Pentateuch respectively with the significance of the five numbers which would correspond to these. But even on this account it is worthy of separate consideration as showing how the principles we have been considering run through the Word.

Now it is evident that as in Genesis we find the Creator, so in Exodus we find the Redeemer, and in Leviticus the Sanctifier. We with our Christian knowledge speak of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Thus God has written His name at the very opening of His Word.

With the thought of Creator necessarily is associated the thought of counsels, election, sovereignty ; and of these Genesis is full. The first book of the Psalms has also much of this character. On this very account no doubt it is harder to characterise and compare than any of the other books because of its variousness. As Genesis has been called the seed-plot of the Bible, so the first book is undoubtedly the seed plot of the Psalms.

But the comparison between Exodus and the second book is easier ; for this is the story of the final deliverance in grace of a people hopeless on the ground of responsibility ; the third and last section tracing the ground of this deliverance in One who restoring what He took not away, says of their sins, "*my sins.*"

Leviticus again is fully represented by the third book : it is God in the sanctuary seen and known there, as witness the very first psalm (lxxiii.) ; and all through, the holiness that suits His presence is told out. "*His way is in the sanctuary*" is the constant burden everywhere.

The comparison of the fourth book with Numbers is full of interest. The first psalm of this series is "the prayer of Moses, the man of God," and is the lament over the generation dying in the wilderness. Yet is Jehovah man's dwelling-place, spite of his frailness and mortality. But who shall find the secret place of the Most High ? He shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty. Christ finds it, and for man ; hence in Him who can lay His hand on both, Creator and creature have their meeting-place and their eternal link. This is the theme of the Book ; and the coming and reign of the Lord which find such a large place in it are but this actual meeting-place of Creator and creation.

Finally the fifth book opens with a recital of man's wanderings, and a summing up of God's ways with him, thoroughly in

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

91

character like Deuteronomy ; and, "O that men would praise," is the moral of it. All through the Book it is the rehearsal of principles after some like fashion. The order and connection of the parts are beautiful : first, these ways of God (cvii.-cxiii.) ; then, how His ways declare Himself (cxiv.-cxix.) ; then, man in contrast searched and known, and what is he ? but that only leaving him, as having nothing else to boast of, to rejoice in God the more (cxxxv.-cxlvi.) ; lastly—all that is left—the final praises from the now full heart.

The fuller exposition of this must be reserved for the detailed study of this blessed Book. This now invites us. May the Spirit of truth make it profitable to our blessing, and the glory of Him who speaks to us in it.

Where are our hearts, O ! where are they ? Are they occupied with this world, or are we quietly passing on to heaven, taken up with that which love cannot lose sight of—a living Christ in heaven ?

Ah ! blessed Lord ! I have got nothing but Thy love—a love that takes me right home to the Father's house, to be with Thee where the full expression of that love is to be manifested. Such love is a powerful thing when it gets into the heart, to lead the feet into a walk quite different from that of a man who has not got it. I can turn to that Christ and say, Nothing can disturb me, that glorified Christ in God's presence is the very ground of my peace. I know Him as the One who bore my sins on the cross, as the One who revealed the glory of God to me, and I am in connection with Him as the man of sorrows, with Him who went down to the grave, with Him risen and alive for evermore at God's right hand. And there we find, in Him so presented, our place before God.

As we go on for years, we find that these things keep their value ; but what estimate can a poor sinner form of the inestimable value of that blood ? What will it be when we get home, and find that we have got *within*, brought by that blood into the fellowship of what God is ? And as we walk through the Father's house and enter into the fulness of joy reserved for us, we shall find it all connected with the very same elements wherewith He conferred on us our joy down here, as He carried us through the wilderness.

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I—(*Continued.*)

CHAPS. I. II., GOD'S COUNSELS IN CREATION.

THE ordinary dispensational application of the week of creation is one which has so many adherents, and has given rise to so much speculation otherwise, that we shall do well to look at it before proceeding further. In the words of a modern writer, "In this application 'one day is as a thousand years.' Six thousand years of labour precede the world's Sabbath. The parallel here has been often traced." It is as old indeed as the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas,"* and its Scriptural support is supposed to be the passage in 2 Pet. iii, already referred to. According to it the millennial kingdom answers, as the seventh thousand years, to the "seventh day," earth's Sabbath-rest.

But as to the principle, the passage in Peter is no proof at all. It is no statement of time, but the contrary—the simple assurance of how little God counts time as man counts it. It might be as fairly argued from it that the millennial 'thousand years' was but a day, as that the creation 'days' represented each a thousand years; for it is not only "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years," but also "a thousand years as one day."

Nor is the millennium, with all its blessedness, a proper Sabbath. The apostle represents the "rest" (literally, "Sabbath-keeping") that remains to the people of God," as *God's* rest, and that surely is, as both the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. iv. 9, 10), and the book of Genesis show. His *ceasing* from His work. But in the millennium there is not as yet this. It is the last work-day rather, and not till the new heavens and earth will God's rest be come. The seventh day is not then the type of a millennium at all, but of final and eternal rest.

*Which, it is almost needless to say, was not the production of the Scriptural Barnabas, although by the very general voice of antiquity attributed to him. Its date is supposed to be somewhat before the middle of the second century A.D. I quote the passage from the translation in the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

"Attend, my children, to the meaning of this expression, 'He finished in six days.' This implieth that the Lord will finish all things in six thousand years, for a day is with Him a thousand years. And He himself testifieth, 'Behold, to-day will be as a thousand years.'" The last is probably an incorrect citation of Psalm xc. 4.

Moreover, the millennial kingdom answers so fully to the sixth day rule of the man and woman over the earth, that it is strange how it could escape the notice of those who were seeking a dispensational application of the creation-work. While on the other hand a mere arithmetical interpretation of the days as each a thousand years of the world's history, seems almost self-evidently artificial and unspiritual.

I may leave this, then, to point out what I have no doubt is the real dispensational application. In this it will be found we have but the former interpretation extended and adapted to the larger sphere.

Thus we have here alike a primitive creation and a fall, and then, too, that work of the Spirit and the Word by which every step towards the blessedness that shall be has been successively produced. The first day has very plainly the features of the age before the flood, when through the word of promise the light shone, but without further interference with the state of the creature. The light fell only upon a ruin. Lust and violence were the general features of man's condition, and furnish a history over which the Spirit of God passes with significant brevity, and which "the troubled sea, when it cannot rest," sufficiently depicts. Upon this world a literal flood passed, and it perished.

The second day gives us the formation of the "heavens," a symbol not hard to read, when we have learnt elsewhere the constant use of these as the seat of authority and power. It is the uniform language of Scripture that "the heavens rule." The "*sun* to rule by day" is indeed not yet come; nor the moon by night. Nought fills these heavens as yet but "waters"—waters above as well as beneath—the very type of instability. And this makes it the perfect type of what took place when, after the flood, man was put in the place of responsibility to be his brother's keeper. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, *by man* shall his blood be shed," is the principle, and was the institution, as is plain, of human government. It was the formation of a political "heavens" with, as yet, nothing but waters filling them. And how quickly Noah, the acknowledged head of the new world, drunk with the fruit of his vineyard, exemplified the instability of the type! And from thenceforth what has it been, but the constant display of this—the want of self-government in those who govern? A step towards the full attainment of God's perfect counsel for the earth it is; even now, power ordained of God, and His ministry for good, and yet a Nero or Caligula may be this "power." And significant it seems that on this second day there is no voice of God pronouncing "good" what is nevertheless for good. Providentially He may be working blessing by that which

in itself He cannot bless. And this is of solemn import for all times and spheres.

The third day following sees the dry land separated from the waters. These waters we have all along seen to be the type of human passion and self-will—what man left to himself exhibits. But this is evidently, on the larger scale we are now taking, just the Gentiles,* and the earth raised up out of these waters is the seed of Abraham after the flesh; that people ploughed up with the plough-share of God's holy law, and among whom was sown the seed of the divine Word. Little fruit may it yet have yielded, and given up it may be for its fruitlessness and unprofitableness at the present time, yet it lies but fallow, like the actual land of Israel, waiting for the latter rain and the foretold fertility under the care of the Divine husbandry. Nor has the past been only failure. For long the only fruit for God we know was to be found there, and in a sense, of its fruit are even we: "salvation" was "of the Jews." Thus there need be no difficulty in this fertile earth separated from the waters representing Israel's separation to God out of all the nations of the world.†

The fourth day's lesson is one simpler still. The lights set in the heavens speak very plainly of Christ and of the Church; or, as we are accustomed to say, of the Christian dispensation. The mystery here we have already glanced at, for the individual application scarcely differs from the dispensational. Here Christ, revealed by the Holy Ghost, shines out for men in the word of His grace; while the Church is the responsible reflector of Christ, His epistle to the world. The word of the Spirit to the Churches (Rev. ii. iii) may give us the moon's phases in the night of Christ's absence—that night surely now fast drawing to a close.

Let this scene preach to us that all true and divine light now is heavenly. To let our "light shine" is nought else than to let men see we belong to another sphere, are not of the world even as Christ was not; and to let them see our faces brightened with the joy of what He is, our hearts *satisfied* with Himself, and so independent of the broken cisterns from which they strive to draw refreshment. This was once actually the Church's testimony in those days when men were "turned to God from idols"

*Compare Rev. xvii. 15: "the waters . . . are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues."

†To those acquainted with the meaning of Rev. xiii. it will not be insignificant that the last Gentile empire should be figured there in the beast *from the sea*, the Jewish Antichrist in the second beast *from the earth*.

to wait for His Son from heaven." Alas, while the Bridegroom tarried, the light grew dim. "They all slumbered and slept." The only light for the world is still the virgin's lamp, as she goes forth to meet the Bridegroom.

His call of them to Himself will close this dispensation,* and then will dawn that strange and solemn fifth day, when once again the "waters" will have risen and covered everything: the time of which the ninety-third psalm speaks, though as of a past condition, "The floods have lifted up, O Lord, the floods have lifted up their voice; the floods lift up their waves;" but only to prove that "the Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea."

The time of the world's discipline will have come, "the hour of trial upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." These waters speak of a universal *Gentile* (that is, lawless) state; of the working of man's wild will: "upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; *the sea and the waves roaring*; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth."

But when God's "judgments are upon the earth the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness." This is the secret of the waters producing the living creature. It is the time when (the heavenly people being gathered home) God will be preparing a people for earthly blessing. Brief may be the time in which He does this: Scripture is none the less full of the detail of the mighty work to be done. And a most real and necessary step it will be towards that reign of righteousness and peace which the sixth day so plainly figures.

For here the rule of the man in God's image and likeness can scarcely fail to make itself understood by those who look for the Lord then to take a throne, which as Son of man He can call His own (Rev. i. 13, iii. 21); and which, therefore, He can share with His people, as He cannot share His Father's throne. The first Adam, we are told by the Apostle (Rom. v. 14), was the image of the One to come; even as he also tells us (Eph. v. 25, 32) Eve is of that church which He will present to Himself without spot or blemish. Thus we can scarcely by any possibility mistake the spiritual meaning of the sixth day's work.

In that day, too, the *earth* brings forth the living creature. "*Israel* shall bud and blossom, and fill the face of the earth with

*Those unacquainted with what will follow the close of the present dispensation, will find in the "Study of the Psalms," pp. 12, 41, 47, a partial outline which may be helpful.

fruit" She shall be Jezreel, "the seed of God," and "I will sow her to Me in the earth," says the Lord God.

And as this is the last work day, not yet Sabbath rest, so is the millennial kingdom in the hands of Him who takes it to bring all things back to God. "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under His feet. And when all things shall be subdued under Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that GOD may be all in all." Then, and not till then, is the Sabbath reached.

"And on the seventh day God had ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."

Here God alone appears, and the work being ended, all being according to His mind, He sanctifies the day of His rest. How significant this of the day, never to give place to another, when redemption being fully accomplished, and all things brought to the pattern proposed in the eternal counsels, He shall indeed put the seal of His perfect delight upon the whole new creation, hallowed to Himself for ever! How could God rest, short of this consummation? Then indeed He will be "all;" and that be the simple, full expression of the creature's blessedness, and of its perpetuity as well.

Some details of this final blessing are presented to us in the following section, which concludes this first part of Genesis (ch. ii. 4-25). But before we go on to this let us only for a moment compare the meaning of the lives which shortly follow in the book—a meaning already briefly glanced at—with that now given of these six creative days. We shall find in them, not absolute identity (for Scripture never merely repeats itself), but a parallel of a most striking sort: a remarkable witness of the internal unity of Scripture, and of this first book. How easy to understand that Genesis is (as it has been called) the "seed-plot of the Bible," when it is thus in the whole the expansion of those divine counsels, which have their indication already in the creative work itself. And so indeed it is.

But it is plain that here the *seven* lives recorded in Genesis must have their counterparts in the *six* days' work; there is none to the seventh-day rest. And it is as plain that the last life, Joseph, the most perfect type of Christ, the man, God's image, answers here precisely to the sixth, and not the seventh day. We shall obtain a seventh day then (so to speak) by taking the third day as a double one. We have already noticed that it is

so, for God speaks twice, and twice pronounces His work good. Looking at the days thus, let us compare the double series.*

Now, beginning with the third chapter, the story of Adam is just the exposure of man, such as the fall has made him : the light let in upon his condition, with no apparent internal change. And this is the truth of the first day.

Next, as to the division of the waters on the second day, we have seen already that its lesson corresponds with that of the two seeds into which the human race at once divides : the opposition, namely, between the carnal and spiritual mind, which every renewed soul is conscious of.

Then, if the third day give us in the earth's coming up out of the waters the type of how we too rise up out of the inundation of sin into the place at once of rest and power over it—the third life, Noah's—gives us as plainly our passage in Christ our ark out of the scene of the sin and judgment of man in the flesh to that in which blessing is secured by the sweet savor of accepted sacrifice.

The *fruit* of the second half of the third day, again, is seen in Abraham, the practical life of faith which follows upon this.

The fourth day parallel seems less exact with Isaac ; yet is he undoubtedly, more emphatically than any, the heavenly man. Even Abraham is found out of Canaan ; Jacob almost spends his life away from it ; Isaac may fail and does, but never leaves it, and as the picture of Christ Himself, as he undoubtedly is, he is necessarily the picture of the reflection of Christ—of the Son, and of the *sons*, of God.

The parallel of the fifth day type with Jacob is self-evident : the lesson of each is discipline and what God accomplishes in it for His own—the peaceable fruit of righteousness in those who are exercised thereby.

While Joseph's life is as plainly the spontaneous fruit of the new nature, and the attainment of sovereignty over all around, as the sixth day is also of the same things, none the less blessed because so little known.

Thus the remarkable unity of this first book of Scripture is apparent. Nor will this glance at it be in vain, if it awake in any

*It has been noticed by many that the six days themselves fall into a double parallel series. Arranged thus, we have, as to the parts of creation touched on these respectively :—

- | | |
|------------|------------|
| 1. Light. | 4. Light. |
| 2. Waters. | 5. Waters. |
| 3. Earth. | 6. Earth. |

Dividing the third day into two, will give us a regular series of seven, which is commonly in Scripture (as noted elsewhere) 4 + 3.

soul a fresh realization of that eternal love so manifestly set upon us, when He for whom are all things and by whom are all things formed the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth. Well may our voices mingle in that jubilee-song, "Praise ye the Lord from the heavens ; praise Him in the heights ; praise ye Him sun and moon ; praise Him all ye stars of light ; praise Him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons and all deeps ; mountains and all hills ; fruitful trees and all cedars ; beasts and all cattle ; creeping things and flying fowl ; kings of the earth, and all people ; princes and all judges of the earth ; both young men and maidens ; old men and children ; let them praise the name of the Lord, for His name only is excellent ; His glory is above the earth and heaven."

Critical.

AN ATTEMPT AT A REVISION OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION OF THE PSALMS.

VII.

*Shiggaion * of David. which he sang unto Jehovah over the words of Cush the Benjamite.*

1. O Jehovah my God, in Thee have I trusted : save me from all my pursuers, and deliver me ;
2. Lest he tear my soul like a lion, rending it in pieces, and there be none to deliver.
3. O Jehovah my God, if I have done this ; if there be iniquity in my hands ;—
4. If I have recompensed evil unto him that was at peace with me ; (yea, I have delivered him that without cause is my oppressor :)—
5. Let the enemy pursue my soul, and overtake it ; yea, let him tread down my life to the earth, and make mine honour dwell in the dust. Selah.

* Probably, "a wandering ode," or "an ode composed on occasion of wandering." But De Wette gives "a song of lamentation ;" Conant, "a plaintive song ;" Gesenius, on the other hand, "a song of praise," and Paulus, "a responsive song."

REVISION OF THE PSALMS.

99

6. Arise, O Jehovah, in Thine anger ; lift up Thyself amid the rage of mine oppressors, and awake for me : Thou hast commanded judgment ;

7. And the assembly of nations shall compass Thee about : on this account therefore return Thou on high.

8. Jehovah shall govern [the] peoples : judge me, O Jehovah, according to my righteousness, and according to mine integrity upon me.

9. Oh let the evil of the wicked cease ! yea, Thou shalt establish the righteous, even [Thou] who triest the hearts and reins, O righteous God.*

10. My shield is with † God, who saveth the upright of heart.

11. God is a righteous judge ; and God ‡ hath indignation every day.

12. If one turn not, He will whet His sword : He hath bent His bow, and made it ready.

13. For him also hath He made ready instruments of death : He maketh His arrows burning.

14. Behold, he travaileth with vanity : yea, he hath conceived labour, and brought forth falsehood.

15. He hath digged a pit, and is hollowing it out, and falleth into the ditch he is making.

16. His labour returns upon his own head ; and upon the crown of his head doth his violence come down.

17. I will celebrate § Jehovah according to His righteousness, and will sing psalms to the name of Jehovah, Most High.

VIII.

To the chief musician upon Gittith : ¶ a psalm of David.

1. O Jehovah our Lord, ** how excellent is Thy Name in all the earth ! who hast set Thy majesty above the heavens !

* Or, "one trying hearts and reins [is the] righteous God."

† *Lit.* "upon."

‡ El.

§ Elsewhere, "give thanks to."

¶ ? The wine-vats ; which the Septuagint favours. The common opinion is that it is a musical instrument ; according to the Talmud, a cithern from Gath.

** 'Adonim, a plural form like 'Elohim.

2. Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast Thou founded strength* because of all Thine oppressors,† to still the enemy and the revengeful.

3. When I behold Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, moon and stars, which Thou hast established,

4. What is man,‡ that Thou rememberest him, and the son of man,§ that Thou visitest him ?

5. Yea, Thou makest him a little lower than the angels,|| and crownest him [with] glory and honour.

6. Thou makest him rule over the works of Thy hands : Thou hast put all things under his feet.

7. Sheep and oxen, all of them ; yea, also the beasts of the field ;

8. Fowl of heaven and fish of the sea : whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea.

9. O Jehovah our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth !

* Some would say "praise," the "ascription of strength." The Sept., "perfected praise," and so quoted, Matt. xxi. 16.

† From *tsarar*, "straiten, distress." As used here of the Lord's enemies, it seems akin to Acts ix. 4, 5.

‡ There are three words for man, which seem impossible to distinguish in a translation : 'Adam, generic for the race ; 'enosh, (used here) implying frailty, and often used in contrast with (3) 'ish, man, generally in a good sense.

§ 'Adam.

|| *Lit.* "gods," same word as God, which is a plural form, (*Elohim*.)

It is a blessed thing for people to be brought into living connection with Christ Himself ; if *they* sleep, He never does ; if *they* fail, He never fails. He will be as tender and gracious as possible ; but whatever He sees that the Divine glory requires, He will give an ear to hear on that point.

You could never tell what Christ would have you to be about, but if you go *with Him* in *everything*, there will be consistency with the ways of Christ. If you go with *self*, you will find a stop.

Nothing so enables the soul to separate between that which is of the flesh and that which is of the Spirit, as having the eye single for Christ. And if occupied with Him, it will be, "Lo, I come to do Thy will."

[101]

Practice.

—
“ADDING.”

(2 PETER I, 5 - 7.)

The connection and order of Scripture truth is everywhere important. In the list of graces which the apostle gives us here, we shall find this perhaps in an especial manner true. They cannot be “added” to one another really, save in the order which he gives them to us. My desire is to trace out this their mutual dependence a little, for the profit of our souls.

In the “precious faith” of Christianity God has given us the knowledge of Himself, and One who, displaying Him, links us to the God whom He displays. Precious faith, this, indeed, which enables us to find our happy place with God as sons in the Son of His love, there to enjoy the communications of that love, which embraces in Him eternally all His.

“All things that pertain to life and godliness” are found in this knowledge of God in Christ, of Him who hath called us by glory and virtue.” The only perfect realization and enjoyment of what is ours as Christians is implied in this “glory.” Ours now in hope, (and that no doubtful one, but a “hope that maketh not ashamed”) in the path towards it lie all the difficulties and trials which attach to progress through a hostile world ; therefore also the need of virtue—valour *—to face these trials and overcome these difficulties.

In this way then are we called. “Exceeding great and precious promises” become the means of fellowship in the divine nature, satisfying while energising the soul of the believer, and so delivering it from the corruption that is in the world through lust.

This is the ground of the exhortation before us. On this account, † as being partakers of this blessedness, are we, giving all diligence, to add to our faith virtue. The near prospect of assured and eternal glory is to beget, and as it is realized surely will beget, the earnestness of spirit, which presses on to apprehend all for which we are apprehended of Christ Jesus. The brightness and clearness of the hope beyond braces up the soul

* Both in Greece and Rome was virtue valour. The word here is aretes from Ares, Mars, the god of war. In the Christian sense no less is virtue valour—the true mark of a “good soldier in Jesus Christ”—the weapons of whose warfare are not carnal.

† Not “beside this.” Alford gives, “And for this reason ;” the Bible Union, “yea, for this very reason.”

to meet the trials and dangers of the way. This is so simple, so necessary a result that it reminds us painfully of what we are that exhortation to "all diligence" should be needed by those who are possessors of such precious faith ; that it should be needful to warn the pilgrim citizens of heaven, that their faith must have in it "virtue."

We know, alas, it is needful, none the less, but rather the more, for us who live in days when men deem the conflicts of Christianity to be well nigh in the past, than for those who had to fight with beasts at Ephesus, and take the place of men "appointed to death." The very epistle in which we find this is one of those supplementary epistles which were specially designed to meet the exigencies of the last days *—days of a wide-spread form of godliness, destitute of power.

The dangers of a time when the devil took the guise rather of a "roaring lion," seeking openly whom he might devour, may be more alarming to the natural thought ; but in that very fact was the safeguard. The enemy and the enmity were both apparent ; the choice between Christ and Satan, to one who had known Christ, would not be doubtful ; the power of God resorted to could not fail the weakest ; and thus life wrought in the midst of death : "delivered to death for Jesus' sake," the life of Jesus was made manifest in their mortal flesh.

"The course of this world" is not changed by its having assumed the title of Christian, nor is "the god of this world" another, or less powerful, than he was before. But the fact of its being a "Christian" world he rules is one of immense significance. It means that henceforth the name of Christian is to be used against Christ ; that the guile of the serpent is to replace the old open antagonism ; that "overcoming" is to be now not merely of the world, but in the Church itself ; that nothing is now to be what it seems ; and that he who would struggle against the stream, shall do it in the teeth of all that inherits the glory and honour and sanctity of the house of God itself, and shall have a martyrdom at the hands as it were of martyrs.

No less then, certainly, than ever, is the exhortation needed, "add to your faith virtue," or "have *in* it virtue," as the words rather mean : for faith is to be the germ out of which all else in Christian life develops, the hidden root through which alone is drawn up the sap and nourishment out of which bud, blossom, fruit, in due time and course proceed. Faith is so to make reality the things unseen, so to lay hold of the exceeding great and

* See chap. iii. 3. All the *second*, or supplementary, epistles, except 2 Corinthians, apply to the last days, and perhaps this is not wholly an exception.

precious promises, as to empower the soul to decide simply, unhesitatingly, enduringly, to lay hold of its own things at all cost. This is the girding of the loins with truth, which is the first necessity for progress. Knowledge, temperance, patience, lie all beyond, just as we see them here. The first thing is "virtue"—the first point in practice; the gathering up and the uniting of the soul's energies for the race before it. Without this no "weight" will be *felt*, much less "laid aside," nor, therefore, the sin which doth so easily beset us. Pause, dear reader, and let us ask ourselves what we know of this; and if it has not been known, or has been forgotten, let us ask further, how it can be that Satan has so prevailed over us as to divorce us from our only true interest and blessing. The children of this world are in their generation wiser.

This, then, is "virtue," the counting all things but loss for the knowledge of Christ; the "purpose of heart" according to Barnabas' exhortation, to "cleave" at all cost "to the Lord." This is the very first thing here after "faith"; the next is "knowledge." What is needed for this is thus not high intellect, still less, this world's wisdom: it is Paul's motto rather—"This one thing I do: forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto that which is before, I press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

Of course it may be possible by mere force of intellect to lay hold of the truths (or let us rather say, doctrines) of the Word. Truths they are not in reality when thus intellectually apprehended, apart from "the Truth" itself. This Christ alone is, and it is as they connect us livingly with Him, that they become to us "knowledge" in any real way. They are beams of His glory or they are nothing. And to Him we come, not as reasoners to discuss or argue, but out of His fulness to receive. It is our need makes us acquainted with the full supply there is in Him. As "water of life" it is not merely to be "tasted," but drunk in. Our title to come to Him, is that we "thirst."

Thus it is when it comes after "virtue," that the pursuit of "knowledge" becomes a practical thing, and has divine warrant for it, and safeguard. How little could we afford to do without it, if only we were really half in earnest about "practice"? For what are we to practice? how obey, save as His word reveals what is obedience? how "walk as He walked," save as we have learnt to realize His walk?

Especially as there is no code of Christian laws—no defining expressly how to act under all circumstances that might arise. "He that is *spiritual* discerneth all things," but only he. Scripture itself, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," is so, "that the *man of God* may be

perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The spiritual man, the man of God, will find in it what fits every circumstance and detail of his path. This is just another way of putting the same truth, to "virtue, knowledge." Nor is it hard or strange that Scripture should refuse to unfold itself to the speculative theorist ; or that God should withhold instruction from one who has not in his mind to do His will. I do not doubt there are many who say, truly enough so far, they cannot see such and such things in the Word of God, who, if He gave them the heart to practice what they *did* see, up to the full measure of their light, would shortly find the light beyond their thought increased, and revealing clearly enough what they were blind to. There as elsewhere the principle holds good, "to him that hath shall more be given." "He that will do His will shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

(To be continued, if the Lord will.)

The Faith.

THE TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

V.—"FOR EVER AND EVER."

Question has been raised so earnestly and repeatedly as to the possible signification of the words translated "eternal" and "for ever," that we must necessarily examine them before our view of the solemn subject can be assumed as anywise complete. Let us do so at once, as the fitting conclusion to this glance at the sayings of the Apocalypse.

Mr. Jukes, of all writers that I have seen, bases most for the Restitution theory he favors, upon an exact and positive meaning of these terms, which I will, therefore, allow him to state in his own words. He says * :—

"The language of the New Testament, in its use of the words which our Translators have rendered 'for ever' and 'for ever and ever,' but which is literally 'for the age' or 'for the ages of ages,' points not uncertainly to the same solution of the great riddle, though as yet the glad tidings of the 'ages to come' have been but little opened out. The epistles of St. Paul will prove that the 'ages' are periods, in which God is gradually working out a purpose

* "The Second Death and the Restitution of all things," by Andrew Jukes, pp. 57-67 (4th edition.) Of course, I quote but a part, but enough to give his thoughts clearly, and substantially his arguments.

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. 105

of grace, which was ordained in Christ before the fall, and before those 'age-times,' in and through which the fall is being remedied. So we read that 'God's wisdom was ordained before the ages to our glory,' that is, that God had a purpose before the ages out of the very fall to bring greater glory both to Himself and to His fallen creatures; then we are told distinctly of the 'purpose of the ages,' shewing that the work of renewal would only be accomplished through successive ages. . . . Now, what is this 'purpose of the ages' which St. Paul speaks of, but of which the Church in these days seems to know, or at least says, next to nothing? I have already anticipated the answer. The 'ages' are the fulfilment or substance of the 'times and seasons' of the Sabbatic year and Jubilee under the old law. They are those 'times of refreshment from the presence of the Lord, when He shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached,' and when in due order, liberty and cleansing will be obtained by those who are now in bondage and unclean, and rest be gained by those who now are without their rightful inheritance."

That will be enough for the present. The evident conclusion is, that punishment (corrective, of course, in every case) is for the ages of ages during which this purpose is being fulfilled, and then terminates in the final blessedness of all the subjects of it.

There is no question that the word which in one shape or another enters into all the New Testament expressions for eternity, is a word very commonly and very well rendered "age." It is so rendered in our common version twice (Eph. ii. 7; Col. i. 26), where the plural form would make "eternity" inadmissible. It is nearly forty times translated "world," and not badly so either, if only we conceive of a world in *time* instead of space. But while there is thus no attempt to evade or deny the fact, and that the "for ever and ever" of Revelation and elsewhere is more literally "for the ages of ages,"—Mr. Jukes himself cannot deny on the other side that this mode of expression (somewhat varied, as we shall see) is the only one in the New Testament for eternity at all.* So that if after all it does not express it, then we are shut up to the conclusion, strange and startling enough, if true, that there is no assertion of eternity at all in Scripture.

This it will be difficult for most perhaps to believe, but it is the necessary result of Mr. Jukes' theory. The ages of ages are to be taken up with this process of reconciliation of the lost to God. But then of God Himself is it only said "that He liveth for the ages of ages" (Rev. iv. 10; v. 14; x. 6; xv. 7); glory is ascribed to Him but "for the ages of ages." How surpassingly strange that there should be no glimpse beyond these ages, during all of which "the smoke of torment" never ceases (Rev. xiv. 11; xx. 10)! That just when the object of that strange and lingering

* Strictly there is one other, but it is only found twice: in Rom. i. 20, "His *eternal* power;" and in Jude 6, "reserved in *everlasting* chains." Resurrectionists cannot plead even this, for they deny these chains to be "everlasting" either.

judgment is attained—just when the fullest glory should be reached—just when praise should be most rapturous—that just then we should have reached the very limit of all that Scripture contemplates of the glory and dominion, yea, and the very life of God itself—and not a sound of praise be heard, not a ray of glory shine, out of the infinite silence and impenetrable darkness of the Eternity beyond.

This would be inconceivable enough, but we are not left to reasonings such as this. We must ask, is there such a “purpose of the ages,” as Mr. Jukes affirms? The phrase occurs (Eph. iii. 11), as the Greek of what in our version is “eternal purpose.” And what is this “purpose of the ages” as Scripture, not the Restitutionist, declares it? Is it not, so far as given in the passage cited, “the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be [made] known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the purpose of the ages?” There is no mention of any other beings here than the “Church” and the “angels”; the time for the wisdom of God to be made known thus is “now.” If Mr. Jukes has selected this passage as one of the best suited for establishing his views, it is only the clearer how little can possibly be found. Of course it is not here the place to examine the passages generally which are assumed to speak of such a restitution as Mr. Jukes contends for, but it is abundantly plain that not one can be brought forward with any hope of success to prove the Scripture “ages” to be linked with any such “purpose.*”

Now let us look at the precise expressions. “For the ages of ages” occurs, as has been elsewhere mentioned, twenty times. Ten times it is found in ascriptions of praise to God and the Lamb; five times it is used for the eternal being of God, “He liveth for ever and ever”; once, it is Christ who says, “Behold I am alive for evermore”; once it is given as the duration of the kingdom of God, and once of the saints’ reign. The only other two passages refer to the subject before us: the torment of the lake of fire, (Rev. xx. 10), and the smoke of Babylon (xix. 3). How little reason is there to question the force of the expression!

* I give a list of the passages in which the word is used in the plural: 1 Cor. ii. 7, (“ordained before the *ages*”); x. 11, (“the ends of the *ages*”); Eph. ii. 7; iii. 6, (“*from the ages*”); 21, (“world without end” is “of the *age of ages*”); Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. i. 17, (King of *ages*); Heb. i. 2, (“worlds”); ix. 26, (“in the end of the *ages*”); xi. 3, (“worlds”); Jude 25 (“both now and unto all *ages*”). And passages where “for ever and ever” are literally, “for the *ages of ages*.”

(To be continued.)

Questions of the Day.

THE CHURCH : SAVED OR SAVING ?

MR. SADLER'S views of what he calls "the great 'Church truth of God's word,'" he states as follows :

"From the time of Abraham to the present time it has been God's will to save men, not only by working in them individual personal religion, but by joining them together in a body, or family, or kingdom or church. This body has always been an outward and visible body known by certain outward and visible marks. Men have always been admitted into this Church by a rite or ordinance which betokened God's special good-will towards each one of them. This Church, or body, has always been governed and instructed by a visible ministry . . . always has been, and till the second Advent, always will be a mixed body ; *i.e.*, it has always consisted of two sets of persons, good and bad, penitent and impenitent, those who realize God's love, and those who do not. The covenant of God has always been with this visible Church. The word of God has always been addressed to this outward visible body. The members are always assumed to be, or to have once been, in the favour of God. Each member is assumed to partake, or to have once partaken, of the covenant grace, whatever that grace be. . . . No interior or 'invisible' church within this outward body is ever recognised in God's word as a separate church. When a man who belongs to the visible body lives contrary to his profession, he is nowhere bid to examine himself as to whether he belongs to the visible body only, and not to the invisible. . . . He is rather told to believe and realize that the church in which he is already, is the fold of God, and so his condemnation will be the greater, if he do not live and love accordingly."

This is the foundation of the ritualistic system, and as such we must look the more closely at it. Clearly the distinguishing feature in it is, that the "church" is looked at as a means of salvation ; its sacraments the appointed channels through which divine grace flows ; but at the same time a salvation only attained at the end of one's course here, and conditioned by his own character and conduct—the making good use of the means of grace afforded him. Justification by faith only is denied ; *present* salvation has no place ; the enjoyment of peace is out of question, save such as may be supposed possible from the assurance that one's own performance of the conditions cannot fail to satisfy a holy and heart-searching God. But above all God is put back in the distance of Judaism from man, and ordinances displace Christ as the immediate recourse and Saviour of the soul.

Let us without further comment turn to Scripture to find there what the Church of God is, and the confusion of these thoughts will be very soon apparent. But instead of attempting to trace this church from Abraham down, let us rather begin with

the New Testament, and then we may enquire how far the congregation of Israel represented in a former economy the church of the New Testament times

It is well to remember that the word for "church" in the New Testament is "ecclesia," or "assembly," the same word used for the heathen mob at Ephesus (Acts xix 32, 41). The mere mention of "the church [of Israel] in the wilderness" in Stephen's speech determines nothing as to the identity of this with the Christian assembly, any more than it would identify it with the heathen one. While moreover this word "ecclesia" *does* show us that the Church of God is a body of people—the whole body, let us remind ourselves, of Christian people, and not a certain class or portion of them at all *

Now this assembly of God in the New Testament is presented in two different characters. It is the "body of Christ." It is the "house of God." Two other terms which Mr Sadler confounds with these, are really wider, but as the assembly of God is never in Scripture stated to be His kingdom or His family,† we may

*Apparent as this is, the recognition of it would at once expose some errors of the most serious kind, which are current among others beside "Anglo-Catholics." Thus the common idea of the "church teaching" could have no place in the mind of one who understood the church to be the whole body, both of teachers and taught. By the teachings of the church is evidently only meant the teaching of a certain number of teachers, supported or received by a certain number of others. Suppose it were even universally accepted (which can be proved as to very little indeed of what is called church-teaching, by what right could the church of one generation (or shall we say, one generation of the church), impose its definitions of doctrine upon another generation equally dowered with the promise of Christ and the presence of His Spirit?

It is certain that Scripture gives no hint of this church teaching, save to rebuke it. There we read that Christ has given gifts unto men, "some apostles, some prophets, some teachers," of whom apostles and prophets laid the foundation (Eph ii 20, I Cor iii. 10, 11, and teachers teach the Word delivered to them (2 Tim ii 2, iii 13 17), themselves not judging the Word, but judged by it, and the consciences of the saints to be in subjection to the Word alone. Thus (as Mr Sadler truly says) *to the church* the epistles are nearly all addressed—not to a body of clergy, as recognised expounders, but to the body of Christian people at large. They are supposed, then, to be capable themselves of understanding, and responsible to understand, the Word addressed to them—responsible to reject those not bringing the doctrine of Christ, as well as to receive those coming with the truth (2 and 3 John).

Nor is this the "right of private judgment," an unhappy term, however largely used. It is not the right of judging as to the Word, but the *responsibility of receiving it*, and judging all that is not it.

† It is not of course denied that believers are "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son," nor that they are "children of God," as born of the Spirit. It is only meant that these terms do not necessarily imply being members of Christ, or belonging to the church.

leave the consideration of these terms to another and more fitting time.

"The church which is His body," tells us of course (and Mr. Sadler would not deny it) wherein church-membership consists. Church members are members of Christ. No other membership is ever spoken of in Scripture: no membership of *a* church, nor even of *the* church, strictly speaking, but of the *body*—the one only body—of Christ. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body."

Mr. Sadler would agree with this; only he would make the baptism of the Spirit here to be water-baptism, and introduction into this body, therefore, sacramental. There is nothing plainer in Scripture, however, than that this is not the case. For not only is this baptism of the Spirit contrasted with John's baptism with water, but the "ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," (Acts i 5), was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, not by water-baptism, but in the way with which we are all familiar, when with a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, there appeared unto the disciples cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.

At Samaria afterwards this gift of the Holy Ghost is distinguished also from water-baptism as well as from new-birth: for the Samaritans both believed and were baptised, and yet did not receive the Holy Ghost till the apostles Peter and John, going down expressly for that purpose, laid their hands on them.

The first Gentile converts again, as we have seen, received the Holy Ghost *before* they were baptised. And once more, at Ephesus, the disciples of John were first baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus, and then "*when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them*"

Thus in the order obtaining among the Jewish converts we find first faith, then baptism, and then the gift of the Holy Ghost: and this is the order announced in the apostle Peter's words at Pentecost, "Repent and be baptised every one of you for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." While in the case of Cornelius, the only and typical case of what would obtain among the Gentiles, we have first, faith, then the gift of the Holy Ghost, and no intervening baptism at all: and to this answers the statement of the apostle of the Gentiles, "In whom after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the re-

demption of the purchased possession." Here baptism is equally omitted.

In either case it is impossible to be denied, that the gift of the Holy Ghost (or baptism with it), is distinguished on the one hand from that repentance and faith which are the inseparable accompaniments of new birth; and on the other, from the baptism with which Mr. Sadler confounds it. It is as plain then as can be that the "members of Christ" are made such by no sacramental rite or ordinance whatever.

Nor, if we take that Epistle to the Corinthians, wherein the apostle addresses them all as individually members of the body of Christ, shall we find the least room for the thought that he supposed these to be a mixture of "good and bad, penitent and impenitent" together. Bad as their condition at that time might be, and though he could not speak unto them as unto "spiritual, but as unto carnal," still it was "as unto babes in Christ." When speaking of those who as "the unrighteous, shall not inherit the kingdom of God," he adds: "and such *were* some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (vi. 11). Those therefore whom he addresses are spoken of as good (in this sense) and not bad, penitent and not impenitent, in a word the very opposite of the "mixed body" Mr. Sadler would have.

So with the other epistles. In that to the Romans he thanks God for them *all*, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world (i. 8). Of the Galatians he stands more in doubt, still he speaks of them as sons of God, with the Spirit crying, Abba, Father, in their hearts, knowing and known of God (iv. 6-8). The Ephesians he calls "saints," "and faithful in Christ Jesus;" speaks of their having been quickened and saved (ii. 1, 8). As to the Philippians he expresses his confidence about them *all*, that God had begun a good work in them and would perform it until the day of Jesus Christ" (i. 6, 7). To the Colossians he speaks of their having redemption, the forgiveness of their sins, and to their *having been* "made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (i. 12, 14). Of the Thessalonians he says, that the "gospel came not to them in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance," and their "faith to God-ward" was "spread about in every place."

Surely we need not go on. It could scarcely be more manifest that the bodies of professing Christians in those days took the ground, and were assumed to take the ground, of persons not only "penitent," but believing, forgiven, redeemed, saved, in possession of the Spirit, and already "*fit* for the inheritance of the

• THE CHURCH: SAVED OR SAVING? III

saints in light." So little were they allowed to be a mixed body in Mr. Sadler's sense, that the apostle John tells those whom he addresses, that he writes to them *because* their sins were forgiven them (1 John ii. 12).

Such then were these members of Christ. Having received the Gospel which we have already heard preached by the apostles, and being justified by faith in Christ, they were baptized by the Spirit into the one body, the one only true Christian body anywhere, the body of Christ. This was the Christian assembly, the recognized church of God: visible indeed in those days, invisible now only as what sin has wrought; never *allowedly* a mixture of unbelieving and believing, but that resisted with all the power of the Spirit in its first beginning. Witness the apostle's words in the second epistle to these very Corinthians: "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel (or unbeliever)? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God . . . Wherefore *come out from among them*, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Cor. vi. 14-18).

It is quite true that practically we may find the assembly soon becoming more or less a "mixed" one; but this was simply man's failure. Nor are those who might in this way be introduced among Christians ever spoken of as members of the body of Christ, or as being, or *ever having been*, in the proper sense, Christians. Take the first epistle of John in proof, where the profession of Christianity is being continually tested, and where it is owned that in this external profession there may be those who "say" they are in the light, while yet in darkness. Still the profession is of being born of God and having eternal life; and that not such a change as an ordinance might produce, but one characterised by faith in Christ, love to God and to the brethren, and keeping God's commandments. Could Mr. Sadler dare to affirm of his sacrament-born Christians, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him and he *cannot* sin, because he is born of God?" Or again, "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith?" This was the character of the new birth by which men became Christians and took their place in the family of God. Men who deceived themselves or

others might have come in among these, and they had ; but they are never owned as really *of* them, nor as having been.

For as all belonging to the body of Christians were recognized as possessors of eternal life, so it was never held that eternal life could be lost or come to an end in those who had it. Of those who went out from them the apostle surely gathers from the very fact, that they were never of them. "They went out from us, but they were not of us ; for if they had been of us they would have continued with us, but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all (or rather, more strictly, that *none* were*) of us (ch. ii. 19). Again, where there might be no such voluntary departure, "He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother is—not mark, in the darkness merely *now*, but is—in darkness *even until now* ;" he never was in the light at all. And so once more, "he that sinneth"—not has forgotten Christ, or lost the knowledge of Him, but never had it—"he that sinneth hath not seen Him, neither known Him" (ii. 9 ; iii. 6).

It is very plain then, that the Christian assembly was (as set up of God) as different from Mr. Sadler's view of it as well could be. It was not a mixed body of penitent and impenitent, introduced into it by a sacramental new birth, which might be practically nothing at all. It was the company of those who, already and really born again by the word of the gospel (1 Pet. i. 23, 25), were the happy possessors of a life really eternal, and manifesting itself as such by the obedience of faith. It was not a means of dispensing salvation to its members, but the assembly of those already saved. As set up upon the earth, and entrusted to man's care, others of another character might indeed (and alas, did) come in. They did not thereby become members of Christ at all, nor could they, but the actual "assembly," or church, soon ceased to be identical with the "body of Christ," and in no long time the very pretension to be such became the source of soul-destroying error, the traditional teaching which Mr. Sadler has himself imbibed, and by which he is ignorantly misleading others.

This "ruin of the church" (as it has been truly called) the Word of God announces in the plainest way, as we may now proceed to see.

*There is a difference in Greek between the expressions "all were not" and "not all were." The former is that used here, and is parallel to Matth. xxiv. 22 : "All flesh should not be saved," rightly translated, "*no* flesh should be saved."

(To be continued, D.V.)

“DUST THOU ART.”

Mr. Roberts next quotes some of the passages identifying man with his body, with the vain hope of trying to support his cause by them. But their existence has been already acknowledged fully and accounted for. His way of using them is a mere and poor attempt at raising a mist, too poor to need much exposure. Thus he quotes Gen. ii. 7 : “The Lord God formed MAN *out of the dust of the ground*,” and then asks : “If man be ‘that which lives in the body’—an invisible tenant, capable of conscious separation from the body—how are we to understand the statement that HE was made of dust? Mr. Grant’s position is that ‘HE’ is not dust at all but merely spiritual—the spiritual inhabitant of a mud hut, as it were. Consequently Mr. Grant is in opposition to the testimony.” Now Mr. R. knows perfectly well that this is not so. He knows quite well, and quotes it, that Mr. Grant’s statement is, that man may be identified with spirit, soul, or body according to the line of thought in the mind of the speaker ; and that therefore the “HE” must be determined by the context as to the sense in which it is anywhere used. Why then does he ignore this ? He knows perfectly well, that all agree with him that “the first man was of the earth, earthy,” and also that at death he “turns again into dust.” Why quote such passages as if they were new discoveries, when every child almost is familiar with them, and the solemn fact of death is before all our eyes ?

We deny not that man is dust—comes from it, returns to it : the point is not there, and Mr. Roberts knows it. Man was made a living soul, *not* by being made of dust, but by the breath of God. The conscious, intelligent part of him is not the body but the spirit. The body and what dwells in it are not the same thing. This something that dwells in it must be a true constituent part of man himself—man is often identified with it ; consciousness is ascribed to it—aye, the possibility of consciousness even when “out of the body.” These are the issues to be faced, and the production of ever so many other passages can settle nothing, and Mr. Roberts knows it : they can *blind*, alas,—but nothing else.

As vainly he turns back to Paul’s “earthly house of this tabernacle” to say again “it is a figure.” Of course, who doubts it ? But what does the figure mean ? He admits that the present body is the “tabernacle.” Very well ; then who cannot see that this figure is due to the fact that there is a something “*in the body*” which, while identified with the man himself, can be compared to the inhabitant of an “earthly house ?” How futile

to try and evade this! And we neither "construe the figure literally," nor "extract from it a declaration subversive of Paul's hope." How the fact of the possession of an immortal soul can subvert the blessed hope of a resurrection of the body, it remains for Mr. Roberts yet (if he can) to shew.

What follows for a column or two of pretty close print is very much in the same style. He makes Mr. Grant "admit," what he never thought of denying, that as to the body "man is not immortal;" asks in anticipation the question fully answered elsewhere, as to what proof there is that death which destroys the body does not destroy the other part; affirms that annihilationists too can identify man with his soul and spirit, although but awhile ago fighting with all his might against such identification, and that they "can conform these expressions with their conceptions of truth;" which last matter may now well be left to be judged of by the reader.

Then he demurs to the statement that "man's identification with the body which one sees and touches is in general the language of sense, while faith identifies him with the unseen spirit." He takes Heb. xi. 1, "faith is the substance of things *hoped for*," to prove that "faith is therefore the belief of promise," and that *promise* "has as much to do with body as mind"—a thing quite true, but not at all to the point. For surely Mr. R. does not mean that faith may not have reference to the present or the past. If he does, the very next verse but one which follows his quotation refutes him; for "through *faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God" certainly does not speak of faith as the "belief of promise" at all. And if we speak of the present and not the future, the *body* is that which the senses perceive, while we *believe in*, not see or touch, the spirit and soul.

The identification of a man with his body *is* then the language of sense, although it is of course true that faith may recognise a future for the body.* But Mr. Roberts goes further in his

* Though not Mr. Roberts' faith, for it should be known that Christadelphianism is as really unbelieving as to the resurrection of the body, as it is to the immortality of the soul itself. For them there is no necessary resurrection at all; it is not the same body but a new one; "*any other dust*," says Dr. Thomas, "*will do as well, the power of identity not residing there.*"

The astonished reader will ask, perhaps, where then does it reside? for with these men the spirit is electricity, as is well known, and the soul the body itself. Hear Dr. Thomas: "What then remains for the establishment in these resurrected men and women of a consciousness of having existed as members of human society"—which they never have!--"three thousand

eagerness to demolish this unwelcome statement that "faith identifies man with his unseen spirit." He affirms that "the 'unseen spirit' is visibly manifested to and recognised by *sense* (!) *Does it require 'faith' to note that a man is angry? The man that is hasty of (unseen) spirit is known and read of all, even the most faithless.* The perception of the fact is *entirely a matter of sense.*"

What shall we say to this? It is hard to deal gravely with it, and yet grave enough it is. A mere trick of speech, too poor for a jest, and yet helping to cheat men out of all they claim to value for eternity! No one doubts that an angry spirit can be noted, I presume. Nor on the supposition of Mr. Roberts' *electrical* theory being true, that you could insulate a person and demonstrate his "spirit" still more satisfactorily; but even then it would require some "faith"—not to call it by its true name—to believe that *this* was the intelligent discerner of the "things of a man," by which man knows all he knows" (1 Cor. ii. 11). Mr. R. then must allow us who do not believe this, still to believe that *this* spirit is not so easily discerned, through his hasty temper—"spirit" in that sense—may be. He himself, while asserting the latter, ignores the former still. For him then it cannot be so perceptible.

Nor does it appear how to quote "faith cometh by (the *sense* of) hearing" helps his case. It is not the question how it *comes*, but what its object. It is the "evidence of things unseen." The soul and spirit, in the immaterialist sense, are things unseen, Mr. Roberts himself being witness; the body is what sense recognises. This, which seems self-evident, is the foundation of the statement he objects to.

A graver point remains for notice. The book which Mr. Roberts reviews, in answer to a common argument with materialists, that the body of Stephen was called "Stephen" &c., adduces the same language used of the Lord: "there laid they *Jesus*," "come, see the place where *the Lord* lay"—to urge that "just as simply and as surely as 'David' or 'Stephen' is said to denote the whole personality of David or of Stephen, so, *after*

years, more or less, before? . . . Their HISTORIES will be *flashed upon their brains*, being transferred thither from the divine and electrical page upon which they are all inscribed . . . the character already formed being flashed by the spirit upon the NEW CREATURE." ("Anastasis.")

That means just, there is no identity at all, for personal identity and identity of *character* are wide as the poles asunder. If this be not "strong delusion" which has thus blinded men of intelligence in other things, what shall we call it?

the same mode of interpreting, must 'Christ' and 'the Lord' denote the whole personality of Christ ; which would reduce Him also to a mere dead man. And the question is asked in view of Thomasism, which would affirm this, how a dead body (according to John x., 18) could have power to take its life back ?

Mr. Roberts answers to the question, "Was there nothing of Christ but what was laid in the grave?" "Yes ; *God*, who was in Christ (2 Cor. v., 19). This is Paul's statement ; who also says God was manifested in Him. Jesus gives the same account of Himself in saying, 'The Father dwelleth in Me.' This much, then, was left of Christ, while he lay in the grave : God, who in the fulness of the spirit, had tabernacled in Jesus in the days of His flesh. 'Christ died ;' but the Father who could not die, remained and raised Christ from the dead the third day."

The doctrine is very plain here, at any rate, that Christ was a mere man, in whom the Father dwelt—the Father one person, the man, Christ, another. It is true, he uses more ambiguous language elsewhere. Thus he says, "The higher part of Jesus was God. The Spirit descended, and as it were, clothed itself with flesh" ; but it is only "as it were" ; no real incarnation of God is meant. He owns elsewhere that "The Word was God," but "the Word was made flesh" has no force for him whatever. Thus therefore he explicitly comes under the condemnation of the Apostle, "every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, and this is the spirit of Antichrist." (1 John, iv. 13.)

The person of Christ is the very ark of God itself ; that gone all else is gone. Who is this "Jesus" but He who was called such—"JEHOVAH SAVIOUR"—because *He* should save his people from their sins? "Salvation is of Jehovah" ; *Jehovah* saves ; *He* saves *because* Jehovah.

Thus the Word, who in the beginning was with God and was God, was made flesh and dwelt among us. He who was the seed of David according to the flesh, was "God over all, blessed for ever" (Rom. ix. 5). "He who came down from heaven" was even then on earth, "the Son of man *which is in heaven*" (John iii. 13). Thus wondrously Godhead and manhood united in His blessed person. Thus truly was he Emmanuel—"God with us."

All this Mr. Roberts denies, and denies, therefore, Christ, and stamps his doctrine with the fatal brand of Antichrist. With him there is only the Father dwelling in Christ, or the Spirit in Christ—in neither case incarnation. Therefore, to speak of God being "the higher part" of Christ, is but in his mouth one of those plausible deceits by which Satan, the father of lies, lures souls to their destruction. With him, there was *no* "higher

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

117

part" of Christ; no one who could lay down this human life, and yet exist, to take it up again. He would, therefore, turn this "take" into "receive." But it avails nothing. "Destroy this temple," says the Lord, "and in three days *I* will raise it up. . . . He spake of the temple of His body" (John ii. 19, 21).

I know well the answer that is made to this: "It was the Father dwelling in him that spake here." When they please, it is the Father speaks, and when they please, the man Jesus. But it is the same "he," at any rate, of whom it is immediately added, "When, therefore, *he* was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that *he* had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which *Jesus* had said."

To quote against this, that "this Jesus hath *God* raised up," is only possible to blindness such as we have seen. Surely it was Divine power wrought, and Father, Son and Holy Ghost concurred in it. This makes nothing against the fact, self-evident save to disbelief, that *Jesus* said *I* will raise it up; and if Scripture be true, as, blessed be God, it is, HE DID.

But Mr. Roberts objects still further, that we must not imply a "parallel" between the Lord Jesus and the "children of Adam, who are altogether of the earth, earthy." No parallel is implied at all. It is simply what the language used involves, that is in question, and nothing more; and this remains uncontradicted therefore, and impossible to be disproved, that—"if 'the Lord' lay in the grave, and yet the higher part did not lie there, so (plainly) might 'David,' or 'Stephen,' or 'Moses,' lie in the grave, and yet have another and higher part of them, which did not lie there."

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

II. LIGHT SHINING IN A DARK PLACE—(*Continued*).

The New Testament again gives definiteness of detail. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, *until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in*. And so ALL Israel"—the nation at large—"shall be saved." "*As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes*" (Rom. xi. 25-28).

The Gospel is still proclaimed; the complete number of the

Gentiles has not yet been saved by it : for 1800 years this has been going on ; and still " blindness in part " is theirs ; and still (nationally) they are " enemies."

In all this I am stating nothing doubtful or obscure. I am expressly taking what is open to the understanding of the simplest and most ignorant. Is it possible, Sir, that you who are so well acquainted with the condition of Tyre and Babylon, have overlooked such simple facts as these ? I repeat it : Israel's history is a most striking and exceptional one—their present condition unexampled anywhere beside. Scripture details it thousands of years beforehand, such as it is this moment before our eyes. What will you say to this ? To you, who out of the fortuitous concourse of atoms can evolve a world, it may of course be chance and nothing more. Certainly you can say this. From the nature of things you can never *prove* a chance, of course, even to yourself. What—oh, what—if it were possible you could mistake ?

Shall we still come closer home ? The world around us is mainly, by profession, Christian. You have referred to what it takes no out of the way discernment to point out, the abundance of vice and crime " in all the Christian nations of the world." Hence you discredit the moral power of the Gospel. I have already pointed out that the corruptions of Christianity are all mapped out in the special Christian Scriptures, as the Jewish corruption and apostacy in the Jewish books. I would ask your attention to this more at length, though briefly still, and still confining myself to what is simple and on the surface.

Before the canon of Scripture was completed, the Christian Church was declared of God to be in a fallen condition. As a witness for God,—like all other witnesses among mere men—it failed from the beginning. The Epistles give us fully this failure, hiding nothing. Judaism coming in in Galatia ; such evil as was not named among the Gentiles in Corinth ; along with this the denial of the resurrection. The farther you go the more the shadows deepen. From his prison at Rome the apostle writes to the Philippians : " All seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ ;" . . . " *many* walk, of whom I have told you before, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ." To Timothy he writes as of a well-known fact : " This thou knowest, that *all* they which are in Asia have departed from me." Thus east and west were involved in a like moral ruin.

And this was no temporary decline. It was predicted to go on and become ever worse : " Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse ; deceiving and being deceived." . . . " The

time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and be turned to fables." . . . "In the *last* days perilous times shall come," &c.

Thus, Sir, your statement that "in all Christian countries vice abounds"—true, as alas it is—attests no less the truth of Scripture, which long before foretold all this; and not in a mere vague way, but with a definiteness and detail, possible alone with Him who seeth the end from the beginning. The shame of Christians, no less than of Jews, bears Him witness, and those who take it up against the purity and truth of Christianity, themselves perforce, if unconsciously, bear witness to Him also.

Take for example the forced celibacy of the Greek and Romish bodies, you are as well aware, I should suppose, as any, that "forbidding to marry" is named in Scripture as one of the marks of departure from the faith; and equally so that with this is joined the "commanding to abstain from meats," both in the practice of these sects, and in the word of prophecy (1 Tim. iv. 3).

But Rome is still more distinctly noticed. If I were to ask you what city in the Apostle John's time—if you will grant me, indeed, that such a person lived, or if not, then in the time, at least, when the Book of Revelation must have been written—reigned over the kings of the earth, you will surely answer me that it was Rome that did so. Did I add, it was a seven-hilled city, every schoolboy would understand of what I spoke. But as little can you deny, then, that Rome is pictured in the Revelation as a harlot-woman, branded with "mystery" on her forefront, in guilty commerce with the kings of the earth, "drunk with the blood of the saints and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."

If you say (with her own advocates) that it was Rome pagan that did and was all this, then you must of course allow that pagan Rome has at least set to her seal that the Book of God is true. But you cannot help understanding that professing *Christian* Rome in this character is far more a "mystery"—far more corresponding to the picture of a harlot woman, gone astray from the One to whom she was espoused (2 Cor. xi. 2)—and likelier far to provoke the apostle's wonder.

Papal Rome has certainly fulfilled it; nay, to this day maintains her right over kings—her right (however little it may be wise or possible for the time to execute it)—her *right* to destroy those whom she accounts heretics. I shall not need, I presume, to prove this; but then you must admit that Rome papal also has set to her seal that the Word of God is true.

But if Rome be thus prominent in prophecy, Protestantism on

the other hand does not escape. The large profession of the day must share together, I fear me, in the character so graphically detailed of the profession of the last days (2 Tim. iii. 1-5). The keen, clear eye of the world has no difficulty in discerning underneath a large mass of such as have "the form of godliness," features such as "lovers of their own selves, covetous (or "money-lovers"), boasters, proud, . . . lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." You may say perhaps all this is only human nature. True, it is poor human nature, found where people professedly are *born again*, and "partakers of the *divine*."

But I need not follow this. Worse evils still are found elsewhere; but I must not expect you to believe that Unitarianism in its various grades is the fulfilment of those "damnable heresies" whereby men "deny the Lord that bought them." Perhaps some geological speculations as to creation or the flood will however come to your memory when you read some further words, as to how some should "willingly be ignorant, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water, whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished" (2 Pet. iii. 5, 6).

And perhaps some other theories, of the earth's internal heat for instance, may add something to the force of this which follows, that "the heavens and the earth which are now by the same Word are kept in store, reserved unto *fire*, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."

And I would, sir, that having read so far, you would still read on, until you find how that "the Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

To which I will add no word of mine. But I trust you will not imagine that I have given anything more than just a few simple Scripture statements, which any one that will look may see fulfilled under his eyes; nor that you will deem it strange that we should credit it, therefore, with something more of authority than the *Livy* you compare it to; and even where it speaks authoritatively of things beyond our knowledge, should only prize the more such a light amid the darkness.

I can even suppose that you yourself may have times when that unattainable certainty, as *you* believe it, must be to you like the barred Paradise of old, and make all that goes by the proud name of "science" seem but as that "*tree of science*" of an "old tradition," for whose taste man bartered, all too cheaply, blessedness at first.

* * *

[121]

Exposition.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

III.

THE FIRST BOOK, OR "GENESIS" OF THE PSALMS.

(Sect. I.—Ps. i.-viii.)

I WOULD now attempt a sketch of the more intimate structure of the books of the Psalms. The first book divides, as has already been said, into three sections. The first eight Psalms are introductory to the whole, and give the argument of all that follows. The second section, of seven Psalms, presents the actual circumstances of those last days to which the Psalms as a whole refer. The third section, by far the largest and containing six-and-twenty Psalms,* gives the divine and spiritual meaning: Christ entering into all the sorrows and sufferings of His people, and His identification with them before God, the basis of all their blessings. These sections, then, are surely in no wise artificial, but necessitated by the meaning of the Psalms themselves.

The introductory character of the first section (Ps. i.—viii.) is after the constant pattern of the Divine Word, which thus, in the opening of every book, is careful to instruct us as to the nature of what lies before us in it. Were this more understood and laid hold of, it would surely simplify much their meaning for us, as well as enable us to realize more the grace and love that make us so fully welcome to the stores provided for us. Would that, indeed, our anxiety to enter into what is thus made over to us answered in any way to the desire of the Provider!

The first section, then, begins with what come always first, the divine counsels which give shape and limit to the scene: counsels manifesting themselves, first, according to the righteousness of God in care for and protection of the righteous, and in judgment of the wicked, sure at length, if long delayed (Ps. i.); secondly, in the exaltation, therefore, of the only Righteous One, tested according to the full measure of that righteousness in God (Ps. ii.). Against Him the ungodliness of man breaks out with-

* At all risk of being counted imaginative—as to which I would only ask sober and not hasty judgment—I would point out how nearly thus the number of these Psalms approaches that of the New Testament books already referred to. In my apprehension their comparative importance is thus not obscurely intimated.

out disguise ; God identifies Himself with this blessed One, exalting Him to the right hand of power, and making Him to rule over all His enemies.

But another element beside that of righteousness is here introduced. Not immediately does the merited wrath come down. He who has only to "ask" to have His enemies made His footstool, delays, and "His long suffering is salvation." Thus this Psalm reveals the blessedness no longer merely of a righteous "walk," but of those who "trust in Him." His very rejectors are invited to "kiss the Son."

How this leads on to the five Psalms that follow (iii.—vii.) is apparent. Here we have the experience, in this interval of grace, of these who do "trust Him," and moreover, a class drawn out of the ranks of his bitterest rejectors. The Jewish remnant of the last days have in a peculiar way this place. And while owing their own blessing to this long-suffering goodness, they find as the result also prevailing around, the more and more open wickedness of those who still reject it. This becomes the discipline of God to their own souls, a process of instruction the steps of which are not hard to follow in this group of Psalms.

First, we have (Ps. iii.) the confidence of faith in God, the childhood lesson with which all begins : so simple and sure, so easy to be learnt as one would think, but which so many things both around us and within come in to try, perhaps to shake, but only at last to root more firmly.

Next (Ps. iv.) we find "righteousness" the key-note of an appeal on the one hand to Him who loveth it and has set apart the godly for Himself ; on the other, to the weary and dissatisfied hearts of men around, turning away from the very good they seek.

Then again, as the evil thickens, and the enmity becomes more decided, the voice of pleading changes to the call for judgment, by which alone deliverance can be effected now (Ps. v.).

But still the pressure goes on and increases, till the shadow of death darkens upon the soul, and it begins to fear in it divine wrath. Then not righteousness nor judgment is the cry, but mercy—deliverance for His mercies' sake (Ps. vi.).

Then the cloud lifts, the dread is gone, the day of deliverance is welcomed as at hand ; the effect of discipline being found, the soul can again speak of righteousness, and anticipate its issue in judgment without fear (Ps. vii.).

Thus the series is complete. I do not doubt it will be found also that even here we have in these five Psalms again a lesson as to Scripture numerals not hard to read in view of what we have already seen. For the *first* of them is but the joy of divine sovereignty : our God *is* God.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

123

The *second* is the soul's "witness" to the sons of men.

The *third* is deliverance looked for, and God's manifestation of Himself in righteous judgment.

The *fourth* is sifting and chastening.

The *fifth* is the Deuteronomic principle—man's reward according to his ways.

Thus we have had two divisions of this first section : 1, Two Psalms giving the principles—the blessedness of obedience and faith—and defining the character and limits of what follows ; 2, five Psalms which give the exercises of faith during the time of God's long-suffering. Finally, we have now, as a third division, one Psalm which gives the issue of the trial, in the setting of the Son of man over all in the world to come (compare Heb. ii.), and the stilling of the enemy and the revengeful. I have noticed already how this *eighth* Psalm as that and as also a *third* division, is perfectly well characterized by these two numbers, which tell of God manifesting himself in a new creation scene.* With this the section naturally closes, and a new series begins with the ninth Psalm.

(Sect. 2.—Ps. ix.—xv.)

The second section, we have seen already, divides into two parts. The first two Psalms again give the subject, and the five following, the exercises of the heart upon it. It is plain that in Ps. ix. and x. we have the actual circumstances of the last days more in view : the detailed character of the oppressor from without and of the wicked one within. The ninth Psalm is the prophetic anticipation of judgment upon both, a judgment which makes Jehovah known. He dwells in Zion, amid the praises of His people. In the tenth Psalm it is more the delineation of the godlessness and tyranny of the wicked which draw down the judgment on him. The two Psalms are structurally bound together by a peculiar, acrostic character, as the two parts of an imperfectly alphabetic Psalm.†

* The significance of the number of the verses in each Psalm, though one of peculiar difficulty naturally, is to me undoubted, as witness once again the acrostic Psalms. In Ps. viii. they are *nine* in number. In the 2d Psalm, the key-note of which is, "Yet have I set my King," they are *twelve*, and that a perfect four by three ; also in Ps. v. In the 6th Psalm we have significantly the number of responsibility, *ten* verses.

With the English version I do *not* reckon in the titles as verses of the Psalm, nor is it reasonable, inasmuch as they *are* titles. A better warrant is that the letters of the alphabetic Psalms (ix., xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxiv.) omit them always, and commence with the verses of the Psalms themselves.

† On this account, no doubt, both the Septuagint and Vulgate give them as one Psalm, as also a very few Hebrew MSS.

The five Psalms that follow (xi.—xv.) form the second part, and give once more the exercise of heart of the godly in view of what the preceding Psalms depict. The first (Ps. xi.) again fittingly begins with what God is for those that trust Him. Foundations gone, what can the righteous do? The answer is, the throne of heaven is not empty yet. He who may be out of sight is yet over all, and the end shall declare it.

The second Psalm (xii.) contrasts the words of pride on man's lips with the pure words of Jehovah, the resource and assurance of the righteous.

The third is as it were a resurrection-Psalm (xiii.). The enemy seems to have prevailed and the Lord to have forgotten. The soul has the sentence of death in itself, that it should not trust in itself, but in God that raiseth the dead. And from the gates of death it is delivered.

The fourth is God's estimate of the children of men—"none that doeth good, no, not one." Yet has the Lord a people with whom He is; a people, therefore, whom the vain workers cannot eat up, as they imagine. The old Balaam and Balak question is here in this fourteenth Psalm.

Finally, the fifth of this series is again Deuteronomic, and very plainly so. Only it is the blessing and not the curse, but according to the eternal principles of righteousness in God Himself.

This closes the second series. The general features of the scene are now before us, but they wait yet to be transfigured and glorified by the presence of a Man in whom men are to see the glory of the Only-begotten, full of grace and truth. This waits us in the third section of the book.

(Sect. 3.—Ps. xvi.—xli.).

For Christ has not yet been seen taking His place among the sons of men. Son of God He has, and, though rejected, only to ask to have the rule over His enemies. Son of man He is seen, too, in the eighth Psalm set in authority over all. But this only gives the limits and character of the path of faith in the meantime. It is another thing to have Him personally in the path itself; and this is what we now have. The Shepherd putting forth his own sheep *goeth before them*, and the sheep follow Him, for they know His voice. We, too, are to listen to His voice, remembering how He has said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." Whatever differences may (and must) obtain between ourselves and the Jewish remnant of a day to come, wherever we hear Him and see Him, we ought to know enough to maintain our title, too, to follow Him.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

125

This third section itself divides into three parts, as characteristic as are any elsewhere. We have, in the first place, nine Messianic Psalms, again giving the basis and theme of the Psalms that follow, which are now fifteen in number, the experiences and exercises of the godly as before; the third part contains only two Psalms, which are again Messianic. The structure of this section is thus parallel with the first, although differing altogether as to the number of Psalms contained.

The nine Messianic Psalms are arranged in three evident groups of three psalms each; making the divine number, as already remarked, very prominent in them. The first three (Ps. xvi.—xviii.) give us Christ identifying Himself with the people, and identified with them by God. The second three (Ps. xix.—xxi.) show us the godly by faith owning and identifying themselves with Him. The third (Ps. xxii.—xxiv.) brings before us the actual atoning work which avails for them, and the results of it in grace. Let any one compare this series with preceding ones, and he will easily perceive some features of resemblance. The first group still gives the purpose or counsel, the divine plan; the second still tends to bring in the people in the workings of their own faith—the exercises of their heart; the third still gives the outcome, the Divine manifestation. Surely there is at least order here of a quite appreciable character. I believe, the more it is examined, the more it will be found how thoroughly these divisions are necessitated by the nature of the Psalms themselves.

The first group of these three will again exemplify this. In Psalm xvi., the Lord clearly takes His place among men, Jehovah His Lord and His satisfying portion, the saints His delight. With death before Him, He is assured of finding beyond it the path of life and pleasures at God's right hand for ever. The 17th Psalm is an appeal to Jehovah, founded on the personal perfection of Christ; but, though still His voice, taking ground which associates others with Himself.* Here, too, the appeal is against the enemy, who in that character finds no place in the previous Psalm. But the pathway of life lies still through death, and the portion (unlike that of the men of this world) is found in resurrection. In the 18th Psalm we have the issue. Christ is seen as the true Israel before God; and, heard amid the sorrows of death, is the ground of their deliverances, from Egypt to the last days. He is delivered from the strivings of the people (Israel), and made the head of the heathen (Gentiles), and all serve Him.

In the second group (xix.—xxi.) the voice is Israel's, although

* "*Them* which put their trust in Thee;" "*They* have compassed *us*."—(Verse 7, 11.)

the subject is still Christ. The 19th Psalm, which speaks of creation and the law, would seem out of place here did we not remember that the return of Israel to the spirit of obedience to the law, according to Deut. xxx., will historically precede their recognition of Messiah. In this Psalm they own God in creation, Jehovah in the law, and the latter as converting, enlightening and rejoicing the soul. But they own, also, as convicted by it, how little they can understand the evil of their own hearts and lives, and are cast upon God for help in helplessness. Then comes before their eyes the vision of Another (Ps. xx.), in weakness also, but thus offering to God what none else could. In His deliverance they learn to see their own, and in the 21st Psalm they find their expectation answered. The King of Israel is delivered, crowned and glorified, and His hand finds out all His enemies; wickedness is destroyed out of the earth, and the godly rejoice.

Then the third group leads us into the Divine meaning of all this: the 22nd Psalm giving us that "forsaking" of the Sinless One upon God's part implied in His being "made sin for us," and in which is found the reality of atonement. From this flows out the grace, which, beginning with the lesser circle of the Jewish remnant, widens out to the "great congregation" of all Israel, and so to the "ends of the earth." Heb. xiii. 20, may give us the connection with the psalm that follows: through the blood of the everlasting covenant, He who is brought back from the dead becomes "the great Shepherd of the sheep." That is the result for the meantime, until the final issue of the 24th Psalm, where as the "King of Glory" He welcomes the pure in heart into His holy hill.

Thus the sources of Divine grace are traced, the present blessing by the way, the perfect rest at the end of the way. This of necessity gives character to the series of experience psalms which once more follow. I have noticed before that even the number of them marks this, and that even as the series preceding is a 3 times 3, so the Divine three combines now with the previous *five* of the remnant-psalms, and we have thus 3 times 5—fifteen (Ps. xxv.-xxxix.) And this fifteen really consists of three fives, I doubt not: the first group (Ps. xxv.-xxix.), giving experimentally the *ground* of the soul's confidence in God; the second (Ps. xxx.-xxxiv.), the joyful certainty therefore that, whatever the circumstances, God is for His saints; while the third (xxxv.-xxxix.) seems to contrast the effect of the government of God over the righteous and the wicked, what is wrath for the latter becoming discipline for the former—which last is still further developed as the lesson of the third book.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

127

To come a little more to detail. The first psalm of the first group (Ps. xxv.), gives along with the confession of sins, the first announcement that "Good and upright is the Lord: therefore will He teach sinners in the way." For His own name's sake He is besought to pardon iniquity, and thus the very greatness of it can be a plea. This is new ground clearly. The second (Ps. xxvi.) is (what unites so often in the Psalms with the confession of sin) the pleading of integrity; but this consists not (as Ps. vii.) in upright conduct towards others, but in loving Jehovah's house and being separate from sinners. The third (Ps. xxvii.) likewise pleads that the one desire of the soul had been to dwell in Jehovah's house, a thought based upon the 23rd and 24th Psalms previous, and which shows the heart laying hold of the promises of grace. Yea, Jehovah had invited to seek His face, and faith had answered the invitation: therefore He would not hide His face. The goodness of the Lord would he see in the land of the living. Then the fourth Psalm (xxviii.) declares how the soul's trust had been met and answered, and the fifth (xxix.) celebrates the majesty and power of Jehovah, who, sitting above the waterflood and King for ever, gives strength unto His people and blesses them with peace.

The second group of five (xxx.-xxxiv.) gives rather the fullness of the blessing than the grounds of confidence. The first of these contrasts the trust in prosperity ("my mountain"), even though the gift of God, with trust in Himself, the Giver. The one failed, the other never can. Hence he can be assured of giving praise for ever, for the Lord abides. In the second Psalm (xxxi.) we have a further proof of this. Even to himself the enemy might seem to have prevailed, and he to be in his hand. It was not so; both he and the enemy were in Jehovah's. Hence, again, he has to praise for goodness stored up for all those that fear and trust Jehovah before the sons of men. The third Psalm (xxxii.), as usual, leads us deeper in. It is, as we well know, the blessedness of one as to his sin forgiven, as to trouble hidden from it in God, and surely guided by Jehovah's eye. The fourth Psalm (xxxiii.) gives the principle of all these: God—Creator—Governor—Disposer of all—God is for us. His eye is upon them that fear Him, upon them that hope in His mercy, to deliver their soul from death, and keep them alive in famine; to make them practically independent of the world's resources, as well as master over all that sin has caused in it. And thus once more (Psalm xxxiv), we can "bless at all times;" only under the holy eye of such an One "what man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days, that he may see good? Keep thy tongue from evil. . . . depart from evil, and do good." The fifth Psalm of

this group again closes it thus with a refrain from Deuteronomy.

The third and final group gives the contrast of God's ways with the wicked and the righteous. It gives us again the issue—the working out of the final result.

The first of these is a Judas-psalm (xxxv.) Hatred without cause ; evil for good ; the rejection of love—these things bring down the sure and righteous, if long-tarrying, judgment. In the second (Ps. xxxvi.), alienation from God is the secret of man's pursuit of evil, as on the other hand, the knowledge of God's loving kindness leads the sons of men to trust in Him. In the third Psalm (xxxvii) the final end is seen. The day of the wicked comes, and his place is gone from the earth. The meek inherit the land, and delight themselves in the abundance of peace. Thus is manifested the Lord's judgment. But then what about the trials meanwhile of the righteous ? This the two following Psalms take up. It is *sin* that necessitates judgment for them also (xxxviii.) ; and the end of the discipline is the discovery of the vanity and nothingness of man (xxxix.), good and needful lessons, which vindicate the truth and love of the All-wise Teacher.

Two Psalms alone remain, as the last division of the third section of the book. We shall have cause to note elsewhere how often two are joined together to give in brief some point of great significance. They are a sort of inspired *nota bene*, if I may so say. Let us mark how specially appropriate here.

If there be significance in numbers, and our sections of this book have foundation in fact, as I am seeking to point out—then in the third division of the third section of the book we should surely be in its *penetralia*—in the sanctuaries of Divine thought. Let any one, then, take up the Psalm that we have now reached—the 40th Psalm, and ascertain if it be not so. I know not what sanctuary we shall find more sacred than the heart of Christ, nor where that heart is opened to us more than in the words which express the principle of his whole life on earth : “ Lo, I come : in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do Thy will, O my God ; yea, Thy law is within my heart.”

And thus is found a sacrifice and offering, which henceforth takes the place of every other. We see our iniquities upon His head (verse 12) and learn the new song from the lips of resurrection (3).

Such is the 40th Psalm ; and is the 41st wholly disconnected from it ? Who is this “ poor man ” whom they are so “ blessed ” that “ consider ? ” Can it be He who for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich ? Surely in this

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

129

way not only is there completest connection, but the fullest and worthiest sense of that first verse.

Then it is a "Judas" Psalm (verse 9), which assures both of whom* God sees in it, and opens up *man's* heart, alas, to its innermost depths. But it is no holy place we reach here; all is express, dark contrast with the former Psalm. But the sun shines out above all this darkness. God's answer to man's rejection of the Blessed One is this: "As for Me, thou upholdest Me in mine integrity, and settest Me before Thy face for ever."

Thus ends the book. Shall *we* not end it too with, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting. Amen and amen."

* I see no inconsistency with this in verse 4. "I have sinned against Thee," may, without any straining, be the language of the Sinless One when bearing sin; and "heal my soul" only assures how deeply it had been wounded, and does not imply *moral* healing, or actual sinfulness necessarily at all.

Am I happy? It is because Christ *loves me* and He is happy. Who, that is made one with the Lord, shall say, I am not blest, if Christ is?

It is exceedingly important in these days to have Christ the centre of everything to us, so as to be able to say, "to me to live is Christ; to be walking in the light of His glory shining down upon our path, in everything that glory kept uppermost; not to be allowing *two lives* in us, the life of the flesh and the life of the Spirit, but to be sinking the life of the flesh, and having only the life of Christ living in us.

It is very blessed to see the different thoughts the mind of Christ has, in different epistles, in connection with His coming. First, in Ephesians, He presents to Himself a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle, as the bride. Second, in Philippians, poor things groaning in vile bodies—He will work in them, and change the body of humiliation into a glorious body. Third, in Colossians, life hid in Him, to be manifested with Him in glory. In a little while, He who is your life shall come forth, and you with Him. Fourth, in 1 John iii., the relationship formed by Christ, of *sons* to the Father, and He will treat them as sons, they shall behold Him and be like Him, He will show Himself to them as He is.

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART I.—(*Concluded.*)

CHAPS. I., II.—GOD'S COUNSELS IN CREATION.

WE have noted already that from the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter is a distinct part, and gives us "God in relationship with the creature He has made." Thus He is now spoken of not simply as God—'Elohim,—but as *the Lord God*—Jehovah 'Elohim.

Jehovah is the name of which the inspired translation is given in the third of Exodus—"I am": expanded to its full significance in the book of Revelation as, "He which is, and which was, and which is to come." Thus in immutable existence He follows out the changes of created being, propping up creaturehood with the strength of eternity. "By Him all things consist." As in relationship with a redeemed people—Israel,—how blessed and reassuring this His covenant name!

But here He is the "Lord God," not of Israel, but of *man*, a prophecy and picture of what shall be when "the tabernacle of God shall be with *men*." Still there is no "tabernacle of God" here; the final fact transcends all pictures.

That we have, however, a picture or type of eternal blessedness in this account that follows is plain to see. Its central figure, Adam, with his relationship to Eve, his wife, is so referred to elsewhere (Rom. v. 14, Eph. v. 31, 32). Paradise and the tree of life also meet us in prophecies of the blessedness to come (Rev. ii. 7, xxii. 2). That there should be contrast also in many respects is not inconsistent with the nature of types, but on the contrary most consistent (1 Cor. xv. 45—48; Phil. ii. 6). We may, therefore, in the beginning of things, contemplate the final end, however much we may find it true that "we see in part, and prophesy in part."

Man, then, is the manifest head of the new created scene; and if made in the image and likeness of God, how plainly is he in the image also of the true man, God's image. The dust of the earth, inspired by the breath of the Almighty, might well be the foreshadow of the union of the Divine and human in one blessed Person in the time to come. The place of headship over all is but the anticipation of the wider headship of the Son of Man. "Image" and "likeness" of God have immeasurably fuller meaning in their application to the "last Adam" than to the first.

Then as to the relationship of the man and woman. It takes little to see in that "deep sleep" into which Adam was cast the figure of the deeper and more mysterious sleep of the "last Adam." Out of the man thus sleeping the woman is derived, as the Church out of Christ's death, and which by the creative Spirit is built up* as His body, "of His flesh and of His bones."

This building of the Church being not even yet complete, the presentation to Himself is of course still future. To that day, however, the apostle carries us on in thought, at the same time reminding us of the necessary contrast between the earthly first man and the heavenly second. For whereas the Lord God brought the woman to the man, "*He*"—the second Man—shall "present unto *Himself*" the church, "a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

Our eyes are dim to see so far into the blessedness of that bright future which for eternity we shall then enter on with Him. Let us rather turn back here to see how distinctly it is noted that all belongs of right to Him whose love must needs share it with His own. Thus, first of all, before the Bride exists, the creatures are brought to Adam, that he may see† what he will call them, and as master of them all he gives them names. And though the woman in due time shares this sovereignty as we know (ch. i. 27, 28), she yet comes into it by her connection with the man, and only so.

How perfect is the harmony of all this! How blessed to see the Lord of heaven and earth thus at the very beginning occupied with these thoughts of His love as to that new creation which was once again to be wrought out of the ruins of the old! To wisdom such as this the craft of Satan and the weakness of man could add no afterthought. Against such power no other power could be ought but as the potter's clay. Such love combined with all gives acquiescence and delight that all of power and all of wisdom should be His, and make resistless the designs and counsels of His heart.

And Eden, man's garden of delight! how sweet to know that that which lingers lovingly yet in the heart as in the traditions of men—which not six thousand years of sin and misery have been able utterly to banish from the memory—how sweet to know that that also is but the type of a far more blessed reality, "the Paradise," not of man only, but "of God" (Rev. ii.

* The margin of Gen. ii. 22, gives rightly, for "*made* He a woman," "*builded*."

† I do not doubt that "to see what he would call them," is that *Adam* might see.

7). The little that we can say of it belongs rather to an exposition of Revelation than of Genesis. The trees and rivers and precious things of the latter we see but as images of beauty too little defined. It is to our shame, surely ; for even as the fruits of the tree of life finally await the Ephesian "overcomer"—that is, the man who, amid the general decay and departure of heart from Christ, holds fast in the heart the freshness of the first, newborn love—so, who can doubt? a truer devotedness of heart to Him would give us even now a fuller knowledge, as well as a richer enjoyment, of what to Him (for it is His) the Paradise of God will be.

He who has the "keys of death and hell," has also, we may be sure, and in this sense, too, the key of Paradise as well.

THINK of the angels who witnessed the creation, and the flowing out of the Creator's power in the perfection and beauty of Eden, having the thought that the One putting forth all this beauty and goodness would be the One to be nailed to the cross as a malefactor, and put into a cave in the earth, and nothing too bad for man to say of Him! Again, could there have been such a thought in heaven as that one treated like a malefactor, would not only be raised up and be in heaven, but be seated on the throne of God—God's delight. No! Never! And it is one of the most difficult things for me to get the thought that according to what I was in nature, it was as unlikely for God to work in me, and out of such materials to fashion a perfect vessel, as for His Son to come down and die.

There is no light like the cross to show out the real character of human nature ; no act man ever did of which God could say, "That is what *man is*," till His Son was put to death and the light of heaven shone down upon a city of murderers. That cross just showed what we are in nature : but God looked into the pit of nature, and He came there because He is rich in mercy. Who can say anything if God chooses to take up such, and give them a new nature, a new life?

Adam's life in Eden was not a life beyond the grave—not that life in which the second Man, the Lord from heaven, ascended up where He was before. As Son of Man Christ could and did die ; but He gave up His life, and took His life again ; and that is the life which a man taken out of nature gets. The first Adam could not have had such a life unless imparted by the last Adam : He communicates life—eternal life. There was no living fountain of water flowing down until Christ left the grave and ascended. Eighteen hundred years ago a fountain was opened in heaven.

[133]

Critical.

AN ATTEMPT AT A REVISION OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION OF THE PSALMS.

IX.

To the chief musician upon Muth-labben : A Psalm of David.*

Aleph†—1. I will praise Jehovah with my whole heart : I will declare all thy wondrous works. .

2. I will rejoice and exult in Thee ; I will sing psalms to Thy name, O most High.

Beth.—3. When mine enemies turn back, they stumble and perish from before Thy face.

4. For Thou hast maintained my right‡ and my cause : Thou satest on Thy throne judging righteously.

Gimel.—5. Thou hast rebuked the heathen ; Thou hast destroyed the wicked one : Thou hast blotted out their name for ever and aye.¶

He.—6. The enemy, [his] desolations are completed for evermore§ : yea, Thou hast destroyed cities ; their remembrance is perished with them.

* "Death for the Son."

† The Psalm is an irregular acrostic, the initial alphabetic letters running on to the end of the next Psalm, which is thus connected with the present one. But many letters are wanting, and the last in Ps. ix is a *koph* instead of *caph* ; then a *lamed* begins Ps. x., after which for ten verses the letters cease, and are continued finally with *koph*, *resh*, *schin* and *tav* at the end of the Psalm. According to Delitzsch, the ten verses without the letters supply exactly the six strophes which would correspond to the letters between *lamed* and *koph*.

‡ *Lit.* Wrought my judgment.

¶ I have endeavoured to *mark out* the various expressions for eternity, although accomplishing nothing in the way of additional clearness of translation : (1) *le'olam*, "for ever," but when in the plural rather "for ages," or "the ages." *Olam* is as nearly as can be equal to the Greek *aion*. The expression found so often in the N. T., "for the ages of ages," occurs but once, however, in the Old (Isa. xiv. 17). (2) *Ad* I translate by "aye ;" (3) *lanetzach* "for evermore." The many shades of difference in expression it is perhaps impossible to render into English. It has not, at any rate, been done, if indeed attempted, hitherto. My own rendering merely distinguishes and nothing more.

§ The construction is a difficult one here. Most translate it as above. Some (with the A. V.) make it a direct address to the enemy, "O enemy !"

Vau.—7. And Jehovah sitteth for ever: He hath established His throne for judgment.

8. And Himself shall judge the world in righteousness: He shall govern the nations in uprightness.

Vau.—9. Jehovah also shall be a high place for the afflicted one, a high place in seasons of distress.

10. And they that know Thy name will put their trust in Thee, for Thou, Jehovah, hast not forsaken them that seek Thee.

Zain.—11. Sing psalms to Jehovah, who hath His seat in Zion: tell His deeds among the peoples.

12. For He who seeketh out bloodshed hath remembered them: He hath not forgotten the cry of the humble.

Cheth—13. Be gracious to me, O Jehovah; behold my affliction [at the hands] of them that hate me, lifting me up from the gates of death;

14. That I may declare all Thy praises in the gates of the daughter of Zion,—[that] I may rejoice in Thy salvation.

Teth.—15. The heathen are sunk down in the ditch that they made; in the net which they hid is their foot taken.

16. Jehovah is made known: He hath executed judgment; the wicked one is snared in the work of his hands. *Higgaion.** Selah.

Jod.—17. The wicked shall turn back into Sheol: all the heathen, forgetful of God.

18. For not for evermore shall the needy be forgotten; the expectation of the meek shall not perish for aye.

Koph—19. Arise, Jehovah; let not frail man† strengthen himself: let the heathen be judged before Thy face.

20. Put them in fear, Jehovah: let the heathen know themselves to be frail men.† Selah.

X.

Lamed.—1. Why standest Thou afar off, O Jehovah? hidest Thyself in seasons of distress?

2. In the haughtiness of the wicked doth he hotly pursue the humble;‡ they shall be taken§ in the plots that they have devised.

3. For the wicked one boasteth¶ of his soul's desire; and he blesseth the covetous, he despiseth Jehovah.

4. The wicked one in his disdainfulness** [says] "He will not require it:"†† there is no God [in] all his plots.

* Meditation. † 'Enosh. ‡ Or "doth the humble burn." § Or "they are being taken." ¶ *Lit.* "Praiseth." ** *Lit.* "The lifting of his nose." †† Or "in his disdainfulness will not seek."

5. His ways are sure at all times ; Thy judgments are a height out of his sight : all his adversaries, he puffeth at them.

6. He hath said in his heart, I shall not be moved : from generation to generation I am one who shall not be in evil.

7. His mouth is full of cursing and of deceits and cruelty ; under his tongue are mischief and vanity.

8. He sitteth in ambush by the villages ; in the secret places doth he slay the innocent : his eyes lurk after the wretched.

9. He lieth in wait in the secret place like a lion in his covert ; he lieth in wait to seize the humble ; he doth seize the humble when he draweth him into his net.

10. He croucheth, he boweth down, and the wretched are fallen by his strong ones.

11. He hath said in his heart, God hath forgotten ; He hath hidden His face ; He will not see it for evermore.

Koph.—12. Arise, Jehovah! O God,* lift up thine hand : forget not the humble.

13. Wherefore hath the wicked one despised God ? he hath said in his heart, Thou wilt not require it.

Resh.—14. Thou hast seen it : for Thou lookest upon mischief and provocation to requite it with Thy hand : the wretched one committeth† himself unto Thee : Thou hast been the helper of the orphan.

Schun.—15. Break Thou the arm of the wicked, and the evil [man], seek out his wickedness [till] Thou find none.

16. Jehovah is King for ever and aye : the heathen are perished out of his land.

Tau.—17. Jehovah, Thou hast heard the desire of the humble : Thou wilt confirm their heart ; Thou wilt cause thine ear to hearken.

18. To judge the orphan and the afflicted, that frail man‡ from the earth may no more alarm.

* *'El.* † *Lit.* "Leaveth." ‡ *'Enosh.*

IF Christ is ours, He is a *living Christ*, and He sends messages and special ones by us. He may put it into the heart to go with the word of truth to some heavily burdened sinner, and the person may do it without a thought of having any power, until he finds from the effect that Christ has been using him as a connecting link between Himself and a people on earth. And so He also passes some word of comfort or truth, out of the lips of a saint, to the one who is needing it.

[136]

Practice.

“ ADDING. ”—(*Continued.*)

“ And to knowledge temperance.”—The next step at once shows how practical this knowledge is to be; as also where it must begin to take effect. “ Temperance ” is, precisely, “ self-mastery.” It is the bounding of that inner deep which cannot be removed or changed, that it “ turn not again to cover the earth.” Manifestly that is a first necessity in order to have fruits of the earth at all. The salt and barren waters must be restrained. The necessity is easily realized. Many will rather ask wherein they are to find the power for fulfilment ; the answer to which is found in the type alluded to.

Power over sin is realized as we learn practically what it is to be “ not under law but under grace.” In the epistle to the Romans we are taught, as the secret of this power, to “ reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin ” through Christ having “ died to sin once ” for us upon the cross. It is the ability to recognize in that cross the condemnation of ourselves, to find there what we are in ourselves under the holy eye of God, and at the same time that what we are thus has already been dealt with and put away for ever. We then realize that “ he that is dead is justified from sin ” (Rom. vi. 7, *marg.*) *A dead man* you can charge with nothing. And we are dead. Therefore the corruption we find, alas, within, is not seen nor imputed by that holy eye, which *has* seen Christ die because of it. To remember it would be—what God can never do—to *forget Christ*.

This is blessed deliverance for the soul cast down with the discovery of indwelling corruption. Joy in the Lord, and peace, perfect and conscious, will be found the secret of power also. Lifted up into a scene of unimagined blessedness,—a Paradise where the tree of knowledge is no more forbidden,—nay, where the trees of knowledge and of life are one,—the enjoyment, free and unrestrained, unclouded, of the things which are its own, gives independency of other things. “ Knowledge ” is *found* to “ have in it ” “ temperance.” The flowers which fade on earth, in heaven are unfading. The stars of heaven, as faith brings them near, are brighter suns. The sweetness of everlasting love is sweeter than the “ honey ” of nature,—proved as it has been in the sacrificial fire (Lev. ii. 11). And, to revert once more to the language of the Scripture before us, “ by the exceeding great and precious promises we are made partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption which is in the world through lust.”

Thus the sea is bounded. If it be yet asked, why we are then still coming so short as we find we are, the answer may not be very far to seek.

First, there is the daily contact with the world,—a world constantly appealing to the evil in us. Necessarily occupied in it, with little balance of retirement, its cares crowd out the blessed realities of our true life. This applies to a day like the present in a degree perhaps beyond any former one. The "progress" of the day, whatever else it means, means undeniably progressive demand for mental energy and effort. The whirl of business, the activity of eager competition of all kinds, is everywhere apparent. In proportion as we enter into this, "that which is our own" will have less place, and, having less place, less power. Even religious activities may manifest by the way they cause this that we have found for ourselves a "world" in them.

Then we carry still within us what links us but too easily with the world we are passing through. It is one thing to have found as to the body of sin and death the law of the Spirit of life as deliverance; it is another thing to have judged in detail what the sin is from which we need deliverance. That which is unrecognized yet as the working of the flesh is so much yet remaining as to which we have never looked for and never realized deliverance; it is so much yet remaining over which the spirit of the world has power.

But the main cause of a low practical condition is with many of us deeper. The first question for all is have *we* merely got hold of the truth which delivers, or has *it* in very truth *got hold of us*? The terrible self-confidence, the lack of brokenness of spirit, which characterize many professors of the doctrine of being "dead to sin," force one to ask the question. For it is a true and practical deliverance that real "knowledge" brings: it has in it "temperance," although capable of and needing daily increase, as I have said, and to learn the details after we have learnt the great first principles.

Not needless any way, is the exhortation to have in our "knowledge temperance" — self-governance. And self-governance is only possible, and only *that*, as it is Christ's government of "self." Just as in the book of Israel's deliverance, it is but half the story how the oppressor's rod was broken, and his iron yoke of slavery removed; the second half is how they receive the easy yoke and light burden of the Lord their Deliverer. What easier, what more blessed, than to run in a path prepared for us by Divine love and Infinite Wisdom, shielded and sustained by Almighty power! Only thus can

"rest" practically be attained. The indulgence of our own way and will is the surest guarantee of unhappiness and unrest.

Then follows "patience":—"and to temperance, patience,"—that is, "endurance;" an easy step after the attainment of the former; in any other way unattainable. Self being mastered, no external thing can master us.

It is no wonder, therefore, that Scripture makes much of this grace of "patience." How much it makes of it may be seen in James, where he admonishes to "let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be *perfect and entire*, wanting nothing." In truth, what can be wanting to a soul subject to God in all things? How simple, that patience should "work experience, and experience, hope!" that, as God's will is waited on, and there is no strife of a contrary will of ours with His, we should find His will the only right and good one, and under all the discord yet this harmony, that "all things serve Him,"—that "He worketh all things according the counsel of His own will!"

This is the secret of the Lord, which is with them that fear Him, and we want to be low enough to learn it. Therefore so much need of tribulation, because tribulation worketh patience; of so much humbling, because we are so little humble; of so much exposure to ourselves of our own shame, because we so slowly take in the lesson of what we are. How solemn to find "godliness" developing out of "patience," when we know so feebly what both temperance and patience are. Yet this is God's order; and we neither may nor can set it aside.

(To be continued, D.V.)

PETER'S "CONVERSION."

I.—THE ROOT OF FAILURE.

"And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

"And he said unto Him, Lord, I am ready to go with Thee, both unto prison, and to death.

"And He said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me" Luke xxii., 31-34.

"And the Lord turned, and looked on Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how He had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter went out and wept bitterly." Luke xxii., 61-62.

PETER'S "CONVERSION".

139

"But go your way, tell His disciples *and Peter* that He goeth before you into Galilee : there shall ye see Him, as He said unto you. (Mark xvi. 7.)

"The Lord is risen, indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon." (Luke xxiv. 34.)

"Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him (for he was naked), and did cast himself into the sea. . . . As soon, then, as they were come to land, they saw a *fire of coals* there, and fish laid thereon, and bread. . . . Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine. . . . So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these ?" (John xxi. 7-15.)

I have put together these passages from the Gospels, that we may have before us, at one view, all the steps in that "conversion," or restoration of Peter's soul, of which they speak to us. Conversion, in Scripture, is not by any means always the first grand turning of the soul to God, but is the term used for any turning from sin also, into which even as converted (in the ordinary sense now) the soul may have got. Peter long before this had been converted (or born again), as is plain by the Lord's words in Matt. xvi. He had had Christ revealed to him by the Father, and had believed that revelation—was a child of God by faith in Christ Jesus. The conversion the Lord speaks of is his restoration of soul after the denial of his Lord and Master.

The outward sin, which too commonly we judge to be all, is ever and only the out-cropping of a state of soul which was there before, and is the root of it. No force whatever of temptation would suffice to upset or draw away a soul which was finding its strength in God Himself. "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able," is ever true here. So that a man is actually "tempted"—that is, temptation succeeds with him—when he "is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." That which exposes him to the evil is in himself, and not in his surroundings. A soul that in the thorough consciousness of impotence rests in God for help is impregnable to assault. "When I am weak, then am I strong." Self-confidence, therefore, in some form, is the secret of all failure—the root of all actual commission of sin.

That this was so in Peter is evident. It ought to be evident also that his is a pattern case. His restoration is the divine application in the last supplementary chapter of John's Gospel, of the feet-washing of the 13th, where Peter, too, is the resister, and is told that bye-and-bye he shall understand the meaning of what he understood not then. In pain and shame, indeed, he learns it, as more or less we all do, but a lesson well worth learning at whatever cost, and, indeed, absolutely necessary to be learnt ; a lesson it will be well for us if we learn, and at less cost, through his example as the Word gives it us, than by our own.

A root is a little thing apparently, and below the surface. Who would judge to be so grave a thing the expression of honest affection to his Master which spoke out in him in the words, "Lord, I am ready to go with Thee to prison and to death." How easily such like things in us pass undetected in ourselves and others! At least, if detected, how little serious we deem them! Who would have thought that the fruit of this would be, "I know not the man." Yet it was, plainly. Not, of course, the fruit of the affection, which was really there—he was no hypocrite,—but of the wretched self-confidence, only able to carry him into the danger, but not through it; sure to break down, and needing to be broken down, at whatever cost; necessitating the perfect love of God itself to give him over into Satan's hands to break it down.

Look at Job. There is not one like him upon the earth, a perfect and upright man. That is God's testimony. Why put such an one through those sorrows which are the very type of suffering to this day? Alas! Job nourished and cherished this perfectness of his, as hundreds now their *Christian* perfection, as they style it. Therefore, "Behold, he is in thine hand." *Satan had asked the same thing concerning Simon Peter*; a lesson for perfectionists to the end of time, but a lesson for many more besides. "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired"—it is "demanded," rather—"to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." Mark that "demand." It is *as* wheat he demands them, for he is the sifter of God's wheat. This applies to all the disciples; but there is one in special need among them, and him the Lord singles out from among the rest: "I have prayed for *thee* that thy faith fail not." How tender that anticipation of the trial before Simon Peter, yet no prayer that he may escape it; it was necessary that he should be exposed to it, and that, too, with the certainty of breaking down. How solemn that warning! And how different yet the Lord's judgment of the matter to ours. In ours that terrible denial in the high priest's palace would be the thing most thought of. In his it was the laying bare only of the state which necessitated it.

While warning it is, there is yet comfort in the warning. If I have fallen into the ditch, it is that I might be turned back out of the path which led to it. It was needful I should fall, and love allowed it for my recovery. But that recovery is not effected simply by my getting out of the ditch, therefore I must be got back to where my path diverged from the true one; yes, and have got the sign-post up upon the bye-path, too. It is for want of this that we fall again so often in the same way. To judge the open sin is easy, and no assurance at all that I shall avoid it for

PETER'S "CONVERSION".

141

the future, no token in itself of recovered spirituality. "If we judge *ourselves* we should not be judged." To judge our *sins* and to judge *ourselves* are two different things. For the last we must have distinguished and judged the state of which the sins are only the issue—the root on which, if it be not removed, fresh fruit will surely grow.

This is restoration in full result. We must notice, however, that there is another kind of restoration needed first and in order to this. Many overlook it or displace it, and to their own serious hindrance. To this the Lord's prayer for Simon Peter plainly looks on, and His own announcement of it to him, along with the announcement of the sin itself, would do its part in due time towards it. The tendency of sin—*all* sin—is to weaken faith, and put distance between the soul and God. And then this again is what makes (so long as it lasts) recovery impossible. Not merely if you are not washed, but "if *I* wash thee not thou hast no part with Me." And we—we must have put our feet with all their defilement into his gracious hands, that they may be cleansed. For that we must be with Him. Distance will not do. With Peter we may think it only becoming to hold off and say—and say it with reverent consideration of His greatness and His holiness—"Thou shalt never wash my feet." We may try to cleanse them by confession and self-judgment, and so make ourselves fit to be with Him again. We shall accomplish nothing by all this. *He* alone washes. We must needs submit to the supremacy of love and grace in Him, and be with Him not as cleansed but as defiled, and let Him cleanse.

We will return to this, and look at it more in detail presently. What we begin with is, that in all cases actual sin is the out-cropping of a state of soul which went before it and necessitated that we should be given up to it. And moreover, this state is very generally, and at the best, some form of self-occupation and satisfaction. We never fall because of weakness merely. We fall because we do not realize our weakness. We have our hand out of our Father's hand. What could harm us if it were not so?

But there are many forms of this, and some so unsuspected, it will be well to pause and look at them a moment. Peter's might be plain; yet were there undoubtedly true affection to his Master, and upright honesty of purpose to disguise it for him. Such do you find with many a young soul fresh with a fervour most real but yet untried. What is the meaning of the miserable breaks-down and failure so soon experienced often after conversion? Not surely that God would have us fail? Not that there is a necessity of failure to which we are delivered? No, but that even at the expense of failure we must be allowed to see

what we are who would so fain serve God, and be something now, if we never were *till* now. Did He leave us to that what should we not lose? How would our very piety soon shut out God from us, the Strong One's strength that beareth us and all our burdens; the love of Him who carrieth in His bosom! To know His worth, we learn our worthlessness, and that the lesson is cheaply learned will be proclaimed in eternal Hallelujahs.

There are others apparently not at all on this ground, and indeed at its very antipodes. They have learnt so fully (they would say) what failure is, that they can think of little else but this. Speak to them when you may, they have nothing but lamentation over their short-coming to respond with. Sunk under the load of a body of sin and death, they imagine that to be self-judgment which is mere self-occupation, and which gives no whit of power for the holiness they long after.

This is not self-complacency, it is true; but it *is* desire after it. If not able to utter the Pharisee's "God, I thank Thee," they are at least miserable because they cannot do it. They have not reached that point in self-judgment at which we turn away in hopelessness from what we have no further expectation from. On the contrary, it is because they have this expectation that they find such grievous and continual disappointment. This, therefore, almost equally with the former condition, exposes the soul unarmed to temptation. If "the joy of the Lord is your strength," it is but little joy they have.

In both cases evil is the fruit, because did God suffer good, it would be but worse evil. We should dress up self with that of which we had robbed Christ, and all seeming good would be perverted and transformed to its mere opposite. "No flesh shall glory in His presence." Therefore the solemn and reiterated warnings of Scripture, not to bring us to content with fruitlessness, but to show us the way rather of bearing fruit. God takes up Job, a perfect man as none else on earth, and how painfully He has to teach him his vileness. The Lord takes up Peter with his honest love to His Master, and has to let him learn in the high priest's palace that he could deny that beloved Master with oaths and curses. He has to be in Satan's sieve, who for other purposes than God's would sift that which presents itself as the wheat of God, that he may be "converted," *not* from the denial of his Lord,—that was but the bitter and painful means by which he was to find out where he was before;—but out of the self-complacency and self-sufficiency, which was, in His sight who seeth not as man seeth, the deeper evil.

How slow are we to recognize this! Yet it is most important to do so, for if we look at the fruits in the life as isolated from

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT. 143

the condition they manifest, we may judge and judge the former, and, leaving out the latter, leave still the root out of which again and again the evil springs. So in the case of another equally with our own we may address ourselves to the mere things into which one may have got, forgetting the deeper question of what got one into it. And here we shall find that Peter's fall is no exceptional one. Self-trust is ever our ruin. Never trusting ourselves we shall never be disappointed. The answer to all that we are is the cross whereon for what we were Christ died. We have died,—we are dead,—with Him, that He might be indeed the object of our life. "To me to live is Christ." If it be *that*, God, with all that He is, is with me. Power cannot be lacking to accomplish what is His own purpose. Alas, that it should be so easy to mistake my desire to be something for Christ for this, the only rightful object of the soul!

The Faith.

THE TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

V.—"FOR EVER AND EVER."—(*Continued.*)

"For ages of ages"—the same phrase, omitting only the article—occurs but once in the passage already considered, Rev. xiv. 11: "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." These two almost identical expressions are the only ones in which the word "ages" is found in the book of Revelation, and this will enable us to judge of the truthfulness of Mr. Jukes' assertion, that "the book of the Revelation more than any other speaks of them, for this book opens out the processes and stages of the great redemption." Now, the phrase occurs fourteen times in this book. Ten times it refers to the being, reign, or worship of God; once to the saints' reign, three times to the torment of the wicked. *Not once* are any "processes or stages of the great redemption" even hinted at in connection with it. The connection is in Mr. Jukes' mind alone. "Unto the ages" is the literal rendering of "for ever," in seven places,* and in Jude 25, we have

* The passages are Luk. i. 33; Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xvi. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Heb. xiii. 8. Matt. vi. 13 would be an eighth, but its latter half is uniformly rejected by the critics.

"unto all the ages." All these occurrences are found in ascriptions of praise to God, the celebration of a glory which can never cease, or in relation to the unchangeableness of Christ, "the same yesterday, to-day, and *for ever*," or to His kingdom. That is, the expressions are used to denote a proper eternity.

Once we have "the age of ages" Eph. iii. 21): "Unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, unto all the generations of the age of ages." These are all the occurrences of the plural form with reference to the *future*. All therefore that could be even supposed to connect with any future restitution of those unsaved on the day of grace.

But the most frequent term for eternity is not a plural form, and here it would hardly do to render it "for the age." What age? Most certainly one that comes to an end cannot be intended when it is said that "Christ abideth forever," or that "he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever;" or again, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever."* Thus we are compelled to find, if possible, another meaning for "aion" here than "age;" and it is quite certain that whatever its original meaning, the Greeks, long before the New Testament, used it for eternity. It remains to be proved yet—for it never has been done—that the phrase in question ever means anything less or else than just "for ever." It is objected, but surely to no purpose, that there are places where in the nature of things a proper eternity cannot be meant. That is as true as it is idle, for the very same thing is true as to the English "for ever" itself, which no one doubts the meaning of on any such account. That the context or the nature of the thing spoken of may modify the meaning, only confirms what the meaning is, when not so modified.

Nor is it true of any except this last expression, that it is ever found even thus far modified. Whatever then is meant in English by "for ever" is expressed in this last Greek term, while "evermore" and "for ever and ever," as more emphatic forms, represent better those more literally given, as "for the ages" and "for the ages of ages."

The word "eternal" we shall look at in another place.

* *Lit.* "For the course of eternity"—"the age of the age," if we are to translate uniformly. The exact expression only occurs, Heb. i. 8.

[145]

Questions of the Day.

THE CHURCH : SAVED OR SAVING ?

(Concluded.)

WE have already noticed that the only other term for the Church of God in the New Testament is "the house of God," or, what is equivalent, His "building" or "habitation." In the very first notice of the Church we have it spoken of in this way, where the Lord, in His oft-quoted words to Peter, says, "Upon this rock will I build my church."

It is not my purpose yet to do more than refer to this. In the epistle to the Ephesians we find the actual carrying out of the Lord's words: "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the"—or rather "in"—"spirit" (Eph. ii. 19—22.)

So also he to whom the Lord had spoken, expounds His words: "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, ye also as lively (*i.e.* "living") stones are built up a spiritual house" (1 Pet. ii. 4, 5).

And this in the first epistle to Timothy is explicitly stated to be the "church:" "That thou mayst know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God" (ch. iii. 15).

Thus, no one can doubt, Peter's "living stones" answer exactly to the "members of Christ;" and his "spiritual house" is exactly co-extensive with "the church which is His body." It is another aspect of it, of course, and another line of truth connects itself with it. We may shortly look at this. All we want to see just now is that the church, Christ's body and the house of God, built up of living stones, as the apostle Peter depicts it, are but the same church from two different points of view.

In the passage quoted from Ephesians there are again two aspects of the *house of God*. In the first place, it is a building at present incomplete, but *growing* into a (future) temple in the Lord. There, mark, the whole of it is "fitly framed together,"

the work of a Divine architect, and without a flaw. This goes on from generation to generation until, all the living stones being in the building, it is owned as complete, the eternal habitation of God, the anti-type of that in which the glory dwelt of old.

But then, is there no present dwelling-place of His? Do we wait simply for that future time to have this blessedness? This is the question which the last verse answers. "Ye *are* also builded together for an habitation of God in spirit." He has His dwelling already in that which is now down here. The church of the present day—that actually existing upon earth—is the House of God in the meantime. If you turn to the first epistle to the Corinthians, you will both find this recognized, that there is, not merely a future, but a *present* temple—"know ye not that ye are the temple of God"—but also that, as practically built up now in the world, built up by human instrumentality, other than "living stones" may be put into the house: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now, if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest. . . . Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (ch. iii. 11—17).

Thus the practically existing Church, as committed to the responsibility of man, may differ from the divine pattern. Corrupters may defile it; bad workmen may build in materials which will not stand the final test. The house of God, as built up continually of living stones by the Lord Himself, may come to be in character very distinct from what actually exists as that at any certain time. It is never said that it ceases thereby to be God's house—that the Spirit of God gives up His claim upon it, or His place in it. But the actual building, in the exact measure of the corruption, ceases to be the manifestation of Christ's own work, and to correspond to the actual membership of the body of Christ.

Thus the Church, as it is in God's thought, necessarily becomes "invisible;" but is so not by divine constitution, but by human failure. These two things so different from each other Mr. Sadler confounds. He seeks divine sanction for what is only man's sin. For what the passages we have looked at contemplate as possible, many another Scripture shows us already, even in the apostles' times, coming to pass, and announces as more and more to be the actual condition in the time to come.

Thus to the Philippians the apostle could already say, "Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even

THE CHURCH: SAVED OR SAVING? 147

weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly." The beloved John could write of those who had been amongst Christians, though now gone out, but were not of them (1 John ii. 19). Jude also spoke of ungodly men, who had crept in amongst them, about whom Enoch had already prophesied as ordained to judgment at the coming of the Lord (Jude iv. 14, 15). The apostle Paul testifies that men having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, would make "perilous times in the last days" (2 Tim. iii. 1—5). And in the same epistle he warns Timothy already that, while "*the Lord knoweth* them that are His"—alas! already it was difficult for *man* to know—"in a GREAT house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour and some to dishonour" (ch. ii. 19, 20). The house of God had become like this "great house!"

We may easily see, then, how far Mr. Sadler's assertions are Scriptural or not, judging by the *New Testament* (for of the Old I have not spoken yet). Instead of "saving" men by joining them together in the Church, *He* joins together the *already saved*. Instead of men being "admitted into God's Church by a rite or ordinance," the baptism of the Holy Ghost is no such rite, and by this alone we are baptized into the body. Instead of the members of the *visible* church being always assumed to partake or to *have* partaken of any covenant grace, it is distinctly stated that men might be amongst Christians who were *never* "of" them. Lastly, according to God's thought, the visible Church *should* be the body of Christ visible, but *actually* it is very far from being this; while, *not* according to God's thought, but through man's sin, the body has become indeed invisible, and the house of God, while still His, has been built up of other than the living stones, which are alone truly "*His building*."

The whole system falls with these foundations. On the other hand, it should be plain that if so-called "Catholicism" has erred on the one side, the mass of ordinary Protestantism is at fault on the other. If the "Catholic" error be in substituting for the "one body" of Christ, a body of mere sacramental "members," on the other hand, the Protestant error has been in allowing the body of Christ, which they rightly own to be the *true* Church, to be set aside for most practical purposes by *bodies* which can none of them, nor all together, put forth any just claim to be that. Surely nothing can be clearer, if we take the first epistle to the Corinthians even alone, that the practical, actual Church at Corinth was just the body of Christ, so far as there! Nor can it be with any hope of success maintained that what was true at

Corinth was not equally true at Ephesus, at Colosse, at Rome, or wherever else. The local "churches" (or "assemblies") were thus nothing but the one Church, divided by the accident of locality and nothing more. There were not so many "bodies," but all "one body," one organization, not human but divine. How solemn a thing to own that the *true* Church is *invisible*! What, then, must the *visible* Churches be but the *untrue*? Let not my reader take offence at the suggestion, which if it be only mine he can afford to pass over easily enough. If there be truth in it he *cannot* afford to pass it over.

Certain it is that there is but one Church which has Divine sanction, whether it be visible or invisible, and that is the true one. That it is owned another would spring up through man's bad building, is quite true, but does not alter one iota of God's thoughts or of our responsibility. That this, which is identical with no one or half-dozen denominations, but covers the whole ground of Christian profession, retains still the responsibility of God's house, and privilege of the indwelling Spirit, is true, and manifests His grace and unchangeableness, but does not sanction the violation of His principles, or association with what, *judged by His word*, is contrary to them.

The "yoke" with unbelievers is still forbidden. The Lord's Supper still remains not only the symbol of the death of Christ, but the expression of the unity of Christ's body also (1 Cor. x. 17). These things we are accountable to maintain, whatever the mass even of His people practice or believe, and while we recognise, as we are bound to, the members of Christ everywhere as our own, and show them all the practical love of the relationship.

There is yet a most important point as to which we are to examine Mr. Sadler's position, but we must leave it for a separate paper.

"SPIRIT AND SOUL AND BODY."

MR. ROBERTS' treatment of the apostolic doctrine of man's physical constitution as given in 1 Thess. v. 23, is a remarkable illustration of how little any natural cleverness can avail to make Scripture speak in contradiction to itself. It is immense comfort, when dealing with some of the subtleties of which the human mind is capable, to trace in contrast with these the blessed unswerving certainty of the word of God. In everything it approves itself the very opposite of the vague and ambiguous thing which

men so often deem it, and in every line and word the sure and trustworthy stay of the soul.

If Mr. Roberts' arguments are pitiable, as they are, it is not from any want of cleverness that they are not better. He says all that can be said. And if I may seem to follow him at unnecessary length it is because the subject is so exceedingly important, and so many are in various ways being exercised by it, that it is only due to these to omit nothing that may in any way be a question to the minds of the weakest. The Christadelphian arguments are in this so noteworthy, that, being annihilationists of the extremest sort, they raise every question that possibly can be raised, and would fain believe they have found every weak point in the armour of orthodoxy. Listen to such self-gratulation as the following:—

“For ‘the remarks of Ellis and Read upon the text,’ the Christadelphians are in no wise responsible. *Uncertain and contradictory reasoning is natural on the part of men knowing only a part of the truth, as these men do.* Mr. Grant's strictures on their arguments do not touch the Christadelphian position in the slightest degree. We therefore pass them by, regretting merely that Mr. Grant should appear to get an advantage which is due not to the strength of Mr. Grant's position in itself, but to the *incompetence of the diluted ‘annihilationism,’* which he combats in conjunction with his assaults on the Christadelphian position.”

It is evident, therefore, we must examine the “competency” of Christadelphianism to sustain its appeal to Scripture the more carefully. If we omit one point in dispute, it will be alleged that that one point is just the unanswerable one, and the key of the whole position.

But in truth, Mr. Roberts' self-laudation is in very ill (however suited) company with his arguments in this very connection. He is only skilful in avoiding the point at issue, and triumphant over opposition where there is none. And of this the proof is at hand to be produced.

He rightly represents the view he is opposing to be “that the physical constitution of man, as defined by the Holy Scriptures, comprehends three separate elements: spirit, soul, and body. These are three separate parts, each of which is necessary to the whole man. And he adds:—

“This, says Mr. Grant, ‘is denied on the part of those who hold’—what? ‘That the body is the whole man.’ We must object on the part of all Christadelphians to be confounded with these, if there are such. We are of those who recognise the possibility of: 1, A body without life or mind, that is, a corpse; 2, A body with life, but lacking mind, as in the case of the lowest type of idiot; neither of which would appeal to our appreciations. We are of those who find pleasure only in the combination of ‘body, soul and spirit,’ as constituting ‘the whole man.’”

I have already warranted Mr. Roberts in putting in “living”

into this definition—"that the *living* body is the whole man"—and he has already accepted it on the part of Christadelphianism. I need not then repeat what I have before said as to this.* I would only point out that "life" and "mind" answer respectively in his comment to "soul" and "spirit." It is of little importance, save as a question of consistency, to remark that in this way Mr. R. denies to an "idiot" (at least of "the lowest type") what he makes universal in the beasts. Beasts have "spirit," according to him, "in the same sort as men have it." If "mind," then, be an allowable substitution for "spirit," (as in some sense I do not question) the beast has a "mind" also, according to his own application of Eccl. iii. 21. This is quite akin to some of the scientific theories of the day. But how, then, is Mr. Roberts so sure that even "the lowest type of idiot" has none?

Waiving this, it is plain that Mr. R. himself is one of those for whom the (living) body is the whole man. But what, then, of the three constituent parts? Properly speaking, the "mind" is, with him, *not* one of them, for *spirit alone* is not this. The mind is really, in his way of thinking, only *an effect of the spirit upon the brain*. It is "the flesh that thinks," as he quotes with approbation further on. "Mind" is not, then, for him the equivalent of "spirit," though he would fain make it appear so.

And then again, "life" is not, with him, the equivalent of "soul." It is strange, but true, that he can give no equivalents which will stand a moment's examination. Of course he often represents the soul as life (and so do most who hold annihilation); but he is inconsistent with himself in doing so. The "living soul," according to Dr. Thomas, is just the "natural body," and this he quotes 1 Cor. xv. 44, 45, to prove. The "soul" is not, then, the "life." How could we talk, indeed, of a "living life?" It is once more the "body," or, if you like, *the body vitalized by the spirit*.

Hence Mr. Roberts' interpretation of "spirit" and "soul" turns out to be no interpretation, even on his own shewing. He must positively give up "mind" and "life" as in any sense their synonyms. What else he will give us in their room we must be content to wait for.

It is no question of "*combination* of body, soul and spirit as constituting the whole man," that we are raising; and there is no use, therefore, in Mr. R.'s statement that "*in this sense* we stand as stoutly as Mr. Grant by 1 Cor. v. 23." How "stoutly" that is may be seen by his after statement that "Mr. Grant is guilty of treating as a scientific analysis of human nature the *fervent*

* See *ante*, p 77.

HYPERBOLISM of an apostolic benediction." Why stand up stoutly for an hyperbolism at all? If we know what an hyperbolism is, it is a "shooting beyond the mark;" in short, an *exaggeration*. Why not say so at once, and refuse to contend for it?

But according to the theory before us it may well be an hyperbolism, if not worse, for even "combination" of body, soul and spirit is NOT Christadelphianism; and if Mr. Roberts contends it is, then he will persuade us only that he does not know his own system. Combination of "body, life and mind" would be incongruous enough in itself; but, as we have seen, soul is not "life," but "natural *body*;" and "mind" is not "spirit," but "spirit-vitalized flesh." This is the true Christadelphian statement. "Soul" must therefore disappear out of Mr. Roberts' "combination," for it is only "*body*," and body, *body* and spirit," would be even worse than "fervent hyperbolism."

He may ask, perhaps, however, if I do not myself admit that the word for "soul" here does often mean "life," and on what ground I deny his right to take it so. I answer, it is very plain that Scripture does use the word "psuche" both for "life" and "soul," for the simple reason that the soul *is* the life of the body. But in Dr. Thomas' system it is not so; the soul is the body itself, and there is no basis left for the secondary meaning. The body cannot be the *life* of the body.

Nor does Mr. Roberts distinguish between the two meanings. He does not say, "the word used I take to be 'life' in this passage, and not 'soul.'" On the contrary, he assumes life and soul to be one, and that they are not, according to his theory. He has no right, then, to use the orthodox phrase to cover a meaning wholly foreign to it. "Body" is his real equivalent for soul, and he cannot deny it; and if he assumes "soul" to be correct as a translation of this passage, he must not take that as the equivalent of what, according to his system, it is not.

If he really mean "life," and *not* "soul," we will give him all the benefit of the difference, which is not much. For what *is* the life, in that case, but the simple effect of the union of spirit and body? There is thus no *third* constituent at all—no combination of three, but only two. And what is the sense of the sanctification of the body *and* its life? There is no hyperbolism in this, but simple folly.

Yet folly as it is, Mr. Roberts insists on it:—

"It is evident that (the body) is considered apart from the life and spirit at work in it, just as the life and spirit are considered apart from the body; not that they can be taken apart, but they present themselves separately to the cognition, as the shape, colour and substance of a hat, which though identical with and inseparable from the hat itself, can be thought and spoken of as entities separable from the hat. And does not this illustration in truth

suggest the meaning of Paul's words? How could a man more fervently express the entirety and integrity of a thing than by specifying all the aspects in which it presents itself to the cognition? But would it not be a perverse treatment of his words to extort from them a theory that these separate *aspects* could exist separately?"

But that is not quite the whole point ; nor are we come at all as yet to the question of *separate* existence of body, soul and spirit. The question is, are they not, must they not be, three entities capable of sanctification? Is not that what the apostle's prayer implies? And then I ask again, what is the use of speaking of the sanctification of the body *and* of the life of the body? Nay, more, could you possibly speak of the sanctification of the mere "vital principle" at all?

It is no wonder, then, that Mr. Roberts should speak of "hyperbolism;" nor that he should seek by raising questions of immortality before they are in place, to triumph cheaply before the battle. The real question here he cannot meet; the rest we must reserve for its due time and place.

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

III.

THE SCEPTICISM OF MEN OF SCIENCE.

SIR,—In common with most rejectors of Revelation you deny miracles. It is no wonder, for God with you is not merely the Unknown, but the "Unknowable;" and miracles are extraordinary manifestations of His presence and power as distinct from and above that "Nature" with which the man of science, as such, has to do. What Mr Tyndall says as to creation, in one of your own quotations, may be extended to the whole field of the miraculous:—"As far as the eye of science has hitherto ranged through nature, no infusion of *purely creative power* (!) into any series of phenomena has ever been observed." That may be very true and yet completely out of the way. Science has never seen God creating! If that is what is meant, the very simple answer is, Creation was finished ages before this child of a few years old was born. But suppose it to be going on, and the "eye of science" saw, what it has been straining itself to see, an *Acarus Crossii*, or something else come into being, *would it believe?* Why, sir, you know, and Mr. Tyndall knows, that science has already forestalled the difficulty, and provided a way of accounting for the

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL.

153

wonder. Did this happen, it would not be "creative power" at all ; it would be just "*spontaneous generation*."

People might ask—if daring enough sceptics to question "science"—whether its eye had seen the *spontaneity* as well as the production ? and why it should be more scientific to suppose the *Acarus* to have created itself (or the air or the water to have created it), than God ? Did the eye of science see it produce itself ? or see the water make it ? No, but it saw the *water*, and it never saw God. And that is the whole matter.

But is there, then, nothing but what we see ? we, who see not so very far, nor so very well at best ? Yes, Mr. Tyndall himself will tell us that there is, and that although he *has* never seen it, he yet can pronounce upon what it is gives birth to the *Acarus*. Allow me to re-quote to you your own quotation :—

"As far as the eye of science has hitherto ranged through nature, no infusion of purely creative power into any series of phenomena has ever been observed. The assumption of such a power to account for special phenomena has always proved a failure. *It is opposed to the very spirit of science* ; and I therefore assumed the responsibility of holding up in contrast with it that method of nature which it has been the vocation and triumph of science to disclose, and in the application of which we can alone hope for further light. Holding, then, that the nebula and all subsequent life stand to each other in the relation of the germ to the finished organism, I re-affirm here, not arrogantly or defiantly, but without a shade of indistinctness, the position laid down in Belfast."

Thus it is scientific to believe in "evolution," but not in creation. So Mr. Tyndall says. The eye of science has never seen creation. Very true ; and has it then *seen* evolution ? Every man of science in the world will answer that it is an hypothesis—that is, a conjecture. You, sir, must know full well how anxiously they have been trying, with all the energy man's will is capable of, to "evolve," or to find evolved, one new species even out of an old one, and how absolutely they have failed. You may say (as some have said), "they will not always fail." That is, no doubt, your opinion. Permit me to say, opinion is not evidence ; and as you will listen with interest to Mr. Huxley, allow me to quote from him one signal proof of the danger of *unverified deductions* :—

"However, if I might impress any caution upon your minds, it is the utterly conditional nature of all our knowledge—the danger of neglecting the process of verification under any circumstances ; *and the firm upon which we rest* the moment our deductions carry us beyond the reach of this great process of verification. There is no better instance of this than is afforded by the history of our knowledge of the circulation of the blood until the year 1824. In any animal possessing a circulation at all, which had been observed up to that time, the current of the blood was known to take one definite and invariable direction. Now there is a class of animals called *Ascidians*, which possess a heart and a circulation, and up to the period of which I speak no one would have dreamt of questioning the propriety of the deduction, that these creatures have a circulation in one direction ; nor would any one have

thought it worth while to verify the point. But in that year, M. Von Hasselt, happening to examine a transparent animal of this class, found to his infinite surprise, that after the heart had beat a certain number of times it stopped, and then began beating the opposite way, so as to reverse the course of the current, which returned by and by to its original direction.

"I have myself timed the heart of these little animals. I found it as regular as possible in its periods of reversal; and I know no spectacle in the animal kingdom more wonderful than that which it presents—all the more wonderful that to this day it remains an unique fact, peculiar to this class among the whole animated world. At the same time I know of no more striking case of the necessity of *verification* of even those deductions which seem founded on the widest and safest inductions."—(Lay Sermons, Canadian edition, p. 85, 86.)

Upon such a "film," then, does Prof. Tyndall rest; and how thin the film can scarcely perhaps be estimated. For never has the "eye of science" once seen even one species evolved out of another; much less has it seen the whole orders and classes of animals evolved out of one; or again, this out of a vegetable; or this out of a red-hot globe, which was originally a nebula! How many links of this chain have to be verified! Tenacious indeed must the "film" be that will not break under this enormous and constant stretching!

Yet so hopeless is the assumption of creative power that to this is the scientific mind reduced. Nay, it will go even greater lengths than this rather than accept anything that implies a God that it cannot analyze and make subject to its laws. Hear again this Dr. Tyndall:—

"We need *clearness and thoroughness* here. Two courses, and only two, are possible. Either let us open our doors freely to the CONCEPTION OF CREATIVE ACTS, or, abandoning them, let us radically change our *notions of matter*. If we look at matter as pictured by Democritus, and as defined for generations in our scientific text-books, the absolute impossibility of any form of life coming out of it would be sufficient to render any other hypothesis preferable; but the definitions of matter given in our text-books were intended to cover its purely physical and mechanical properties. . . . But are the definitions complete? Everything depends on the answer given to this question. Trace the line of life backwards, and see it approaching more and more to what we call the purely physical condition. We reach those organisms which I COMPARED to drops of oil suspended in a mixture of alcohol and water. We reach the *protogenes* of Haeckel, in which we have a type distinguishable from a fragment of albumen only by its finely granular character. Can we pause here?"

I really think it would be safer, before we are completely in the fog. So upon Prof. Tyndall's *comparison* of some low forms of life to what they are not, and his *inability* to distinguish between two things, which are nevertheless classed, by himself as well as others, as one living and the other dead—aided by the before-said *assumption* of the evolution of all other life out of such-like lowly forms—he can build ("not arrogantly or defiantly") his wall to shut out God from His own world. And this is "clearness and thoroughness" in science!

Plain enough it is that there must indeed be something very unwelcome to Prof. Tyndall in the thought he disowns. Or is it only a "law of nature" he is exemplifying—the natural fondness of this young mother, Science, for her new-born babe?

Forgive me, sir, if I speak strongly. You have compelled me. You are, with all your science, only trying to make nature bear false witness to her God, and your cross-questioning of her is your own confusion. She will compel the disbeliever in creation, if he would escape it, to pile hypothesis upon hypothesis, till the structure falls with its own weight. But is this "science?" Science is "knowledge." Does Prof. Tyndall "know?" The truth is, he himself disclaims it, all he knows is *that nobody else knows*. The only certainty he has is of *uncertainty*. He is content to be ignorant if he can only persuade us that none are wiser. It is thus he assures us how little he has been convinced by his own arguments, protogenes and all:—

"He (the scientific man) will be the last to dogmatize upon the subject, for *he knows best* that certainty is for the present inattainable. His refusal of the creative hypothesis is *less an assertion of knowledge than a protest against the assumption of knowledge*, which must long, if not for ever, be beyond us, and the claim to which is the source of manifold confusion upon earth."

Alas, sir, must "science" assume to be that in the very face of the confession of her own ignorance? Was there ever such a dogmatizing in the dark as this? To own ignorance simply would be too humiliating. To maintain upon the basis of one's own ignorance, that no one can know anything beyond ourselves, this is the "protest" of true science!

Here we may take our leave of Prof. Tyndall. We need not have dwelt so long upon his sayings, but that his is one of the great names of the day, and you yourself have brought them forward in support of your own assertions. Having gone so far, it will be worth while to look round a little and enquire further as to the value of these scientific estimates which deal so freely with unknown quantities.

Mr. Huxley's name is perhaps as great as Dr. Tyndall's. His appointment three years ago as Lord Rector of the University of Aberdeen was remarked upon "as showing the way the currents of thought and sympathy are setting." Mr. Huxley is in complete accordance with yourself as to what he calls "the religion of the present," which "has not only renounced idols of wood and idols of stone, but begins to see the necessity of breaking in pieces the idols built up of books and traditions and fine-spun ecclesiastical cobwebs, and of cherishing the noblest and most human of man's emotions, by worship 'for the most part of the silent kind,' at the altar of the Unknown and Unknowable."—(Lay Sermons, p. 16.)

Mr. Huxley takes his place thus among Dr. Tyndall's scientific Protestants. He openly worships "he knows not what;" and knows only this: that God is "Unknowable."

But surely, sir, this is either too little knowledge or too much. If that is the only thing he or you knows, one may fairly ask, *how can you know that?* Surely it implies no inconsiderable acquaintance with the Unknown to know that none can know it!

For instance, there is either a personal God or not. If you know not which, then He may be a Person; if a Person He may reveal Himself. You *cannot* deny that without assuming a knowledge that you say none can have. The very words you use imply that perhaps our God of revelation may be the true One; for if you say He is not, you at once assume to know something, and a good deal, about Him. Thus you may say for yourself, you know Him not; but you cannot say, *I* know Him not; for if you say, He is not what I believe, then you must at least know *something* of Him to know that.

You can only escape from this one way, and that is no real escape. If there is *no God to be known*, then, of course, no one can know Him. But even then there is no "Unknowable;" for if there be nothing else but nature, surely you *do* know a good deal about *it*; and must, in order to be able safely to assume that it owns no God. Thus, sir, you cannot be allowed the plea of an universal ignorance you cannot prove. If you know nothing about God, you must not open your lips to speak about Him.

But the fact, alas, is, that whether you own it or not, all your assumptions are that there is none. For surely if there be a God at all, He must have purpose in what He does. His works will manifest the wisdom of a Divine mind. A blind, unintelligent God is not one. But your aim, with Mr. Huxley and others, seems to be, if possible, to annihilate all this. Let me quote this gentleman again:

"The teleological argument runs thus: an organ or organism (*a*) is precisely fitted to perform a function or purpose (*b*); therefore, it was specially constructed to perform that function. In Paley's famous illustration, the adaptation of all the parts of the watch to the function or purpose of showing the time, is held to be evidence that the watch was specially contrived to that end; on the ground that the only cause we know of competent to produce such an effect as a watch, which shall keep time, is a contriving intelligence adapting the means directly to that end. Suppose, however, that any one had been able to show that the watch had not been made directly by any person, but that it was the result of the modification of another watch which kept time but poorly; and that this, again, had proceeded from a structure which could hardly be called a watch at all, . . . and that going back and back, in time we came at last to a revolving barrel as the earliest traceable rudiment of the whole fabric. And imagine that it had been possible to show that all these changes had resulted, first, from a tendency in the structure to vary indefinitely; and, secondly, from something in the surrounding world which helped all variations in the direction of an accurate

time-keeper, and checked all those in other directions ; then it is obvious that the force of Paley's argument would be gone. For it would be demonstrated that an apparatus thoroughly well adapted to a particular purpose might be the result of *a method of trial and error worked by unintelligent agents*, as well as a direct application of the means appropriate to that end by an intelligent agent."

It is Darwinism, indeed, that has presented things in this way, even if it is Mr. Huxley speaking, but in this (he says) Mr. Darwin "has rendered a most remarkable service to philosophic thought, by enabling the student of nature to recognise to their fullest extent those adaptations to purpose which are so striking in the organic world, and which Teleology has done good service in keeping before our minds, without being false to the fundamental principles of a scientific conception of the universe." (Lay Sermons, pp. 301-304.)

These "fundamental principles" seem to be that at all cost God should be excluded. Else why should it be "a most remarkable service" to exclude intelligence from what would seem so striking a proof of it?

The argument, being all founded on an "if," fails, of course, with the failure to establish the condition. Mr. Darwin has failed to show the perfect watch to be the descendant of the imperfect one. He has failed to produce even one of the multitudinous imperfect time-keepers which should have been the result of these indefinite variations. He has failed to convince even Mr. Huxley, willing enough as he is to be convinced, that all the wisdom apparent in nature is a sham or a dream. True it is, that as a controversialist, and when making war upon the "idolatry built up of books," he may seem almost convinced ; but let us hear the other side, and we shall find that *that*, not nature, was the sham. Mr. Huxley's attack upon her wisdom was but the over-heated zeal of the iconoclast. In his inmost soul he deems far otherwise, as his own words shall assure us now :

"Nature is never in a hurry, and seems to have had always before her eyes the adage, 'Keep a thing long enough and you will find a use for it.' She has kept her beds of coal for millions of years without being able to find much use for them. She has sent them down beneath the sea, and the sea-beasts could make nothing of them ; she has raised them up into dry land, and laid the black veins bare, and still for ages and ages there was no living thing on the face of the earth that could see any sort of value in them ; and it was only the other day, so to speak, that she turned a new creature out of her workshop, who by degrees (?) acquired sufficient wits to make a fire, and then to discover that the black rock would burn.

"I suppose that nineteen hundred years ago, when Julius Cæsar was good enough to deal with Britain as we have dealt with New Zealand, the primeval Briton, blue with cold and woad, may have known that the strange black stone, of which he found lumps here and there in his wanderings, would burn, and so help to warm his body and cook his food. Saxon, Dane and Norman swarmed into the land. The English people grew into a powerful nation, and nature still waited for a return of the capital she had invested in

the ancient club-mosses. The eighteenth century arrived, and with it James Watt. The brain of that man was the spore out of which was developed the steam engine, and all the prodigious trees and branches of modern industry which have grown out of this. But coal is as much an essential condition of this growth and development as carbonic acid is for that of a club moss. Wanting the coal, we could not have smelted the iron needed to make our engines, nor have worked our engines when we had got them. But take away the engines, and the great towns of Yorkshire and Lancashire vanish like a dream. Manufactures give place to agriculture and pasture, and not ten men could live where now ten thousand are amply supported.

"Thus all this abundant wealth of money and of vivid life is nature's investment in club-mosses, and the like, so long ago. But what becomes of the coal which is burnt in yielding the interest? Heat comes out of it, light comes out of it, and if we could gather together all that goes up the chimney and all that remains in the grate of a thoroughly burnt coal fire, we should find ourselves in possession of a quantity of carbonic acid, water, ammonia, and mineral matters, exactly equal in weight to the coal. But these are the very matters with which nature supplied the club-moss which made the coal. She is paid back principal and interest at the same time; and she straight-way invests the carbonic acid, the water and the ammonia in new forms of life, feeding with them the plants that now live. Thifty nature! surely no prodigal, but most notable of housekeepers!"

These are surely Mr. Huxley's real sentiments. He does not believe that all this admirable order and economy and anticipation of man's need before he was in being, was the work of chance; and here there can be no question of evolution, no such work of trial and loss wrought out by unintelligence, as he could imagine in the former case. No, sir, here is *design*; and design means a designer; and the designer of all this wondrous plan is in no way Nature; it is Nature's God.

We need not, then, go further now with Mr. Huxley; and this letter is already protracted long enough. But the subject is not exhausted; and in my next I shall ask you to look a little longer yet at these strange utterances of the new philosophy.

For the truth's sake, yours,

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

I.—SOME NOTES ON RESTORATIONISM.

1. You say, "Phil. ii. 9-11 is subjection, not reconciliation, it does not speak of atonement." If confession of the name of Jesus,—bowing to Him,—subjection to Him to the glory of God the *Father* is not reconciliation, then I freely confess I do not know what reconciliation is. He 'humbled Himself, and became obedient unto *death*;' if that is not atonement, what is?"

Confessing Jesus to be Lord, and so bowing to Him *now*, is unto salvation dearly, as in Rom. x. 9. But every one does not,

now so bow to Him ; and to be forced to do so by the power of God at a future day, will not be that at all. All depends upon the time and character of the confession. " Strive to enter in at the strait gate ; for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and not be able ; when once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, *Lord, Lord*, open unto us, and he shall answer and say unto you, " I know you not whence ye are," (Luke xiii. 24, 25.) There no confession of His Lordship avails, the time is past.

Yet is it to the glory of God the Father, that every creature should be subjected to the Son. What difficulty can there be in this, to one who knows who that Son is ?

As to atonement, of course it was His obedience to the death of the cross which wrought it. But here it is not the grace which flows out to man that is spoken of, but the personal exaltation of the One who so humbled Himself. The apostle is saying, " Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." He is proposing Him for our imitation, and it is not atonement we are to imitate Him in. His exaltation at the end of His course is brought in to show the Father's delight in such a path, to commend it further to us. Neither atonement nor the fruits of it are at all in question therefore.

2. " You admit that Christ died (made atonement) for *all*. The application must of necessity follow. Of course it is yet to be developed—as indeed also for the Church itself. *Application* is in course of being made, and is not yet fully made."

It is quite true, Christ died for all ; He is " a propitiation for the whole world," (1 Jno. ii. 2). That makes salvation *possible* for all, but not a *necessity*. They *may* (not *must*) have it. If Christ had borne (or put away), as some have it, everybody's sins, then of course the application would follow to everybody ; but this is not the case. There is no " application " of atonement to those in the lake of fire ; no reconciliation or salvation ever spoken of for them. Those who affirm it are guilty of deluding to their own damnation the very souls for whose safety they are pleading.

Take the sins of the apostates mentioned in Heb. x., who have " trodden under foot the Son of God," is it true that " there remaineth " for them still, and spite of all, the application of His sacrifice, as men now say ? or, as the apostle says, that " there remaineth NO MORE sacrifice for sins ? " Are those solemn words true or not ? If they are, as they surely are, how vain to speak as if it exalted the sacrifice of Christ to apply it to those to whom Scripture assures us it does *not* apply !

Reconciliation of things in heaven and things in earth is perfectly Scriptural, but even that is of things, not persons. It is the restoration of what in creation sin has ruined; and even for this the work of Christ was needed. Thus our inheritance is "purchased" by it, but waits yet to be "redeemed," (Eph. i. 14). And so the sprinkling of the tabernacle with blood is applied in Heb. ix. 23 to the purification of the heavenly places. But where are even *things* in hell ever said to be purchased, or purified, or reconciled, or redeemed? It is a baseless, soul-destroying delusion, from which may the Lord in His mercy deliver those that are His own.

3. "Your remarks on 'mercy,' to show that we ought not to say, it 'endureth for ever,' please re-consider. Is not mercy an attribute of the living God, and does it not therefore necessarily endure for ever? 'Mercy rejoiceth against judgment.'"

There is no need to limit the endurance of the Lord's mercy; but it is a perversion of the thought to suppose it inconsistent with judgment. "To Him that *smote Egypt in their first-born*, for His mercy endureth for ever." . . . "To Him which *smote great Kings*; for His mercy endureth for ever," (Ps. cxxxvi. 10, 17). Mercy to Israel involved judgment to others: "of Thy mercy cut off mine enemies" is their cry, (cxliii. 12). And who can tell how far the very exercise of mercy to those to whom God shows it may itself necessitate the judgment of others, so that "mercy for ever" may coincide necessarily with "eternal judgment."

But James is adduced as saying that "mercy rejoiceth against judgment." No doubt; but why not quote the whole? And, if "he shall have judgment *without* mercy, that hath showed no mercy," it is surely plain that mercy neither sets aside nor always modifies it, or else what is "judgment *without* mercy?" Correction,—reformatory discipline, however long continued, is not that; and yet some are to have it. How vain to say then, the two things are inconsistent!

"I will show mercy on whom I will show mercy," saith the Lord. "He that made them will *not* have mercy upon them." "I will not pity, nor spare, nor have mercy, but destroy them."

If these are Old Testament utterances, how solemn are the closing words of the New! "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

[161]

Exposition.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

IV.

THE SECOND OR EXODUS-BOOK OF THE PSALMS.

THE second book of the Psalms divides, like the first, into three parts, the first and third of which are partly, but not wholly, Messianic ; while the second consists almost entirely of remnant psalms, to which however the Author and finisher of faith furnishes expressions of the faith which in Him was perfect: These divisions are Ps. xlii.-li. ; lii.-lxviii. ; lxix.-lxxii.

1ST SECTION. (Ps. xlii.-li.)

The truths characteristic of this book are, ruin in responsibility, and salvation in grace. We may take as its motto God's address to the people by Hosea : " O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in Me is thy help " (ch. xiii. 9). The first section, which gives, as always, the theme of the book, exemplifies this most thoroughly. It consists of *ten* psalms, the responsibility number (xlii.-li.), which are again divided into *eight* (xlii.-xlix.) and *two* (l., li.) These *eight* psalms give us thus the new covenant* number, which is at the same time the fullest expression of grace, and of the ruin of man under the old. These psalms are moreover *Korahitic* psalms ; Ps. xliii. has no title, but is only an apparent exception. And when we remember how they escaped the judgment which fell upon their father Korah in the wilderness, we shall easily realize that more suited witnesses to Divine grace hardly could be found. The two psalms which follow (l., li.) bring us back to the consideration of the people's sin, which had brought them into that condition of outcasts from Jehovah's presence which the first psalms of the book so touchingly lament.

Ps. xlii. begins then these Korahitic psalms. It is a passionate outburst of the soul after God Himself, as away from His

* *Eight* seems the stamp, not only strictly of new creation, but of all that in Christ can be called " new," as the new covenant, for instance. The *octaves* of the 119th psalm illustrate this.

house and under the oppression of the enemy. It is God's judgment; the waves, the billows, the waterspouts, are His. Yet the psalmist rebukes his own unbelieving heaviness, and comforts himself under the enemy's taunts with the assurance that He to whom he clings will yet answer, and command His loving kindness in the day-time, as by night still His song is with him, and his prayer is to the God of his life. As to his position he is outside the land proper, beyond Jordan, and the enemy is also apparently the external one.

Ps. xliii., on the contrary, speaks of the ungodly Jews and the enemy *inside*, "the deceitful and unjust man." It thus completes the picture of desolation, while still repeating the comforting assurance of the former psalm, and promising return to the holy hill and tabernacle of God.

Ps. xliv. is the appeal of faith against the now triumphant oppressor, on the ground of God's works of old, of which they have heard, and of their present cleaving to Him. It was God's favour only, not their fathers' swords, which got them possession of the land at first; so will they also now not trust in bow or sword, but on their King. A long and earnest pleading closes the psalm.

In the xlvth we have the answer. The King is there in His beauty, and in the plenitude of His power. His enemies fall under Him, and His throne is established for ever. He is God, and yet man, and counting men His fellows. Jerusalem is united to Him in grace, amid the homage of the nations.

In the xlvith, God is in the midst of the city, having put down the rage of the heathen and made wars to cease throughout the earth. In the xlviiith His glory is celebrated as King of all the earth. And in the xlviiiith, *as* they had heard, (referring to Ps. xliv.) now they have seen. The final cloud, the last confederacy, is scattered, and Zion, the city of the great King, is the joy of the whole earth.

Ps. xlix., the closing psalm of this series, gives the moral of the whole. Man has had his day of honour; he has forgotten God and eternity, and become like the beasts that perish, assuming to himself an immortality upon the earth, when all his wealth could not redeem a brother from the grave, and he carries nothing away at his death. He descends to the grave, and his glory is at an end. In the morning,—the dawn of the day of God,—the righteous have their dominion, given them by Him who can redeem, even from the power of the grave.

Then come the two final psalms which reveal the secret of that apparent casting off of the people, of which they had complained. God shines *out of Zion*, where we have seen Him take

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

163

up His abode, and appeals to heaven and earth against His people Israel. He has manifested His grace. He will now testify of His righteousness; and they on their part, can now bear to stand face to face with their sin. It is not neglect of sacrifices of which God complains, but unthankfulness and iniquity. Wickedness is now to be put down with a strong hand.

The li-st psalm is Israel's justification of God in the acknowledgement of their own guilt. They own themselves born in sin and guilty of blood (I doubt not, especially of the blood of Christ). They pray for pardon through atonement, for spiritual renewal, for the continued presence of God, and of His Spirit. They own He wants not sacrifice but a broken spirit; and pray for the building up of Jerusalem, that they may offer the sacrifices of righteousness upon His altar.

2ND SECTION. (Ps. lii.-lxviii.)

Thus the first ten psalms have given us, as is plain, the prophetic basis of the book. It is Israel's latter-day history forecast. The section which now follows gives us again more properly experience psalms, their inward history rather. It divides, I believe, again into three series, indicated as to the first two by their headings: four Maschil, or didactic, psalms; five Michtam, or memorial (?) psalms, and then another series of *eight*, in many respects a parallel to the former one.

Although these divisions appear to be unmistakable, it seems not easy to characterize them satisfactorily. The first four give us plainly however the full length portraiture of the wicked one, of whom in ps. lii. Doeg is the type. There he is a deceitful and devouring tongue, whose strength is not in God but in his devotedness to evil. God would pluck him out of the tent (ver. 5, not "thy dwelling-place," but) where Doeg as we know in the history had been, and where a greater than he will be found in the last days, that "house of God" where He will plant again His olive, His believing ones (comp. Rom. xi. 17, 20).

In ps. liii., he is a fool, without knowledge or understanding, as are those with him. Too insensate to understand before what they are doing in eating up His people, they will find it out in their own sudden destruction. "God has despised them."

In ps. liv., again, they have chosen to be "strangers," as they are, to Him: "they have not set God before them." On the contrary, the righteous, having learnt God's name in his deliverance, *freely* sacrifices, and has found it good to praise Him.

Ps. lv. gives fully the *apostate*. He had gone up to the house of God in company with His people, and they had sweet (apparent) fellowship, but had profaned his covenant, and put forth

his hands against those at peace with him, upon whom now he cast iniquity, and hated them the more. Jerusalem was another Babel of men united against God: the righteous can only pray that He may scatter them like Babel.*

The Michtam psalms now begin. They are all prayers to God in view of enemies, to which the last of them (lx.) adds the acknowledgment of God's casting off, as the reason of their prevailing.

In the first of these (lvi.) the soul stays itself upon the word and sympathy of God, and in the midst of its fear trusts Him. In the second (lvi.) the shadow of His wings is his refuge until the actual deliverance comes from heaven. In the third (lviii.) the wickedness is so malignant and so deliberate, that God must come in to shew there is a Judge in the earth. While in the fourth (lix.) it is as God ruling *in Jacob* He is to be known, the God of Israel, though ruling to the ends of the earth. Finally, Ps. lx., owns, as we have seen, God's casting off; but He had a testimony in His people Israel, which was the banner under which those that feared Him went, and as His beloved, with fresh confidence they claim the land.

From this point the final eight psalms of this section lead up into the full blessing. There is in them much more of the apprehension of Divine grace, as we might anticipate; and the King's voice, heard more than once among them, is the abundant justification of the confidence they express. Into all the sorrows indeed into which sin has brought them, grace has brought Christ. And it is sweet and significant to find, as soon as they have taken their true place before God, how distinctly He is there, underpropping the weakness of their faith with his own unfailing confidence. Thus from "the end of the earth" with a heart overwhelmed (lxi.), till ascending on high He leads captivity captive, (lxviii.) He "fills all things" for them.

Ps. lxi. gives us this first cry of human weakness from the place of distance. To an Israelite, whose holy city and dwelling-place of God was at Jerusalem, the "end of the earth" was distance less geographical than spiritual. This was the secret of the "heart overwhelmed." Yet there is confidence in God, and under the present covert of His wings he looks for the inheritance. God has heard his vows; He will prolong the king's life from generation to generation.

* Are not these "Maschil" psalms special instruction for the *maschilim*, the "wise" in Israel, like Rev. xiii. 18: "Here is *wisdom*. Let him that hath *understanding* count," &c.?

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

165

In Ps. lxii. the enemy is again more distinctly in view,* but there is still the fullest confidence, the expectation *only* from God, in whom is all power, man universally being either vanity or a lie.

In the third Psalm of this series (lxiii.) the longing of the heart is after God Himself, from a dry and thirsty land, to see His glory as seen in time past in the sanctuary, the remembrance of whom gives satisfaction to the soul, and praise in the night-watches. Here again, it is no wonder to find the King (ver. 11) and His own joy in God, though others come into it.

The fourth psalm (lxiv.) speaks of God's ways with the wicked, who are plotting to entrap the righteous in some iniquity; but their mischievous devices recoil upon themselves, making men fear and see God's work in it, and the righteous are glad in Jehovah.

In the fifth Psalm (lxv.) the threshold of blessing is reached, and, though praise is yet silent in Zion, they are expecting there the performance of their vows and all flesh drawing near to Him who hears (Israel's) prayer; for this, the putting away of their iniquities in sovereign grace, then righteous judgment and the blessing of the earth.

In the sixth (lxvi.) they are at the end of the trial, and brought out into a wealthy place. They now pay their vows, and call upon the nations to see God's work and hear what He has done for their souls.

The seventh (lxvii.) gives the blessing of the nations through Israel's blessing.

Finally, in Ps. lxviii. God is among them as of old, fruit of His work, who, ascending on high, has led captivity captive, and received gifts as man for men.

3RD SECTION. (Ps. lxix.-lxxii.)

The four Psalms that form the third section of the book are the key to all the grace that is in it. The work of Christ must of course be that key, here presented however in another character than before. Whereas in Ps. xxii., we have had the sin-offering aspect, and in Ps. xl., especially the burnt-offering, we have here most plainly (Ps. lxix.) the *trespass*-offering, wherein sin is looked at as *injury*, whether done to God or man, and restitution must be made according to the Divine estimation of the

* It has only recently become apparent to me, how much the number *two* is connected with the enemy in some shape. Take as instances the 2nd psalm, the second section of the first book (Ps. ix.-xv.), the whole of this second book, but especially *its* second section (lii.-lxviii.), and, as here, the second psalms of many a series.

harm done, and the Divine thought of recompence. The one injured must be *over*-paid. This the work of Christ has indeed done, whether as respects the glory of God or the blessing of man. Accordingly the key-note of the psalm is, "I restored that which I took not away."

The 36 verses of the psalm (the number, as before noticed, of the Old Testament Books) speak also of the government of God, of which the question of injury and restitution connects itself rather than that still deeper one, of sin and its putting away. This last is a question of the Divine *nature*, not merely of the Divine Government ; accordingly 3 times 7 is the number of the sin-offering (Ps. xxii. 1-21), as 3 times 12 is here of the trespass.

The exposition of the psalm does not belong here. I would notice, however, that in verse 9, "the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up," we have what answers to the "ram" of the trespass-offering. In that way, while coming into a place where He owns "my trespasses* are not hid from Thee," He can at the same time plead, "for *Thy sake* I have borne reproach." Thus Jehovah's glory is concerned in His deliverance, and the Divine government having "the uttermost farthing" rendered to it (comp. Matt. v. 26), Jehovah will "hear the poor and not despise His prisoners : God will save Zion, and build the cities of Judah."

The connection with the blessing in Israel is told out in the three psalms which follow. Thus the next psalm (lxx) is the cry of the remnant, the poor and needy among the people. In the next lxxi), like their father Abraham, they are quickened again in old age, to show God's strength to that generation, and with their mouth to declare His righteousness and His salvation. While in the last (lxxii), the King is there himself judging in righteousness and peace, and the cry of the poor and needy is fully answered (verses 4, 12, 13).

V.

THE THIRD OR LEVITICUS-BOOK OF THE PSALMS.

In the third book it is the *holiness* of God that is insisted on. Be it that He is gracious, He must be holy also ; and if His way be in the sea, and His footsteps hidden, His way is in the sanctuary too. Hence while these psalms give us as elsewhere the history of Israel's latter-day deliverance, it is always looked at from this point of view, and more in connection with the history

* '*Ashmoth*, the very word connected with '*Asham*, trespass-offering.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

167

of the whole people, and God's dealings with them from the beginning.

The book contains only seventeen psalms, of which the eleven psalms of Asaph form the first division, and the rest, by various writers, the only other. The first section gives us the requirements of the sanctuary as illustrated in Israel. The second, the requirements of the sanctuary *met* in Christ.

SECTION I, (Ps. lxxiii—lxxxiii).

The Asaph psalms divide again into two evident series, the first four giving the general principles (lxxiii—lxxvii), the last seven the application of these principles in detail to Israel (lxxviii—lxxxiii).

The first of these psalms (lxxiii) gives us in the most beautiful way the general character of the book. It speaks of the discipline of the righteous in contrast with the prosperity of the ungodly—"a thing too painful when considered, and impossible to understand, until in the sanctuary, in the presence of God, we find on the one hand the end of the wicked, and on the other that, as ever with God, the discipline we receive is the result of the holiness of His nature: "He for our profit, that we may be partakers of His holiness" (Heb. xii: 10). Then the soul acquiesces with delight in its portion; holden by His right hand, guided by His counsel, who is there but Himself for us in heaven or earth?

The *second* psalm of this series (lxxiv.) shows us this chastening rod for Israel—the enemy in the very sanctuary itself. At first sight, it seems as if God had totally cast off, but then *their* enemy is evidently *God's* enemy, therefore He must finally appear against him. The adversary reproaches His name: can He give up into his hand the people of his purchase, the inheritance He has redeemed, nay, His very dwelling-place? Whatever their failure, this He plainly cannot do. It is only his anger against *them* then that is manifested in this rage of the enemy, and it cannot last: He will turn it finally against the oppressor, and break the rod that He has been using.

Then in the third psalm (lxxiv.), this is what has come to pass. When all foundations seem gone Messiah bears up the pillars of the earth. Exaltation comes from neither east, west, nor south,* but from God who putteth down and setteth up. The horns of the wicked are cut off, and the righteous exalted.

Finally psalm lxxvi is the celebration of the full deliverance, and God is known in Judah, and his dwelling place is in Zion.

* Showing doubtless that it is the *northern* king (Dan. xi. 40, 41) that is in question.

The seven psalms which follow give more detailed application, as I have said. In the first of them (psalm lxxvii.) God's way is in the sea, His footsteps cannot be traced, so that the soul turning to God in its distress is troubled. But in the darkness of the present, he comforts himself with His works of old, and remembers his own infirmity, and the years of the right hand of the Most High. Hence comes the conviction that His way is in the sanctuary too—according to the holiness of His nature.

The second (lxxviii) gives us the necessity of these mysterious-seeming ways with Israel, in the long and painful history of the *people's* ways. He had even to forsake His tabernacle on Shiloh, but only to retreat into Himself as it were in grace, a grace which took up Judah, Zion and David, after the needed discipline had done its work.

The third psalm (lxxix), very similar to psalm lxxiv., gives us His sanctuary in the last days, like Shiloh, again forsaken and in the enemy's hand; but Israel own their sins, and plead for deliverance for the glory of God's name. In the next psalm (lxxx.) again they plead for His shining forth as of old between the cherubim, and put before Him the vineyard of His planting, owning that *He* had broken down her hedges and let the wild boar in. It was *His* rebuke, but they can plead for His power to be manifested in Him, whom, being *Son of man*, He had made strong for Himself. Power thus in grace acting for them, they will go no more back from God.

In the fifth of this series (lxxxix.) we find them accordingly celebrating their new moon,* returned in heart to Him whom they recognise as from old their Deliverer. And He, He testifies how He would long before have satisfied them with good, had they only hearkened to Him. Now, as when of old He delivered them, did they open their mouth He would fill it.

In the sixth psalm (lxxxii), as returned to Israel, He is setting right what is wrong there,—judging among the gods, the judges of the people. And in the last (lxxxiii), having accomplished this, He sets them free finally from the last confederacy of their enemies.

SECTION 2. (Ps. lxxxiv—lxxxix.)

The psalms which follow to the end of the book are again divided into two parts, the last two being separate from the

* A beautiful figure is this new moon, *reflected* light, due to the return of the sun. Such was Israel's true glory. And just so is the path of the righteous, "like the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

others, as we shall see shortly. But they all together speak of Christ once more as the secret of a blessing which must be in holiness and according to it. Christ therefore is found in them in servant character, come in to unite the Divine attributes in the salvation of the people.

The first psalm of this series (lxxxiv.) is a psalm of the sons of Korah, again the suited witnesses of Divine grace. Still away from the courts of Jehovah's house, they have yet their faces thitherward, and if not yet having the blessedness of those that dwell there, they have that of those in whose hearts are "the ways." For them even the vale of tears becomes a well, and the rain from heaven also fills the pools. They go from strength to strength, until they come surely at last face to face with God in Zion. But whence all this security of blessing? whence this confidence of heart in God? and whence, too, this attraction of the heart to Him? It is all revealed in this, that God is looking on the face of His anointed. Is it not indeed all through just the Anointed One who fulfils the character depicted in this psalm? For my own part I do not doubt that it is essentially Christ all through, and that this is the basis of blessing both here and afterwards.

Ps. lxxxv. gives us Jehovah speaking to His people, mercy and truth being met together, and righteousness and peace having kissed each other,—the Divine attributes thus harmonizing in their salvation. This, too, is a Korahitic psalm.

The next (lxxxvi.) on the other hand, is distinctly "a prayer of David," and the only psalm of his in the book. Still it does not seem to be Christ Himself who speaks, but the remnant, yet as taught of Him doubtless and the fruit of his work. Thus, and so far, it is His prayer: His servant-character, and the result of His service, is reproduced in them.* The eleventh verse would hinder more direct application.† The word for Lord here is *seven times* Adonai, not Jehovah, but really "Lord."

In the next psalm (lxxxvii.), Jehovah owns His perfect servant. There is one only that Jehovah loves with an especial love; glorious things are spoken of Zion. The cities of the nations have had their men of famous memories; Zion, men really great; but One above all is there, whose name Jehovah

* As in Isa. xl.—lxvi., where from xl.—xlvi. Israel is the servant, and unfaithful; xlix.—lx. Christ is the perfect servant; and then from lxi.—lxvi. the remnant are the servants.

† The Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate, indeed give "my heart shall rejoice" instead of "unite my heart;" but it seems untenable as a translation, and clearly contrary to the Masoretic punctuation.

Himself records as born there, of whom the partaker in the universal joy shall say, "All my springs are in Thee."

The last two psalms are an evident contrast. The 88th is man's portion under the [broken] law; and there is no ray of light, nor answer from God. The 89th, on the contrary gives the grace in Christ—the "sure mercies of David." Observe, still it is "David my servant" with whom Jehovah is in covenant, and even the sin of the people cannot alter that: it might necessitate chastening, and that had indeed come in, so heavily that, except to faith, all seemed over. But faith still owns that He had sworn to David in His truth, and pleads with Him the reproach against His anointed. All the great principles of the book are in this closing psalm.

VI.

THE FOURTH OR NUMBERS BOOK OF THE PSALMS.

The fourth book, like the third, is a very short one, containing only seventeen psalms. It is very distinct, however, in character. As already noticed, it brings us to the question of the wilderness, of the world as that because away from God, a breach having come in between the creature and its Creator. It not only exposes the misery of this, however; it brings us, as these books do ever, Christ as the healer of the breach, in whom, in both person and work, God and man are brought together, and Creator and Redeemer, Jehovah and Elohim, are seen as One. And the coming of the Lord, of which so many of these psalms speak, is just the actual manifestation of this,—the return of the Creator openly to a world so long destitute of His manifested presence.

The book divides, like the former, into two parts. The first (xc.—c.)* contains eleven psalms, and gives us Christ uniting Creator and creation. The second (ci.—cvi.) contains the six remaining ones, and gives the *personal* link.

SECTION I. (Ps. xc.—c.)

There are again two series of psalms in this first division. The first four psalms (xc.—xciii.) give us the *virtual* healing of the breach existing; the last seven (xciv.—c.), the *actual* healing of the world at large.

* I am not so certain as elsewhere of the exact limits here. It has been a question whether ps. li. does not belong to the first division rather. The above, however, seems to me to be correct.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

171

The 90th psalm, as introductory, brings us at once to the great question of the book. It is manifestly a psalm of the wilderness, "a prayer of Moses, the man of God :—" the funeral lament (may we not say ?) of the generation dying there, outside of the land for which they had set out. • It begins with the acknowledgment of the Lord* as the dwelling-place of man at all times. Practically, however, what did it seem to avail ? He, the Eternal, instead of sustaining man for eternity, turned him to destruction in His wrath. It was deserved wrath because of iniquities. O that he might learn this lesson of his frailty, that he might apply his heart to wisdom. The last verses are a cry to Jehovah for His mercy, and for the establishment of the work of their hands.

The second psalm (xci.) shows us again the perplexity of man, to reveal its solution. There is, then, a secret of the Most High, a dwelling-place inaccessible to him ; and thus he fails to find the Almighty his protection (ver. 1). He has lost the knowledge of God, his heart having dropped away from Him. But that lost secret must be recovered, if he is to enjoy the protection of the Almighty.

Then a Man appears, who for man fulfils this condition. He knows this secret dwelling place, and with a perfect heart, makes Jehovah his trust and refuge. Thus he obtains the full and perfect blessedness of His protection : life, deliverance, exaltation, and honour.

The third psalm (xcii.) is fitly, therefore, and beautifully, a "psalm for the Sabbath day," and God is celebrated in His titles of Jehovah and Most High, while His power is employed in behalf of the righteous, and he triumphs in the work of Jehovah's hands.

In the fourth psalm (xciii.) finally, Jehovah reigns. The floods have lifted up their waves in vain, Jehovah is mightier. And the world too is established, that it cannot be moved.

The second series celebrates, as has been said, the advent of Jehovah. Ps. xciv. carries us back to the cry for Divine interference. The earth is full of oppression and regardlessness of God ; iniquity is on the throne, and mischief framed by law ; but in the midst of this goes on the disciplining of the righteous, in result so blessed : Jehovah has a people and a heritage He cannot give up, and judgment, now separated from righteousness, must return to it.

The connection of the following psalms need not detain us long. The 95th is a summons to Israel to worship their Crea-

* Not *Jehovah*, the covenant name, but the governmental *Adonai*.

tor-Shepherd, and not be as their fathers in the wilderness, shut out from rest through unbelief. The 96th is the call for a new song from all the earth. Jehovah comes to judge the world in righteousness, and to establish it. The 97th in answer celebrates Him as come and reigning, the idols destroyed, Zion made glad, the saints delivered. The 98th is the call for the new song from Israel, and the 99th their response. In the 100th, finally, His goodness, mercy and truth draw all hearts to worship, and Israel are His people, the sheep of His pasture.

SECTION 2, (Ps. ci—cvi).

Messiah is now again as such personally introduced. Ps. ci. is the first in this book which is entitled "a psalm of David," and as the anointed King He declares here the principles of His righteous reign. He is not yet reigning, however, and the next psalm calls us to see Him in a very different condition, a man under wrath from God, His strength weakened, His days shortened. And Zion's time is come to be built, and the earth's to be delivered, and Jehovah's to have His name declared and the nations serve Him. But how with the one who was to be Zion's and Jehovah's King, weakened and cut off, taken away in the midst of His days? The answer is,* this humbled man is the Creator of all: God and man, Creator and creation, in them are one; heaven and earth should change, not He.

The third psalm (ciii) celebrates, therefore, Jehovah's mercies to the sons of men. He forgives, He heals, not turns man to destruction now, but redeems from it: He will not always chide. If we are dust, He knows and pities us; if our days are as grass, still His mercy is everlasting upon them that fear Him. This is He whose throne is in the heavens—over all.

The fourth psalm (civ.) links together these two thoughts, Jehovah and Creator. The covenant God, the Redeemer, is Creator also. The Creator is the Redeemer. Redemption has in a most real and precious sense, restored the Creator to His works.

In the fifth psalm (cv.) *Jehovah as such* is celebrated. He has kept covenant, His promise to the fathers, as when He delivered them of old from Egypt.

Ps. cvi. closes the book with full confession and praise on the part of the people. They own their sin in common with their fathers, who had never understood his wondrous works from Egypt on. They had necessitated judgment, though continual mercy had come in too, and now they celebrate Jehovah Israel's

* Which we know as such from the apostle's quotation, Heb. i. 10-12.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

173

God, from everlasting to everlasting. Every voice among them is now to say amen. Hallelujah.

VII.

THE FIFTH, OR DEUTERONOMIC BOOK OF THE PSALMS.

The fifth book of the Psalms is divided into five sections, as already pointed out. The first of these, consisting of *seven* psalms (cvii—cxix), gives, in thoroughly Deuteronomic character, the ways of God. The second, of six (cxiv—cxix), shows us how these ways declare Himself, and bring the heart which ponders them aright, back to Himself. The third, containing seventeen psalms (cxx—cxxxvi), man's heart having been brought back, tells us how He is for us in all that we have learnt to be in Him. The fourth, of nine psalms (cxxxvii—cxlvi), gives us then the searching out of man in His presence, so as to leave us nothing to rejoice in but Himself. Lastly, we have (all that remains) the final praises (cxlvi—cl.)

SECTION I. (Ps. cvii—cxiii).

In the first section, the seven psalms divide (as these sevens so often do) into four and three, the last three being Hallelujahs. The first four are the ways of God, in two parts: first His ways with *Israel* (cvii—cviii); then with *Christ* (cix—cx): man fallen and man *unfallen*. With both, this “end” is blessing; but fallen man, exalting himself, has first to be abased; He who was perfect, yet humbling Himself as none ever did beside, has *only* to be exalted.

Ps. cvii gives thus God's ways with Israel. Thoroughly like Moses' recital to the people in the plains of Moab, just in view of their rest (*Deut.* i—iv),—the people are looked at as gathered back out of the countries in which they had been scattered, and (as seen in the next psalm) just ready to take possession of the land. Here they are bidden to look back upon Jehovah's ways with them, humbling and proving them indeed, but “to do them good at the latter end,” that they might recognize wherein their true life was. Thus we have first the general picture of *want* (4-9), then of their *rebellion* (10-16), their spiritual *folly* (here it is “His word” that heals them) (17-22), storms of trial (23-32); then how the way necessitated by their evil, still and ever led in His goodness to the final exaltation: “whoso is wise, and will observe these things, even they shall understand the loving kindness of Jehovah” (33-43).

Ps. cviii shews us this "end of the Lord" with Israel. It is composed significantly of parts of two psalms (lvii. 8-12 & lx. 7-14), of which ONLY the "ends" are taken, the preceding parts, which give the suffering and trial, the way to it, being left out. The first part gives us the effect of the discipline in their hearts being brought back to Jehovah; the second, their contemplation of the inheritance, now, as the Lord's beloved, to be theirs.

The next psalms bring us to the ways of God with a *perfect* sufferer, suffering (as far as He is personally concerned) without a cause. Rejected of man, hated for His love, in poverty and need, "gone like a shadow that declineth," He commits His cause in prayer to a righteous God. And again the 110th psalm shows us the "end of the Lord." He is set at Jehovah's right hand till His enemies are made His footstool, greeted as Melchizedek-priest, and king in Zion, with a people willingly serving in the day of His power: this is the end of His course, who stooping in His humiliation to "the brook in the way," *therefore* lifts up His head.

Three hallelujah-psalms follow. The first, (cxi.) for Jehovah's *works*; the last two for His *ways*, first, (cxii.) in righteousness, and then (cxiii.) in mercy.

SECTION 2. Ps. (cxiv.-cxix.)

The six psalms of the next section are again divided into four and two. The first four recount how Israel's heart has been brought back to Jehovah (cxiv.—cxvii); to which the last two add, first, the national reception of Christ (cxviii), and, as a consequence, their attainment of the new covenant blessing, "I will write my laws upon their hearts" (cxix).

The 114th psalm takes us back to the Exodus: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language," not alone did He *deliver* them, but "Judah was His *sanctuary*, and Israel His *dominion*." It is not at all the question how far they realized the privilege, but of what His desire was. They never *were* a "kingdom of priests, and a holy nation," but that was what He proposed to them (Ex. xix. 6). Nor was it His will, even after that, that Aaron should not at all times go into the sanctuary of the Lord, but the failure of the priesthood necessitated that. Thus they had shut themselves out of His blessed presence, who had desired to draw them near to Himself and make them acquainted with Himself as manifested there. What a change from being under the foot of a strange people, to being the people of God Himself, God dwelling in their very midst!

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.**175**

All nature owned the power of Jacob's God, and became the servants of their need. They look back from the end of their long discipline, and realize it better than they had at first.

So the 115th psalm, as their appeal, beseeches Him to give glory not to them, but to His own name, a name which it had pleased Him yet to link with theirs. True, He was not in Judah's sanctuary now; He had left it, driven out by their apostacy; still He was "in the heavens," and His power no way hindered. They can now see the senseless folly of the idolatry into which they had wandered away from Him, and with God their help and shield, secure of His blessing, they will be His worshippers henceforth and forever.

Next in the 116th psalm they relate how it is their heart has been brought back to Him: "I love Jehovah"—why? "Because He hath heard my voice and my supplications." "Jehovah, truly I am Thy servant; I am Thy servant and the son of Thy handmaid:"—why? "*Thou hast loosed my bonds.*"

In the fourth psalm of this series (cxvii), they turn therefore to the nations, exhorting them to praise Jehovah, for His great mercy shown to Israel, and His steadfast truth.

The 118th psalm is again the celebration of Jehovah's mercy, a mercy which they now recognize as theirs in Christ: "I will praise Thee for Thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation." Who is it that has become this? "*The stone which the builders refused, the same is become the head-stone of the corner.*" This is Jehovah's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes." It is beautiful to see the way in which this name fills their mouth: it is Jehovah, Jehovah; all the way through the psalm.

The 119th psalm is (as a consequence of this) the law written upon their hearts, according to the new covenant, which I doubt not is expressed in the *eight* verses, through which each letter of the alphabet runs. Every verse almost is the praise of the law, under different titles: law, testimonies, precepts, statutes, commandments, judgments, word, saying, path,* way. Here indeed God's "statutes are their songs in the house of their pilgrimage." The law which they had broken, and whose power in condemnation they had felt, is become their rejoicing, but only after the knowledge of Christ and of salvation. It is the triumph of Divine grace.

SECTION 3. (Ps. cxx—cxxxvi).

The next section contains seventeen psalms, the fifteen

* In our version, "word" (*davar*) and "saying" (*'imrah*) are confounded, and "path," only found once (ver. 15) is translated "way."

"songs of degrees,"* and two "hallelujah" psalms appended. The "songs" are those of returning Israel, just entering upon the full blessing. They are the utterance of hearts full of the joy of what God is to them, to which the numerical structure beautifully corresponds. They are *five threes*, the basis number being thus that of Divine manifestation, which the human number (*five*) limits and controls: man's need giving thus the sphere within which the Divine fulness displays itself. The psalms of this series require to be seen in their connection with one another to find their true character and significance.

Thus the first three, very similar in thought to Ps. cvii. 4, 7, give us the weariness of the wilderness-sojourn, in the tents of Kedar, among the enemies of peace (cxx); but even there Jehovah is their unwearied keeper (cxxi); and at last they are brought out to their "city of habitation" (cxxii).

In the second three we have the question of *enemies*, and here it is not their being brought to Jerusalem, but made *as* Jerusalem, Jehovah round about them their defence, as the hills stand round the city. The rod of the wicked shall not rest upon the lot of the righteous (cxxv).

The third section (cxxvi—cxxviii), quite in character as such, speaks more directly of Jehovah Himself. He has turned their captivity so that the very heathen own the great things He has done for them, and Jehovah has indeed done great things for them (cxxvi). They own now that all blessings are from Him, not the fruit of man's labour or care, "He giveth it to His beloved *sleeping*†" (cxxvii). Blessed therefore is he who feareth Jehovah (cxxviii).

The fourth section gives the result of the exercises through which they have gone. First, as to the enemies: "the plowers plowed upon my back, they made long their furrows (cxxix)." Yet ploughing is needed, and blessed in result. Had *they* not need? Yes, surely, if Jehovah marked their iniquities they could not stand (cxxx. 3). But the same gracious hand that exposed their need had met it. Because of His mercy they fear Him; and wait and watch for Himself in whom they have learned to hope, "more than they that watch for the morning." The result as to their own state is given in the third psalm (cxxxi), the heart no longer haughty, nor the eyes lofty; and *now* "let Israel hope in Jehovah from henceforth even for ever."

The fifth and final section brings us to the complete blessing,

* Or "of ascents"—the "goings up" to Jerusalem, I doubt not. Ezra vii. 9 has the expression for the earlier going up from Babel.

† Acknowledged as the correct translation of cxxvii. 2.

Jehovah resting in His love, with at the same time no obscure or doubtful assurance of how it is He can rest. This is found in "David,"—ever a type of the true "Beloved*," as we know,— "and all his afflictions," with that zeal for Jehovah which would not suffer Him to come into the tabernacle of His house, nor go up to His couch,—His rest on high,—till He had found a place for Jehovah to dwell in upon the earth, "an habitation for Jacob's mighty One." Accordingly the habitation is found, and Jehovah is besought to enter into His rest. David's name is pleaded, and Jehovah responds with His oath to Him. He hath chosen Zion, has desired it, will rest there for ever, will abundantly bless her provision and satisfy her poor with bread, and—the answer going beyond the prayer (ver. 9),—"will clothe her priests with *salvation*, and her saints shall shout *aloud* for joy."

Based upon this, Ps. cxxxiii speaks of the recovered unity of Israel, the result of the unction upon the head of the High-priest, and the last psalm gives us the work of the true Melchizedek, Israel blessing in the sanctuary, Him who blesses them from Zion (cxxxiv).

Two final praise-psalms close this section. The first (cxxxv) calls Israel once more to celebrate Him who has chosen Jacob; the living God, and not as the dumb idols with which they had confounded Him. The second (cxxxvi) is their responsive celebration of His eternal mercy.

SECTION 4. (Ps. cxxxvii—cxiv).

In the fourth section, having now found fully what Jehovah is, and realized the blessedness of those who are His people, we are prepared for a full, final review of what man is, that this God may now be all to us. It is thus a true "fourth" section, with, first, two prefatory psalms (cxxxvii, cxxxviii) which shew us that nothingness of man, which when realized brings God so near and makes Him so precious, the secret of true strength being found in weakness; while the seven psalms following (cxxxix—cxlv,) exhibit in fuller and more various detail man searched out under the eye of God, and yet made in result to welcome that searching.

The 137th psalm is thus exceedingly significant. The people are looked at as in Babel again, under the full judgment thus of their departure from God, which had left them "Lo-ammi" (Hos. i. 9) on the soil of the stranger. But they now realize this. Their hearts are back in Jerusalem, and they refuse mirth in the land of their captivity, and *Jehovah's* song, now understood as

that, in a strange land. From hence then, out of utter ruin, they turn with their tears to Him, and are able to anticipate thence the judgment of their enemies.

The 138th psalm thereupon celebrates Jehovah's acceptance of *the lowly*. He has answered him in the time of that trouble which made God so necessary. This man, brought so low becomes as it were afresh the work of Jehovah's hand. Out of his weakness he is made strong—"strengthened with strength in his soul,"—and made to see Jehovah's glory, as well as find His power for deliverance and realize enduring mercy.

This, then, is the lesson before us which the next series of psalms works out in detail. The 139th is thus the searching out of man under *Jehovah's* eye, not merely God's, but the *covenant* God, for we carry with us now the blessed ascertained reality of relationship to Him. The structure of the psalm is significantly *four* sections of *six* verses each. We have first (1-6) the omnipresence and omniscience of God, who occupies Himself moreover with man, *searching* as well as knowing, "winnowing" his path and lying down. From this (7-12) the first thought might be of escape, but none is possible: heaven, hell (i. e., *hades*), and the uttermost parts of the sea are equally filled with his presence, and day and night are open alike to Him. Then comes (13-18) the thought of how He has been manifesting this omniscience in constant and tender care even from the womb: precious are His thoughts towards me then, and sweet His constant presence. Two things result (19-24), His enemies become mine, and my heart welcomes and invites the searching eye of holiness to detect whatever way in me is painful to him.

The second psalm of this series (cxi) gives us how the poor and needy, as that, brought to uprightness, and taking Jehovah for his God, confides in His deliverance from the enemy. He can plead, as brought to nothingness himself, that the wicked may not exalt themselves.

The 141st psalm shews still more the work effected in him. In self-humiliation and distrust he seeks to have Jehovah watch over his mouth and keep the door of his lips, not allowing him to associate in wickedness or self-indulgence with the workers of iniquity. Yea, he would submit himself gladly to the reproof of the righteous, even of those who needed for themselves Jehovah's chastening, and did not listen to "sweet words" that he (low as he had been brought) still knew he had for them.*

The 142nd psalm shows the absolute failure of human aid

* Comp. Luke xxii. 32 for an instructive parallel.

A STUDY OF THE PSALMS.

179

Refuge failed him, none cared for his soul ; but this loss of human props only cast him wholly on Jehovah.

In the 143rd he owns himself unable to stand before Him to be justified, although his servant ; yet as that he can still appeal to righteousness to interfere for one whose trust is in Him, and who seeks to find the path of His will.

The 144th is the conclusion that if man be nothing, yet is Jehovah goodness, security, and support to those that trust in Him. "Happy is that people, that is in such a case ; yea, blessed are the people whose God is Jehovah.

The 145th psalm is "*David's* psalm of praise,"—Messiah praising in the great congregation (of Israel).

SECTION 5. Ps. cxlv—cl.

Nought now remains but praise ; and that ever remains, still swelling as it flows from hearts filled up of God till it must needs flow forth : the witness that God has got his place again—"God over all, *blessed* for ever." And He, who is that, Himself the dear, imperishable link by which in His own Person all creation is linked up with God—second man ; last Adam ; eternal son of God in the bosom of the Father !

As to these closing Hallelujahs this is not the place to say much. The first is the praise of *Jacob's* God, a blessed and suggestive title ; not here for the first time as we know : praise for power displayed in righteousness, but in pity and mercy. The second (cxlvii) celebrates more the wisdom and understanding manifested in His ways. The third (cxlviii) speaks of His glory as above earth and heaven, and brings in the heavens to praise him also. The fourth (cxlix), of power in the hands of the saints, the final victorious putting down of evil. The fifth, finally, of praise in the sanctuary, no longer inaccessible, but where the full final praise of all is heard. Is it not at least the prelude of a time when the whole earth itself shall be His sanctuary : "The tabernacle of God shall be with men, and He shall dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God."

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART II.

SECT. I.—ADAM (CHAP. III).

The third chapter of Genesis is the real commencement of that series of lives of which, as is plain, the book mainly consists. It is where the first man ceases to be "a type of Him that was to come," that he becomes for us a type in the fullest way—figure and fact in one. The page of his life (and but a page it is) that treats of innocency, is not our example who were born in sin. Our history begins as fallen, and so, too, the history of our new life in God's grace.

Figure and fact, as I have observed, are blended together here. We must be prepared for this, which we shall find in some measure the case all through these histories. Especially in this first one of all, what could be more impressive for us than the unutterably solemn fact itself? Children as we are [of the fall, its simple record is the most perfect revelation that could be made of what we are in what is now our native condition, and also of how this came to be such. It is the title deed to our sad inheritance of sin. And yet what follows in closest connection may well enable us to look at it steadfastly; for the ruins of the old creation have been, as we know, materials which God has used to build up for Himself that new one in which He shall yet find (and we with Him) eternal rest.

A simple question entertained in the woman's soul is the loss of innocence forever. It is enough only to *admit* a question as to Infinite Love to ruin all. This the serpent knew full well when he said unto the woman, "Yea, hath God said ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" that is, Has God indeed said so? In her answer you can see at once how that has done its work. She is off the ground of faith, and is reasoning; and the moment reasoning as to God begins, the soul is away from Him, and then further it is impossible by searching to find Him out. Thus in Paradise itself, with all the evidences of Divine goodness before her eyes, she turns infidel at once. "And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the *mudst* of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, *neither shall ye touch it*, LEST ye die."

Notice how plain it is that she is already fallen. She has admitted the question as to the apparent strangeness of God's ways, and immediately her eyes fasten upon the forbidden thing

until she can see little else. God had set (ch. ii. 9) the tree of *life* in the midst of the garden, and without any prohibition. For the woman now it is the forbidden tree that occupies that place. Instead of life she puts death (or what was identified with it for her) as the central thing. The "garden of delight" has faded from her eyes. It has become to her the very garden of fable afterwards* (where all was *not* fable, but this very scene as depicted by him who was now putting it before the enchanted gaze of his victim) in which the one golden-fruited tree hung down its laden branches, guarded from man only by the dragon's jealousy. But here *God and the dragon had changed places*. Thus she adds to the prohibition, as if to justify herself against One who has lost his sovereignty for her heart: "Ye shall not eat of it, *neither shall ye touch it*"—which He had *not* said. A mere touch, as she expressed it to herself, was death; and why then had He put it before them only to prohibit it? What was it He was guarding from them with such jealous care? Must it not be indeed something that He valued highly?

She first adds to the prohibition, then she weakens the penalty. Instead of "ye shall surely die," it is for her only "*lest*"—for fear—"ye die." There was no real certainty that death would be the result. Thus the question of God's love becomes a question of His truth also. I do not want upon the throne a being I cannot trust; hence comes the tampering with His word. The heart deceives the head. If I do not want it to be true, I soon learn to question if it be so.

All this length the woman, in her first and only answer to the serpent, goes. He can thus go further, and step at once into the place of authority with her which God has so plainly lost. He says, not "ye shall surely die"—for so much the woman had already said—but "Surely ye shall not die." Her feeble question of it becomes on his part the peremptory denial both of truth and love in God: "Surely ye shall not die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

How sure he is of his dupe! And she on her part needs no further solicitation: "And when the woman saw that the tree was good"—she was seeing through the devil's eyes now—"that the tree was good for food"—there the lust of the flesh was doing its work—"and that it was pleasant to the eyes"—there the lust of the eyes comes out—"and a tree to be desired to make one wise"—there the pride of life is manifested—"she took of the

* The garden of Hesperides.

fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat."

Thus the sin was consummated. And herein we may read, if we will, as clear as day, our moral genealogy. These are still our own features as in a glass, naturally. Let us pause and ponder them for a moment, as we may well do, seriously and solemnly.

It is clear as can be that with the *heart* man first of all *dis*-believed. His primary condition was not, as some would so fain persuade us, that of a seeker by his natural reason after God. God had declared Himself in a manner suited to his condition, in goodness which he had only to enjoy, and which was demonstration to his every sense and faculty of the moral character of Him from whose hand all came to him. The very prohibition should have been his safeguard, reminding the sole master of that fair and gladsome scene, were he tempted to forget it, that he had himself a master. Nay, would not the prohibited tree itself have proved itself still "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil," had he *respected* the prohibition, by giving him to learn what sin was in a way he could not else have known it, as "lawlessness," insubjection to the will of God?

The entertaining of a question as to God was, as we have seen, man's ruin. He has been a questioner ever since. Having fallen from the sense of infinite goodness, he either remains simply unconscious of it, his gods the mere deification of his lusts and passions, or, if conscience be too strong for this, involves himself in toilsome processes of reasoning at the best, to find out as afar off the God who is so nigh. He reasons as to whether He that formed the ear can hear; or He that made the eyes can see; or He that gave man knowledge know; or, no less foolishly, whether He, from whom comes the ability to conceive of justice, goodness, mercy, love, has these as His attributes or not! And still the heart deceives the head: what he wills that he believes. For a holy God would be against his lusts, and a righteous God take vengeance on his sins; and how can God be good and the world so evil, or love man and let him suffer and die? Thus man reasons, taken in the toils of him who has helped him to gain the knowledge of which he boasts,—so painful and so little availing.

The way out of all this entanglement is a very simple one, however unwelcome it may be. He has but to judge himself for what he is, to escape out of his captor's hands. Self judgment would justify the holiness and righteousness of God, and ~~make~~ him find in his miseries, not the effect of God's indifference as to him, but of his own sins. It would make him also at least

suspect the certainty of his own conclusions, which so many selfish interests might combine to warp.

But still "ye shall be as gods" deceives him, and thus he will judge everything, and God also, rather than himself. And so, being his own god, he becomes the victim of his own pride, his god is his belly, as Scripture expresses it; insufficient to himself, and unable to satisfy the cravings of a nature which thus, even in its degradation, bears witness of having been created for something more, he falls under the power of his own lust, the easy dupe of any bait that Satan can prepare for him.

It is thus evident how the fall from God—the loss of confidence in Divine goodness—is the secret of his whole condition: of both his moral corruption and his misery together. For, let my circumstances be what they may, if I can see them ordered for me unfailingly by One in whom infinite wisdom, power and goodness combine, and whose love towards me I am assured of, my restlessness is gone, my will subjected to that other will in which I can but acquiesce and delight: I have "escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust," and I have been delivered from the misery attendant upon it.

To this then must the heart be brought back, and thus it is very simple! how "with the *heart* man believeth to righteousness." The faith that is real and operative in the soul (and no other can of course be of any value), first of all, and above all, in order to holiness, works peace and restoration of the heart to God and (let me say) of *God* to the *heart*. How fatal, yet how common a mistake, to invert this order! And what an inlet of blessedness it is thus to cease from one's own natural self-idolatry in the presence of a God who is really and worthy to be that! There is *no such* blessedness beside.

But we must return to look at man's natural condition. Notice how surely this leprosy of sin spreads; and most surely, to those nearest and most intimate. Tempted ourselves, we become tempters of others, and are not satisfied until we drag down those who love us—I cannot say whom we love; for this is too horrible to be called love—to our own level. Nay, if even we would consciously do no such thing, we cannot help doing all we can to effect it. We dress up sin for them in the most alluring forms; we invest them with an atmosphere of it which they breathe without suspicion. The woman may be here more efficient than the serpent. Herself deceived, she does not deceive the man, but she allures him. The victory is easier, speedier, than that over herself: "She gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."

The first effect is, "their eyes were opened;" the first 'inven-

tion,' of which they have sought out so many since, an apron to hide their shame from their own eyes. Thus conscience begins in shame, and sets them at work upon expedients, whereby they may haply forget their sin, and attain respectability at least, if conscience be no more possible.

How natural such a thought is we are all witness to ourselves, and yet it is a thing full of danger. It was the effort to retain just such a fig-leaf apron which sent the accusers of the adulteress out of the presence of the Lord. "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone at her," had been like a lightning-flash revealing to themselves their own condition. They were "convicted in their own consciences." but a convicted conscience does not always lead to self-judgment or to God: and "they, convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest"—the one who naturally would have most character to uphold,—"even unto the last," and left the sinner in the only possible safe place for a sinner, in the presence of the sinner's Saviour. She, whose fig-leaf apron was wholly gone, who had no more character or respectability to maintain, could stay. This was what made the loss of that still left to her; and so had He said to the Pharisees, "The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." This is the misery still of man's first invention, which in so many shapes he still repeats.

When the voice of the Lord God is heard in the garden the fig-leaf apron avails nothing. He hides himself from God among the trees of the garden: "I was afraid, because I was naked," is his own account. This is what alternates ever with self-justification in a soul: the voice of God—the *thought* of God, is terror to it. These two principles will be found together in every phase of so-called natural religion, the world over, and they will be found equally wherever Christianity itself is mutilated or misapprehended, making their appearance again. Man, in short, untaught of God, never gets beyond them; for he never can quite believe that he has for God a righteousness that He will accept, and he never can imagine God Himself providing a righteousness, when he has none.

Hence fear is the controlling principle always. His righteousness is an effort to avert wrath,—in reality (if it might be) to get away from God: and even with the highest profession it may be, still "there is none that seeketh after *God*." Notice thus, the Lord's picture of the "elder son" in the parable, who, hard-working, respectable, no wanderer from his father, no prodigal, but righteously severe on him who has spent his living with harlots, finds it yet a service barren enough of joy. The music

and dancing in the father's house are a strange sound to him : when he hears it he calls a servant to know what it all means. His own friends, and his merriment are all outside, spite of his correct deportment, and he speaks out what is in his heart towards his father, when he says, "*Thou* never gavest *me* a kid, that I might make merry with my friends."

There the Lord holds up the mirror for the Pharisee of all time. Plenty of self-assertion, of self-vindication, even as against God Himself; the tie to Him self-interest; his heart elsewhere; a round of barren and joyless services. This must needs break down in terror when God comes really in : indeed the principle all through is fear, servile, not filial.

So Adam hides himself among the trees of the garden ; but the voice of the blessed God follows him.. "And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, where art thou?"

Here then we begin to trace the actings of Divine grace with a sinner. Righteousness has its way no less, and judgment is not set aside but maintained fully. And herein is shown out the harmony of the Divine attributes, the moral unity of the God whose attributes they are. There is no conflict in His nature. Justice and mercy, holiness and love are not at war in Him. When He acts all act.

Let us mark then, first of all, this questioning of Adam on the part of God. Three several times we find these questions. He questions the man, questions the woman ; the serpent He does not question, but proceeds instead immediately to judgment. Plainly there is some thing significant in this. For it cannot be thought that the Omniscient needed to know the things that He enquired about ; therefore, if not for His own sake, it must have been for man's sake He made the enquiry. It was in fact the appeal to man for confidence in One who on His part had done nothing to forfeit it ; the gracious effort to bring him to own in the presence of his Creator his present condition and the sin which had brought him into it. And it is still in this way that we find entrance into the enjoyed favor of a Saviour-God : "we have access *by faith* into this grace wherein we stand," the "goodness of God" leading "to repentance." Confidence in that goodness enables us to take true ground before God, and enables Him thus, according to the principles of holy government, to shew us his mercy. Not in self-righteous efforts to excuse ourselves, nor yet in self-sufficient promises for the future, but "if we *confess our sins*, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

To this confession do these questionings of God call these

first sinners of the human race. Because there is mercy for them, they are invited to cast themselves upon it. Because there is none for the serpent, there is in his case no question. But let us notice also the different character of these questions, as well as the order of them. Each of these has its beauty and significance.

The first question is an appeal to Adam to consider his condition,—the effect of his sin, rather than his sin itself. The second it is that refers directly to the sin, and not the first. This double appeal we shall find everywhere in Scripture. Does man “thirst,” he is bidden to come and drink of the living water. Is he “labouring and heavy laden,” he is invited to find rest for his soul. This style of address clearly takes the ground of the first question. It is the heart not at rest here rather than the conscience roused. Where the latter is the case, however, and the sense of guilt presses on the soul, then there is a Christ of whom even His enemies testify that He receiveth sinners, and whose own words are that the “Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is *lost*.”

These are (as it were) God’s two arms thrown around men. Thus would He fain by every tie of interest draw them to Himself,—of self-interest when they are as yet incapable of any higher, any worthier motive. How precious is this witness to a love which finds all its inducement in itself—a love, not which God *has*, but which He *is*. How false an estimate do we make of it and of *Him*, when we make Him just such another as ourselves? when we think of His heart as needing to be won back to us, as if He had fallen from His own goodness, with our fall from innocence. How slow are we to credit Him when He speaks of the “great love wherewith He loves us, even when we are *dead* in sins!” How little we believe it, even when we have before our eyes “God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” And even when the awful cross, wherein man’s sin finds alone its perfect evidence and measurement in one, manifests a grace overflowing, abounding over it, even then can he justify himself rather than God, and refuse the plainest and simplest testimony to sovereign goodness, which he has lost even the bare ability to conceive.

In how many ways is God beseeching man to consider his own condition at least, if nothing else? In how many tongues is this, “Adam, where art thou,” repeated to the present day? Every groan of a creation subject to vanity, whereof the whole framework is convulsed and out of joint, is such a tongue. And herein is wisdom crying in the streets even where there is no speech and no word, “so teach us to number our days, that we

may apply our hearts unto wisdom." This man never does until divinely taught: "wisdom is justified" only "of her children."

And Adam does not yet approve himself as one of these. His confession of sin is rather an accusation of God: "the woman, whom Thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." In patient majesty God turns to the woman. She, more simply, but still excusing herself, pleads she was deceived: "the serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Then, without any further question, He proceeds to judgment,—judgment in which for the tempted mercy lies enfolded, and where, if the old creation find its end, there appears the beginning of that which alone fully claims the title of "the creation of God."

In the judgment of the serpent we must remember first of all, the essentially typical character of the language used. We have no reason to believe that Adam knew as yet the mystery of who the tempter was. "That old serpent, which is the devil and Satan," was doubtless for him nothing more than the most subtle of the beasts of the field which the Lord God had made. And herein, indeed, were divine wisdom and mercy shown, the tempter being not permitted to approach in angelic character as one above man, but in bestial, as one below him; one indeed of those to which man as their lord had given names, and among which he had found no helpmeet. How great was thus his shame when he listened to the deceiver! he had given up his divinely appointed supremacy in that moment.

So in the judgment here it is all outwardly the mere serpent, where spiritually we discern a far deeper thing. "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed among all cattle and among all beasts of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Thus the victory of evil is in reality the degradation of the victor: *he is degraded necessarily by his own success*. How plainly is this an eternal principle, illustrated in every career of villany under the sun. By virtue of it Satan will not be the highest in hell and prince of it, as men have feigned, but lowest and most miserable of all the miserable there. "Dust shall be the serpent's meat." "He feedeth on ashes: a deceived heart hath turned him aside that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, is there not a lie in my right hand?"

But there is still another way in which the serpent's victory is his defeat:—"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." That this last expression

received its plainest fulfilment on the Cross, I need not insist upon. There Satan manifested himself prince of this world, able (so to speak) by his power over men to cast Christ out of it, and put the Prince of life to death. But that victory was his eternal overthrow: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out; and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto *Me*."

This is deliverance for Satan's captives. It is not the restoration, however, of the old creation, nor of the first man. The seed of woman is emphatically the "*second* man," another and a "last Adam," new Head of a new race, who find in Him their title as "Sons of God," as "born, *not* of blood (i. e. naturally), nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

This is not the place indeed for the expansion of this, for here it is not expanded. We shall find the development of it further on. Only here it is noted, that not self-recovery, but a deliverer, is the need of man; and if God take up humanity itself whereby to effect deliverance, it must be the seed of the *woman*, the expression of feebleness and dependence, not of natural headship or of power.

This first direct prophecy links together the first page of revelation with the last, for only there do we find the full completion of it,—the serpent's head at last bruised. As a principle, the life of every saint in a world which "which lieth in the wicked one" has illustrated and enforced it. In the next section of this book we shall return to look at this.

The judgment of the woman and the man now follow, but they have listened already to the voice of mercy, a mercy which can turn to blessing the hardship and sorrow, henceforth the discipline of life, and even the irrevocable doom of death itself. That Adam has been no inattentive listener, we may gather from his own next words, which are no very obscure intimation of the faith which has sprung up in his soul. "And Adam called his wife's name, Eve, (life) because she was the mother of all living." The "woman which thou gavest to be with me" is again "his wife," and he names her through whom death had come in, as the mother, not of the *dying*, but the living.

Thus does his faith lay hold on God,—the faith of a poor sinner surely, to whom Divine mercy had come down without a thing in him to draw it out, save only the misery which spoke to the heart of infinite love. Like Abraham, afterwards "he believed God," and while to the sentence he bows in submissive silence, the grace enclosed in the sentence opens his lips again. Beautifully are we permitted to see just this in Adam, a faith which left him a poor sinner still, to be justified, not by

GENESIS IN THE LIGHT OF, &c.

189

works, but freely of God's grace, but still put him thus before God for justification. And we are ready the more to apprehend and appreciate the significant action following: "Unto Adam also, and to his wife, did the Lord God make coats of skin, and clothed them." Thus the shame of their nakedness is removed, and by God Himself, so that they are fit for His presence; for the covering provided of Himself must needs be owned as competent by Himself. And we have only to consider for a moment to discern how competent it really was.

Death provided this covering. These coats of skin owned the penalty as having come in, and those clothed with them found shelter for themselves in the death of another, and that the one upon whom it had come sinlessly through their own sin. How pregnant with instruction as to how still man's nakedness is covered, and he made fit for the presence of a righteous God. These skins were fitness, the witness of how God had maintained the righteous sentence of death, while removing that which was now his shame, and meeting the consequences of his sin. Our covering is far more, but it is such a witness also. Our righteousness is still the witness of *God's* righteousness,—the once dead, now living One, who of God is made *unto us* righteousness, and in whom also *we* are made the righteousness of God. The anti-type in every way transcends the type surely, yet very sweet and significant nevertheless is the first testimony of God to the Son;—a double testimony, first to the seed of the woman, the Saviour; and then, when faith has set its seal to this, a testimony to that work of atonement, whereby the righteousness of God is revealed in good news to man, and the believer is made that righteousness in Him.

Not till the hand of God has so interfered for them, are Adam and his wife sent forth out of the garden. If earth's paradise has closed for them, heaven has already opened; and the tree of life, denied only as continuing the *old* creation, stretches forth for them its branches, loaded with its various fruit, "in the midst of the paradise," no longer of men, but "of God"

[190]

Practice.

"ADDING" (*concluded.*)

We now get the developement of the more *positive* part of the new nature. Of course it has been really manifesting itself all along, but (at least) in "courage, temperance, patience," mainly in meeting evil. We have now what is not merely relatively but absolutely good, "godliness, brotherly kindness, love."

And first of these, and the basis of the rest, is "godliness." God must be ever first, and supreme in the soul, in order to have true "brotherly love" or "love" in the wider sense. And thus the apostle tests the reality of our love to the brethren by our practical subjection to God Himself: "by this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep His commandments." Love to God is again practically tested: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." He will not allow any other than the practical test. A man might say, I know that I love God, for I feel it in my heart. Certainly we may and ought to be conscious of it there, but the test of this for others must be the keeping His commandments. And even for ourselves we are in danger of the grossest self-deception, if we shirk the application of this. No amount of emotional feeling is a proper guarantee. It may be very sweet and full of enjoyment, but we need ever to ask ourselves, is it a love which manifests itself in obedience? "Why call ye Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

And here it is important to observe that if we are really keeping His commandments,—if we have really the spirit of obedience—the test will be again, whether we make conscience of keeping them *all alike*, small and great, as far as known, those in keeping which I shall be perhaps *alone*, as well as those in which I shall have a multitude for my companions. If I pick and choose among his commandments, I am not really "keeping" any of them, though apparently, perhaps, many. *The* commandment which costs me something to keep is really that by which I may test how far I am obedient.

No one can have looked round upon the religious profession of the day with any discernment without becoming painfully

aware how little there is of this practical "godliness,"—how little men dare face the general currents of belief or practice, in the simple, real spirit of obedience to God. How many, better taught in their own secret conscience, are condemning themselves in things which they allow! How many again have no really *Christian* conscience at all, but judge everything by the more moral standard of the world around them! It needs to be pressed, that *godliness* is something more than mere morality; that it is God Himself the practical, living Governor of the soul, not the doing merely our own will in things however lawful.

Then if God be thus before the soul, the children of God are recognized and loved as His—brotherly love follows godliness. Thus it is one of the grand tests of Christianity in the first epistle of John: "we know that we have passed from death to life, because we love"—not men in general here, but—"the *brethren*." This is no mere benevolence therefore—the kindly feelings of humanity. These are "natural affection," which it is indeed the sign of the last days for men professing godliness to be without, but the possession of which is yet no assurance of the power of that being present in the soul. No, this is the special love of the family of God, the range of which is, "every one that believeth that Jesus is the Christ," and so "is begotten of God," for "every one that loveth Him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of Him."

It is a "love" therefore, "without partiality," not a mere *liking* of such as I can get on with, of such as suit my taste. My love is not limited to my fellowship, be my fellowship ever so true and Christian. I love my brother because he *is* that. I may have to show my love in reproof, it may be: still it is love I have to show. It is not true "brotherly love," if it is not to *all* brethren. It is not true love, again, if it be not characterized by that love of God which keeps His commandments. Brotherly kindness developes out of godliness, and only so.

The "love" which closes this list of Christian graces, is a love in fine, which finds not its limit even here. It is a love which, joined with "faith," figures strangely as the "breast-plate" in conflict with the world (1 Thess. v. 8). To meet men's opposition or the world's allurements, we want faith and love, love springing out of faith, and characterized by it; love, not blind, the yielding of nature, but clear-sighted, laying hold of God and of eternity, and of men in their relationship to these; love which transforms the links which bind us together upon earth into ties surviving death, and channels of spiritual blessing. How can we complete our description half so well as in the words of the apostle—

"Love suffereth long and is kind ; love envieth not ; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth ; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

"EVERY WEIGHT."

Many have speculated as to the nature of what the apostle calls (Heb. xii. 1.) "the sin which doth so easily beset us." I am persuaded it is not any special form of sin, although it is quite true that there are such things as besetting sins, and we are all conscious of it. This however is more general. It is sin of whatever nature—all that can be called that—that we are enjoined to "lay aside," in the endeavour to "run with patience the race that is set before us."

The connection here is what is of so much practical importance, and it is missed perhaps by most who read the exhortation : it is this that to lay aside the sin that besets us, we must lay aside along with it the weights that impede us—"let us lay aside every *weight* and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run."

It is as runners in a race that we are addressed. That is plainly the governing thought in the passage. And it is all important in a race, and especially a long-continued one, where endurance as well as energy is required, to be as lightly equipped as possible ; hence "lay aside every weight" is the very first thing, and deserves the first attention. Nay, I doubt not, that this first thing will be found to involve the other, as I have said. If any one asks seriously, how shall I, how can I, lay aside the sin that besets me ? he will find the answer practically in the other part of this, "lay aside every weight."

Not that "weight" and "sin" are identical. It is the very fact that they are not, that helps to hide from many the real connection between them. The "weight" is a thing lawful enough to carry, if you look at it in itself merely. It belongs to that large class of things of which the apostle writes : "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not *expedient* ; all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought *under the power* of any." It is a thing lawful but not necessary, a thing I may let alone if I please, but I please to occupy myself with it

"EVERY WEIGHT."

193

Nothing that it is really duty^{*} for me to take up is properly a "weight." Nothing that I unnecessarily burden myself with, but I shall find one.

A christian is a heavenly man upon the earth, a man taken out of the world, sent into it only on Another's business (Jno. xvii. 18). He is a man in Christ, his place and portion being where Christ is ; his treasure, and so his heart, there. On earth he is a pilgrim and stranger therefore, as a citizen of heaven, from whence he looks for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the meanwhile therefore, while he seeks to be faithful in the things entrusted to him here, which are another's, the things which are his own, and take up his heart, are elsewhere. They are things unseen, substantiated to his soul by faith, things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor which have entered into man's heart naturally, but which God hath revealed to us by His Spirit. It is these with which of his own choice he occupies himself. Here is the line of things in which he desires to make progress. He wants to apprehend that for which he is apprehended of Christ Jesus, and, doing "one thing," concentrating his energies in one pursuit, he forgets that which is behind, and reaches forth unto those things which are before, pressing on toward the mark for the prize of the high calling (or rather, the calling *on high*) of God in Christ Jesus.

This is the practical character of a Christian, described almost in the very words of scripture, and it tells us at once why the thought of running a race should be so prominent in the passage in Hebrews, as well as other places. It is the occupation of the soul with what is outside the present scene that really gives ability to *be in it* aright, and separate from the evil which infects it. If my heart is really outside, it will be shown by my seeking (wherever the choice is left me) to occupy myself with what is outside, and to be as free as possible from all here that would engage and distract my thoughts. If for my own satisfaction I can occupy myself with it, this proves that what is my own does not satisfy me, and that things (which may be lawful enough in themselves) have already that "power" over me, which the apostle dreaded for himself. Moreover by abandoning myself to their pursuit I increase that power, and, as they cannot possibly themselves satisfy me, I am more and more left to the misery of a craving which enslaves me more and more, and compels me to toil in the impracticable pursuit of good I cannot find. "Whose god is their belly," is the apostle's description of such : whereas for him who is in the pursuit of what is real and substantial good, "out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

This then is what is involved in the admonition to "lay aside every weight." It is only a soul intent on progress that will feel what a "weight" is. Such an one will feel it in proportion to the degree in which he *is* intent on it. And when things *are* felt as weights, it is easy to lay them aside; for it is of the essence of a "weight" that it is something I choose to burden myself with. Duties are never in themselves such, for whatever I take up for God, because He wills it, it is not my own heart choosing, and I can count on Him for all needed strength.

If then my heart is set upon the things beyond, and I lay aside every weight, everything that would hinder my occupation with and enjoyment of them, I shall surely find that in laying aside the weight I lay aside with it the sin which so easily besets me. For from whence does temptation come? Comes it not from the power of present things? And is not every one practically "tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed?" Will not then a heart engaged and satisfied with what is elsewhere be the true remedy for this?

Fitly therefore does our text end, "looking unto Jesus, the Leader and Finisher of faith, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." This was the principle of the one perfect life of faith that ever was, and we cannot walk as He walked, unless we imitate Him in this. The man that is seeking to get on in the world, is doing manifestly what He never could do,—is walking as He never *did* walk. Fellowship with Him is on this principle impossible. Our pathway and His have necessarily separated. What wonder if our joy in Him is gone, and our spiritual strength, of which that is the spring, be gone also? What wonder, if sin prevails against us.

There is no remedy, so long as we will not believe that the world is what it is, or that Christ is what He is for those that come to Him. "My people have committed two evils," is the Divine complaint; "they have forsaken Me the fountain of living waters, and have hewn out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water." "If any man thirsts," is the invitation, "let him come unto Me and drink, and he that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

[195]

THE WAY THROUGH EDMOM.

NUMB. XX. 14-21.

The opening verses of this chapter give us a scene parallel in a striking way with one in Exodus, where the conflict with Amalek follows, as here the question with Edom. The twelfth verse of Gen. xxxvi. informs us of a relationship in which these stood to one another, which may prepare us for some connection between their separate histories. "And Timna was concubine to Eliphaz, Esau's son, and she bare to Eliphaz, Amalek." The latter was thus the offspring of Esau, "which is Edom." The Edom of Numb. xx. is thus the parent stock from which the Amalek of Exod. xvii. came. This, we may be sure, is not without meaning. It is one of those "voices" of Scripture, "none" of which "is without significance."

Moreover, as to the name Edom, it is but *Adam* a little changed; a name, too, which Esau got from the indulgence of those fleshly lusts, for which he "despised," and lost, "his birthright," as Adam had before lost his. Hence he is the very illustration of "a profane person" (Heb. xii.), one, of whom, as wholly distasteful to God, it is written: "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Very kindred this to what stands written of the grandson Amalek, "The Lord hath sworn that He will have war with Amalek from generation to generation."

Edom is thus the type of the flesh, in man "the elder" nature, but which has lost birthright and blessing to the younger: Adam reproduced, if a little varnished over, and with a new name, in reality unchanged.

Now let us look at Numbers:

"And Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the king of Edom, Thus saith thy brother Israel, Thou knowest all the travail that hath befallen us: how our fathers went down into Egypt, and we have dwelt in Egypt a long time; and the Egyptians vexed us and our fathers; and when we cried unto the Lord, He heard our voice, and sent an angel, and hath brought us forth out of Egypt, and behold, we are in Kadesh, a city in the uttermost of thy border:—Let us pass, I pray thee through thy country; we will not pass through the fields, nor through the vineyards, neither will we drink of the water of the wells, we will go by the king's highway; we will not turn to the right hand, nor to the left, until we have passed thy borders. And Edom said unto him, Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword. And the children of Israel said unto him, we will go by the highway,

and if I or my cattle drink of thy water, then I will pay for it. I will only, without doing anything else, pass through on my feet. And he said, Thou shalt not go through. And Edom came out against him with much people, and with a strong hand. Thus Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border: wherefore Israel turned away from him."

We have already noticed that the place in which this narrative is found is just after that murmuring at Meribah, a murmuring the precise parallel of the murmuring at that other Meribah, which precedes the account of the strife with Amalek, Edom's offspring. Here there is indeed no battle, but worse failure than before at Rephidim, and the marks of it are apparent in the passage before us. The people have failed miserably, and, still in the weakness of it, they send this message to the king of Edom. There is no trace of Divine guidance in it, although a Divine lesson results. Nay, there is that which (I conceive) forbids the thought of Divine guidance in it. Had it been Jehovah's message, would He have taken up with the insult offered by an enemy, and, as if He had suffered defeat, led His people quietly round another way? He could, when the people themselves failed, take up, as it were, with the consequences of that failure; but to give way before an *adversary* would have been quite another thing, and only have seemed to justify the failure of His people to trust in Him.

I take this then plainly to be the people's own proposal, the fruit of the very natural desire to shorten their journey and get out of the wilderness in which they had now been wanderers so long. The territory of Edom lay apparently right across their path, the shortest way to their destination, and the way round it difficult and long. They would exchange the sands of the desert for a cultivated land, and a place where naturally there was no way for "the king's highway," at least a defined and proper road. It was the most natural thought possible that the way led through Edom, only nature's thoughts are not as God's thoughts.

So when Edom denies them passage, and upon their further representation, bristles up and puts on his armour and comes out with a strong hand, Israel is fain to put up with the disappointment and to turn away. And notwithstanding that the Lord is with them, He whose power had overthrown all the might of Egypt, and after this was to break in pieces Sihon and Og, and all the Kings of Canaan, He does not interfere to force a passage. And why? Simply because the king's highway had never been His way at all, and that He will make the misguided people understand.

THE WAY THROUGH EDM.

197

Before we seek to draw the lesson out of this, let us turn for a moment to Exod. xvii. and compare the defeat of Amalek with this turning away from Edom. Not that I intend, however, to enter into much detail. I would only trace some parallels, and suggest some points of contrast between the two.

Now here in Exod. xvii. the people have been thirsting as in the other case, and failing too, so that Rephidim gets the self-same name of Meribah that Kadesh does,—“because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us or not?”

“Then,” it is recorded, “*then* came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim.” Thus it is the unbelief of the people that is connected with the coming of Amalek against them. For the wilderness is not, properly speaking, the place of conflict, though there may be conflict in it. The Lord does not come out, so to speak, as a man of war, after the Red Sea victory, till Jordan is crossed, and at the sea the people did not draw sword themselves. Through the wilderness they only do so exceptionally and in self-defence. Here unbelief leads into it. Question the Lord’s presence with you and up comes Amalek to fight.

Here, plainly, they could not “turn away.” As the assaulted ones they must stand their ground against the adversary. It was no question of advancing either—of making progress. The Lord being with them, they repel their enemies; but they gain no ground by it. They have had the additional weariness and anxiety of warfare; they are no nearer Canaan than they were before.

These things “happened unto them for types”—types full of beauty and instruction. Let us try now to apprehend their significance.

Amalek is, I doubt not, the type of those “fleshly lusts which war against the soul:” if not the flesh itself, which is rather Edom, it is Edom’s offspring. The gift of the Spirit it is, that is typified in the water from the rock. So, when we have the Spirit, “the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other.” We should mistake the matter, however, if we supposed that the conflict here with Amalek was simply consequent upon the gift of water. We have already seen that Scripture connects it rather with the unbelief of the people. For us there is no question that it is the practical loss of the Lord’s presence—not His leaving us, of course, but our having lost sight of Him, that exposes us to the assault of the lusts of the flesh. It is under such circumstances that, if we do not yield, we have to fight.

But this sort of warfare is not therefore a necessity of God's making, but of our own. It is not the conflict to which we are called, nor that which is proper Christian conflict. It is not that which Christ ever knew, but the outbreak of an inward corruption to which He was necessarily a stranger, and for us the result of *not* walking as He walked, or being in fellowship with Him.

The conflict with the flesh is no element of progress. We may gain the victory, but we gain nothing more. Israel were no nearer Canaan by their victory than before. And although Edom lay apparently directly in their way, and *was* an obstruction in the fullest sense, God sent them not out to conquer Edom, nor bade them even force a passage through the land. No, He has another way for them altogether, more round-about, as we should say, but still His; and so it is in our case as in theirs.

God does not set us on to war against the flesh, or the flesh's lust. Those "fleshly lusts," indeed, "war against the soul," and when they assault we have to fight. But the apostle's exhortation is, not "war against," but "abstain from"—"hold off from"—them. And he addresses us, too, when he says this, "as pilgrims and strangers," as those whose homes and whose hearts are elsewhere; as those upon a journey, to whom even a victory would still be a delay.

How many mistake here, imagining that God has called them to a conflict with the evil in them, when He has provided rather a way of escape: and how many find in such occupation with the sin within, an *entanglement* with the evil, rather than the mastery they seek. In the perpetual strife to which they consider themselves called, they make no progress and they find no peace. The incidental conflict with Amalek is in their experience as ceaselessly prolonged and perpetuated as are the streams from "that Rock which followed" Israel. On the other hand, the turning away from Edom they do not understand: they have found nothing which answers to it. They have not learned yet that "turning away" is the path of progress, and that the Lord's way lies for them, through desert sands, indeed, but at least outside of Edom.

Our privilege it is to turn away. The truest judgment of self, it is at the same time the pathway of peace and of practical holiness. Our *title* to do it is that the Cross of Christ has been for us the crucifixion of the old man. God has there condemned sin in the flesh once for all, and we are not in the flesh but in Christ, before Him, where the flesh is not found.

In us down here it is found indeed,—found by experience, if for faith judged and gone. True, and our remedy is to "turn away." The Lord our leader, and our hearts set upon that good

land of which we have heard the report, "pilgrims and strangers" in fact and spirit, we are to follow on where the cloud leads the way, a path where faith is indeed every hour necessary, but where nevertheless no really good thing is lacked; a path ordered by Divine wisdom, secured by Divine power, furnished by Divine love. It is thus, encompassed by the Lord's mercies, and our hearts set upon what is beyond, "as pilgrims and strangers, we shall find *ability* to "abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul."

— We may look further at the Way through Edom another time.

Critical.

A NOTE ON THE STRUCTURE OF ISA. LII. 13-LIII.

I desire to call the attention of students of Scripture to this well-known prophecy of our Lord, as a further illustration of what has been elsewhere noted in these pages, the minute symmetrical structure of the inspired word, and to the significance of numerals as being the key to the understanding of this, and as a help of very great importance to the precisionizing of our knowledge of the truth contained there.

It is evident indeed that if it has pleased God to stoop to such a style of writing His word, as we see, for instance, in the alphabetic psalms, a style which we should call artificial in the highest degree, He must have some meaning worthy of Himself in doing so. Does it not seem as if the very strangeness of it should attract, and were meant to attract, our notice? And then is not His adoption of such a mode of speech plainly an *accommodation* to infirmity of ours,—a real help designed therefore to meet our spiritual dulness and ignorance? If we can trace elsewhere in His word this same manner of speech, ought we not to know what He means by it, and to avail ourselves of the help which it does seem He must mean to afford us so?

I say this to meet at once the thought that such a mode of reaching the truth of Scripture is artificial and unspiritual. In one sense I may own it to be both, and yet find it all the more a condescension to my confessed weakness and little spirituality, in which I find Divine love displayed in tender consideration of

my need. And I cannot afford to despise it upon that account.

Another may rather object, that it leaves room for the play of fancy, and the misleading of our own imagination. Nor can I assure any one of there being no room for danger as to this. Is there anywhere freedom absolutely from being the dupes of our own thoughts, save in being subject simply to Him who has come into the world to give us Divine thoughts? Yet the more one considers it, the more he will probably see, that the primary facts themselves, (whatever the interpretation of them) are as little liable to question on that ground as perhaps any others. It is quite indisputable (whatever the interpretation), that the 119th psalm divides just into twenty-two series of eight verses each. It is not really more questionable that the twelve verses of the second psalm divide into just *four* sections of *three* verses each, or the 139th into *six*, of *four* verses. The well-known structure of the book of Lamentation gives us further examples of symmetrical division. The first two chapters are each a simple alphabetic series: in each the twenty-two verses have as initial letters the Hebrew alphabet in regular order. The third chapter has *sixty-six* verses, the initials of which are *three* Alephs, and then *three* Beths, and so on to the end of the alphabet again. The fourth chapter resembles the first and second. The fifth contains still the twenty-two verses but *without* the alphabetic initial. Thus the whole book is regularly divided.

Now this is only a sample of facts as to the structure of Scripture in these two books. It would be rash to argue from this that its other books would be similarly divided, but it should at least prevent incredulity as to their being so. And these primary facts being once ascertained, there can be no question that they have meaning, if not only the word, but the *words*, be God's (1 Cor. ii. 13).

The application of the meaning of numerals in Scripture, as giving significance to such divisions of the books, has been considered in former pages.* I take for granted the knowledge of it here.

It is agreed on all hands that the prophecy of chap. liii. begins with the 13th verse of the 52nd chapter. The whole contains, therefore, just fifteen verses; and these are again just *five threes*: every three verses being a separate division of the subject. It will be found moreover that every division is characterized in the completest way by the number thus attaching to it.

* Pp. 81-86.

NOTE ON ISAIAH LII. 13-LIII.

201

Thus the *first* three verses give us the Divine counsels as to Christ, the ordained plan of Him who is "wonderful in counsel, excellent in working." The after-history is but the fulfilment of it, even by the hands of those, it may be, who mean no such thing. How sweet and suited to begin thus, where all begins, with the infinite mind of God, and thus to reach to the "peace that passeth understanding" of One forever above the water-floods.

"Behold, *My* Servant shall act wisely : He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.

"As many were astonished at Thee : His visage was so marred more than any man's, and His form more than the sons of men.

"So shall He sprinkle many nations : the kings shall shut their mouths at Him ; for that which had not been told them they shall see, and that which they had not heard shall they consider."

There is the whole plan announced, and by Him whose plan it is : first the wisdom of Jehovah's perfect Servant, and the exaltation to which it leads ; then the suffering beyond any among mere men, expressed in the marring of His face and form ; then, thirdly, the result in cleansing for the nations, whose highest would be brought to reverent silence in His presence, wondering (with no idle wonder now) at the gracious words proceeding from His lips.

In the *second* three we have another speaker. The prophet, identifying himself with the nation of Israel, speaks of their rejection of God's testimony to Christ, as the repentant generation of a future day will speak of it. God's witness tests man's heart as nothing else does, and brings out the enmity of man's heart against it. It has been already noticed how the number two speaks thus not only of "witness," but of enmity (see p. 163, *note*).

"Who hath believed our report ? and to whom is Jehovah's arm revealed ?

"For he shall grow up before Him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground : He hath no form nor comeliness ; and when we see Him there is no beauty, that we should desire Him.

"He is despised and rejected of men ; a man of sorrows and well acquainted with grief : and we hid as it were our faces from Him ; He was despised and we esteemed Him not."

Then the *third* section brings the Divine meaning of these sorrows before us, misconceived as they were by men. Just as Leviticus, the third book of Scripture, gives us first of all those gifts and sacrifices which are the foreshadowing of the self-same precious work, so are we here in the sanctuary with God, to learn the true character of these sufferings of the man of sorrows.

"Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows : yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

"But He was pierced for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities : the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed.

"All we like sheep have gone astray ; we have turned every one to his own way ; and Jehovah hath made to fall on Him the iniquity of us all."

Thus these three verses are indeed the central ones of all. The next, or fourth, section speaks of another thing. As Numbers, the *fourth* book of the Pentateuch, treats of the testing of the people in the wilderness, so the three verses here describe the trial of the perfect Servant, in His case only bringing out that absolute perfection. Thus we have now His personal conduct under the pressure of this unequalled trial.

"He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth : He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth.

"He was taken away by violence and judgment, and as to His generation who considereth, that He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was HE stricken? *

"And they appointed His grave with wicked men, and with the rich man after He was slain : because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth."

Thus His glory already shone out, strangely mingling with His shame among men ; but immediately it shines fully out ; and to this the next verses bring us. They give us the result, according to the holy ways of Divine government, of that perfect walk on earth, and absolute self-surrender for the Divine glory, and purpose in blessing towards man. In a word it is the Deuteronomic moral of the whole.

"And it pleased Jehovah to bruise Him ; He hath wounded Him : when Thou shalt make His soul a trespass-offering,† He shall see a seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in His hand.

"He shall see of the travail of His soul ; He shall be satisfied ; by His knowledge shall My righteous Servant instruct many in righteousness,‡ and He shall bear their iniquities.

"Therefore will I give Him a portion among the great, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong : because He hath poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors ; and He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

Thus closes the prophecy. It is not my purpose at this time to say more. I only remark how beautifully the structure cor-

* I believe this to be the true rendering here ; as to the next verse there can scarcely be a question.

† The *governmental* offering, as noticed, p. 165 above.

‡ As Dan. xii. 3, an exceptional meaning for *tzadaq*, but evidently the true one here.

responds with the subject of the Scripture here. For if *three* be the number of Divine manifestation, as elsewhere shown, and *five* the human number, then these *threes* contained within this enclosing *five* are just as simply as beautifully significant of One in whom "GOD WAS MANIFEST IN FLESH."

A REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF
THE PSALMS.

XI.

To the chief musician, (a psalm) of David.

1. In Jehovah have I put my trust ; how say ye to my soul, flee (as) a bird to your mountain ?
2. For, lo, the wicked bend the bow ; they have fixed their arrow upon the string ; that in the dark they may shoot at the upright in heart.
3. When the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do ?
4. Jehovah is in His holy temple, Jehovah's throne is in heaven : His eyes behold, His eyelids try the sons of men.*
5. Jehovah trieth the righteous : but the wicked and him that loveth violence hath His soul hated.
6. Upon the wicked He shall rain snares : fire and brimstone, and a burning wind—the measure of their cup.
7. For Jehovah is righteous ; He loveth righteous deeds : the upright shall behold His face †.

XII.

To the chief musician upon Sheminith [the eighth], a Psalm of David.

1. Save, Jehovah, for the godly hath ceased, for the faithful have disappeared from among the sons of men.*
2. They speak falsehood every one with his fellow : with a smooth lip, with a double heart, do they speak.
3. Jehovah shall cut off all smooth lips,—the tongue that speaketh great things :
4. Which have said, with our tongue will we prevail ; our lips are our own : who is lord over us ?

* 'Adam. † Or, as the A. V., "His face shall behold the upright."

5. On account of the spoliation of the humble, for the groaning of the needy, now will I arise, saith Jehovah : I will set him in safety [from him that] puffeth at him.

6. The words of Jehovah are pure words : silver refined in a crucible of earth, seven times purified.

7. Thou shalt keep them, O Jehovah ; Thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

8. The wicked walk on every side, when vileness is exalted among the sons of men.*

XIII.

To the chief musician, a Psalm of David.

1. How long will Thou forget me, O Jehovah ? for ever ? how long wilt Thou hide Thy face from me ?

2. How long shall I take counsel in my soul, [having] sorrow in my heart daily ? how long shall mine enemy be exalted over me ?

3. Look upon, answer me, Jehovah my God : lighten mine eyes lest I sleep [in] death.

4. Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him ; [and] those that straiten me rejoice when I am moved.

5. But I have trusted in Thy mercy ; my heart shall rejoice in Thy salvation.

6. I will sing unto Jehovah, because He hath recompensed me.

XIV.

To the chief musician [a Psalm] of David.

1. The fool hath said in his heart, [There is] no God. They have acted corruptly, they have done abominable deeds ; there is none that doeth good

2 Jehovah looked from heaven upon the sons of men,* to see if there were any that did understand [and] seek God.

3 The whole of them are turned aside ; they are together become corrupt† : there is none that doeth good, no, not one.

4 Have all the workers of vanity no knowledge ? who eat up my people [as] they eat bread ? they have not called upon Jehovah.

5. There were they in great dread : for God is in the generation of the righteous.

6. Ye put to shame the counsel of the humble, because Jehovah is His refuge !

* 'Adam, † 'alack : not the same as in ver. 1.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

205

7. Who shall give salvation unto Israel out of Zion? when Jehovah turneth the captivity of His people, Jacob shall rejoice, Israel shall be glad.

XV.

A Psalm of David.

1. Jehovah, who shall sojourn in Thy tent? who shall dwell in Thy holy mount?

2. He that walketh in integrity and worketh righteousness, and speaketh truth in his heart.

3. That hath not slandered with his tongue, nor done evil to his fellow, nor taken up a reproach against his neighbour.

4. In his eyes a reprobate is despised, but he honoureth them that fear Jehovah. He sware to his own hurt, and changeth not.

5. He hath not put out his money to usury, nor taken a bribe against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

The Faith

TEXTS FOR ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

VI.—“EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.”

“Then shall He say unto them on the left hand, Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.... And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”—Matth. xxv. 41, 46.

This text has naturally been one in much dispute among the deniers of the eternal punishment of the wicked. Their arguments necessarily have reference to one or other of the two words indicated; some laying stress upon alleged meanings of the word for “punishment,” while others contend for the indefinite character of that for “eternal.”

The argument of Mr. Jukes for restorationism is as to the former word, that it “means in its primary sense simply ‘pruning,’” and “is that always used for a corrective discipline, which is for the improvement of him who suffers it. Those who hold the common view of the endlessness of punishment,” he adds, “are obliged to confess this; and this of itself proves that their doctrine is untenable; for any punishment, be it for a longer or a shorter time, would not be corrective discipline, but quite

another thing, if it left those who were so corrected unimproved and lost for ever." And he quotes Archbishop Trench as proving that in the word in question "is more the notion of punishment as it has reference to the correction and bettering of him that endures it," complaining however that he speaks of it as "a serious error to attempt to transfer this distinction in its entirety to the words as employed in the New Testament." "That is," he says, "it would be a serious error to give the word its proper sense."

He omits however entirely the Archbishop's citations of sundry writers "in proof that *kolasis* had acquired in Hellenistic Greek this severer sense, and was used simply as punishment or torment, with no necessary underthought of the bettering through it of him who endured it."*

Beside which, if "eternal" really mean "eternal" here, Mr. Jukes has already allowed that the case is decided against him. In the only other passage in which *kolasis* is used in the New Testament, it is translated "torment." "Fear hath torment" (John iv. 18).

As for annihilationists, while some have endeavored to fix the meaning of "cutting off" upon the word, as a derivation from its primary meaning of "pruning," others, as Mr. Hudson, allow that the word has no such meaning: "In pruning," the latter rightly contends, "the *tree* is not cut off, only the branches."

The real question, therefore, if anywhere, must be raised on the word "everlasting," and here accordingly both classes of writers address their strongest efforts. True, the word is (and they cannot deny it) that used as to the "eternal" life of the righteous, and that is strictly eternal. True, it is the word used everywhere in the New Testament (except two passages. Rom. i. 20, Jude 6) for eternal in the full and proper sense. All this is admitted; and some would speak of a doom of endless extinction on the one hand, as of a reward of endless life upon the other. We have seen, however, that the doom of the devil, which the wicked share, is not extinction;—that the lake of fire is not that for the beast and false prophet cast therein: it cannot be reasonably maintained to be this, therefore, for those upon the left hand here. The phraseology too exactly corresponds. Mr. Blain may from his point of view well say that "*go away into* adds darkness to the text." As it is nevertheless the only possible translation, it may perhaps throw light on it. For how could one speak of going away *into* "cutting off"?

* He cites "Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 2, 2; Philo, *De Agricul.* 9; *Mart. Polycar.* 2; 2 Macc. iv. 38; *Wisd. of Sol.* xix. 4." In the Septuagint version of Ezek. xviii. 30, it is used for "ruin."

As to Mr. Jukes' "correction," it is of course plain that, for any restoration of the person, "endless correction" would never do. He urges therefore that "if it can be shewn that the word here used is in other Scriptures applied to what is not eternal, we may be pardoned for thinking it cannot mean eternal here. . . . The truth is that the word describes not the quantity or duration, but the quality, of that of which it is predicated." Elsewhere he says, referring to his view of the "ages" which we have already briefly looked at [pp. 105, 106], that the word (*æonial*, as he would read it rather than "eternal," "is always connected with remedial labour, and with the idea of 'ages' as periods in which God is working to meet and correct some awful fall. . . . And does not our Lord refer to this," he asks, "in the well-known words, 'This is life eternal (that is, the life of the age or ages,) that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent'? Does He not say here that to know the only true God, as the sender of His Son to be a Saviour, and to know that Son as a Saviour and Redeemer, mark and constitute the renewed life which is peculiar to the ages? . . . The adjective 'æonial' or age-long, cannot carry a force or express a duration greater than that of the ages or æons which it speaks of. If therefore these ages are limited periods, some of which are already past, while others, we know not how many, are yet to come, the word 'æonial' cannot mean strictly never-ending."

Mr. Jukes therefore rids the Bible of any proper word for eternity at all! He carries you on through these terminable "remedial" ages, and where they end, strange to say, all light and knowledge end together. Praise to God is 'æonial,' not eternal; so 'redemption,' 'salvation,' our 'inheritance,' and so forth. True, he believes, from Luke xx. 36, that the believer's life is really eternal; but there is no such word as 'eternal' anywhere!

But that is not all. If, for instance, Plato uses this word "æonial" before the New Testament was written, did he, then, entertain the thought of such remedial ages? Did Aristotle blunder in his Greek, when he defined *aion* or "æon" as *aion on*, 'always existing'? Did all the Greek philosophers together, when they called certain beings *Æons*, as Mosheim says, to describe their nature as "superior to frailty and obnoxious to no vicissitude"? According to Mr. Jukes, they must each and all have blundered: *æonial* cannot be eternal, because an *æon* is always a "limited period"!

That there are such limited "ages" is true enough, as we have seen. But we have also seen that "for the age" (as he would render it) is certainly used to express a true eternity; and much

more strictly, "for the ages," and "for the ages of ages." If æonial be thus equivalent to "belonging to the ages," it expresses real eternity. Who can doubt that it does so in 2 Cor. iv. 18, for instance, where it is contrasted with "temporal":—"the things which are seen are *temporal*; but the things which are not seen are *eternal*"? Surely a passage like this fixes the ordinary meaning of the word, although there may be exceptionally a use of it in another—I do not say, a more limited sense.

In point of fact there are but three passages in which this other sense may be rightly pleaded, and in these three we have the recurrence of a peculiar phrase. This phrase is "æonial times"; and it occurs Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 9; and Tit. i. 2, in each case translated "world" in our version. The meaning is not very difficult. The "times" referred to are of the nature of 'æons,' that is to say, "ages" with definite characteristics. There is no reasonable doubt that these 'ages' are periods of divine appointment, in each of which God was dealing with the world upon some different but determinate principle in view of the coming of Christ that was to be. *These* ages come to a "completion" when "Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself,"* and thus *we* now are said to be those "upon whom the *ends* of the *ages* (in our version, *world*) have come.

These age-times do not therefore serve Mr. Jukes' argument. *They are passed.* Nor will he find any of more service. But it is quite true that *æonial* here is not eternal. Not that it has a more limited meaning, however: for it does not express duration here at all, (the word "times" does that) but defines these 'times' as of a certain character. In no other passage in the New Testament can the word be shown to be used save as expressive of *duration*, and in no passage where it is used for duration can it be shown to mean anything but eternal in the strictest sense.

The usual argument of both restorationists and annihilationists is however less bold than this. They only contend that "eternal" is used (in the Old Testament) as applied to what will necessarily pass away: "the everlasting hills," for example; and that here therefore the punishment, or the people under it, may in like manner pass away. But this is to overlook what constitutes a very important feature in the case.

"The principle of interpretation is this," says one well-known as an annihilationist, as quoted by another of the same school,†

* Heb. ix. 26, where "the end of the world" is, literally, "the completion of the ages."

† Rev. H. Constable, Prebendary of Cork, quoted by Goodwyn, "Truth and Tradition," pp. 6, 7.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

209

that *all language relating to law and jurisprudence*, all language descriptive of the sanction of government, all language setting forth the penalties of crime and disobedience, is to be accepted *in its primary sense, and in no other*. . . . A secondary sense may be usual and proper *elsewhere, but not here*. . . . On this principle we set aside every secondary sense from the terms relative to future punishment."

This principle is true. It needs, of course, wisdom in application, and a certain limitation founded upon this, that in the description of another sphere of things than that with which our senses are familiar, and to which our human language of necessity applies, there will naturally be an *adaptation* of language, which will sometimes affect correspondingly the terms employed. With this reservation, we may frankly accept the principle as true. It means indeed only this, that in a matter of such moment the Merciful One will deal as plainly as possible with His creatures. This is true; for so He will.

This therefore settles the matter that eternal must have its full force here: that what it means when applied to the life of the righteous it must mean when applied to the punishment of the wicked. "Everlasting punishment" cannot be a poetical phrase, like the "everlasting hills"; nor "everlasting fire" be such as will come to an end for want of material. God will not threaten in words which do not mean as much as they would be taken to imply. Eternal punishment is thus a solemn reality. Torment for ever and ever is just as it reads. All other thoughts are but the dreams of men, or worse, the delusion of him who is the destroyer of men's souls.

Questions of the Day.

"THE 'CHURCH' IN THE WILDERNESS."

Having now looked at what we should call, no less than Mr. Sadler, "the great 'Church' truth of God's word," so far as it applies to the 'Church' of New Testament times, we may now turn to the Old Testament to see how far the 'Church' there corresponds in character to it.

Mr. Sadler makes the Old Testament and New Testament Churches one essentially, as we have seen:—

"From the time of Abraham to the present time it has been God's will to save men, not only by working in them [individual personal religion, but by joining them together in a body, a family, or kingdom, or Church. This

body has always been an outward and visible body, known by certain outward and visible marks. Men have always been admitted into this Church by a rite or ordinance which betokened God's special good-will towards each one of them. This Church, or body, has always been governed and instructed by a visible ministry. This Church, or body, or family, always has been, and, till the second advent, always will be, a mixed body . . . The covenant of God has always been with this visible Church. The word of God has always been addressed to this outward visible body. The members of this body or Church are always assumed to be, or to have once been, in the favor of God. . . . No interior or invisible Church within this outward body is ever recognized in God's word as a separate Church. . . .

"In every place in which God speaks of the Jews as 'His people,' 'His flock,' 'Jacob,' 'Israel,' &c., He recognizes this Church principle. In no one case does God by such terms as 'My people,' 'Mine inheritance,' 'Jacob,' or 'Israel,' mean certain godly individuals, considered as an invisible or inner Church. He always means by these terms the whole visible body or Church."

We have already seen how far this is true as to the New Testament Church; that it is indeed almost completely untrue. We have seen that the Church there presented is not simply "a body," but the body of Christ, and that membership in that was not a mixed one of penitent and impenitent together, but of believers only, possessors of eternal life, and of salvation,* washed, sanctified and justified, *meet* for the inheritance of the saints in light. We have seen moreover that they were constituted such, not by an external rite, but by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, a separate thing. We have seen, too, that as the "house of God," it was composed of *living* stones, although man's bad building might, and would, build in "wood, hay and stubble," and so the house of God might (and would) cease to be identical with the body of Christ, and thus the visible Church become practically separate from the true 'body,' thus become invisible through man's sin, and not through God's intention. The visible body *now* in short is not that body which was visible, before corruption had come in, as, alas, so soon it did, and to identify them is error of the gravest kind. In this way, however, the visible church *has* become practically the mixed body which the Jewish 'Church' was, and thus affords a colour to Mr. Sadler's comparison.

If we look at Scripture as to this 'church' of Judaism, we shall soon find how different it was from the body of Christ or the house of God. It is indeed notorious as to the latter, that

*Of course it is owned that there is still a future salvation for every saint, and in that sense it is not complete as long as we are in these poor mortal bodies. This is complete deliverance from sin, death and enemies of every kind. But in another sense we *are* saved already, as from wrath and the dominion of sin.

CHURCH IN WILDERNESS.

211

God's house was the temple or the tabernacle* *in the midst* of the people, but not at all the *people themselves*. "Whose house are *we*," was said first to Christians, never to Jews. As to the body of Christ, if that were formed as the apostle tells us by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that baptism began, as it plainly did, at Pentecost, then the Israelitish congregation *could* not be that. The very thought is outside entirely of Old Testament Scripture, and was a "mystery" or thing "from the beginning of the world hid in God" until revealed specially and first of all to Paul the apostle, as he assures us (Eph. iii.). We shall have however, again to take up this, and I therefore do not pursue it now. The fact is plain, that the Old Testament knows nothing of it, and that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was not till Pentecost.

If not, then, the body of Christ or house of God, what *was* the Old Testament 'Church,' or assembly? It was one of "the families of the earth" (Amos iii. 2.), a kindred "according to the *flesh*" (Rom. ix, 3), not a spiritual one. To this fleshly kindred, as the apostle bears witness, belong "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises": all these, of course, the things contained in those Old Testament books, which even yet they, though in unbelief, hold fast as theirs. Most certainly, we who believe now have the "adoption, glory, . . . promises," but all as *New Testament* blessings, and in another plane to theirs. Let us dwell on this a little, and seek to lay hold upon the difference.

And first of all, we must learn to distinguish carefully between the "assembly" or congregation of Israel, and the *saints* there. Here the use of the technical word 'church,' with the meaning ordinarily attached to it, has wrought mischief. For the very expression, "the Jewish Church," seems to imply at once a spiritual people, which, *as* an assembly, they never once were. Saints there were, no doubt, and many, among them; but what these were as such, and what the assembly was, are two entirely distinct things. Even Mr. Sadler, to introduce people into the 'Church' of his belief, must have some idea of their getting holiness in some way, in order for them to be there. And therefore it is that they must be born again in a sacrament if in no other way, to come in. But in Judaism there was not even the idea of any such necessity. If Abraham, a man of

*As to which professing Christians have got into *lower* than Jewish thoughts. For not only with most of them is the house they meet in still "the house of God," but they even call and think of it as 'the Church.'

faith, were circumcised, not only Ishmael, but "all the men of his house, born in his house, and bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him" Were they supposed by this, all these grown up people, to be born again? Mr Sadler's careful words seem to imply some sense of the difficulty here. "Men have always been admitted into this Church by a rite or ordinance," he says, "which betokened God's special *good will* towards each one of them" "Special good will" is vague enough at least Was it supposed they had spiritual life, I ask. Nay, there never was such a question raised,—never a line drawn between converted and unconverted by Judaism at all Nor could there be

Israel was, as the Word says, one of the families of the earth, a fleshly kindred They had the "adoption," as the apostle says indeed They were taken by God as His 'special people' upon the earth His family "I am a father to Israel," He says, "and Ephraim is my first-born" (Jer xxxi, 9) Does any one suppose by that that they were therefore children of God, as believers now, and taken as that? So far from this that the apostle tells us that, in *this* sense, the very children of God among them never, while Judaism lasted, received the *adoption*, at all These are his words as to the *true saints* in Israel 'Now I say, that the heir, as long as he is a child [a babe], differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father *Even so we*, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world, but, when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, *to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons*' (Gal iv, 1-5) The true children of God had thus in the fullness of appointed time to be redeemed from under the law, before they could be taken by God for the children that they actually were! How plain, then, that Judaism never did own the true children of God, and that the Jewish 'adoption' which Paul speaks of (Rom ix 3), is the contrast with the New Testament "adoption," instead of being the same And it is indeed in nowise difficult to see that a system which took up a nation in the flesh, and proclaimed them, as such, God's family, *could not*, at the same time, distinguish the true sons as being such

Mr Sadler's system similarly now refuses the adoption to the true children of God necessarily, only that with him it is the bringing *back* of a darkness, which in God's appointment has given place to the light of day His sacramentally born children of God, who never gave one sign of life, claim for him as

IS BAPTISM NEW BIRTH?

213

much the title of God's family, as any true saints there. This in Judaism was a necessary thing until the tutors and governors had done their work. With him it is the confusion of a soul not yet out of the darkness, and unable to use the light that is come in.

In point of fact the professing Christian church has ceased to be according to God's design for her at the beginning and turned back to the Judaism that had passed away. And Mr Sadler and those with him have seized upon this approximation to the Jewish pattern, and claim what is human corruption as of Divine right.

IS BAPTISM NEW BIRTH?

FOR Mr Sadler, of course, water baptism is that "rite or ordinance" by which men are now admitted into the Church of God. His doctrine as to it he shall himself state and we shall endeavour to give it as full consideration as may be needed. He brings forward twelve passages of Scripture, in which we have "things pertaining to salvation,—such as the New Birth, remission of sins, &c—connected with Baptism." His first text is Jno iii 35, the proper understanding of which, he says, "is essential to our taking a just view of the whole subject."

His first observation is a very just one, and I repeat it to commend it to the attention of those who hold the view he opposes.

"I shall first observe that our Lord here can allude to *one* thing, and *one* thing only. In the third verse He speaks of a birth, 'Except a man be born again,' and in the fifth He explains what He means by describing it as a 'birth of water and of the Spirit.' If He speaks of one thing, occurring at one point of time in the third verse, he must speak of one thing, occurring at one point of time in the fifth, for a birth cannot be divided. It can be but one thing taking place at one time. A man cannot be born partly at one time and partly at another. The consideration of this at once disposes of all interpretations which would involve a double birth, that is, a ceremonial birth of water in baptism, and a moral or spiritual birth of the Spirit, when a nominal Christian becomes a spiritual one."

This is true, and should bring conviction of its truth to all who interpret so as to dis sever the new birth of water from that of the Spirit. It is plainly but *one* birth which the *two* elements 'water' and 'Spirit' combine to produce.

Against a moral or spiritual change merely being intended, he objects that if so, "it is strange He should have expressed so simple a matter by such a periphrasis as being 'born of water and of the Spirit,' when He could have made His meaning so perfectly plain by saying, 'Except ye be good—except ye

repent—except ye be cleansed from sin—except ye be renewed in your affections and desires—except ye be holy—ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”

For the same reason he excludes as impossible the Lord's meaning to express by such words the need of “conviction of sin,” or of “believing on Him,” “relying upon His merits,” and kindred things to these.

“If being ‘born again’ be synonymous with any such change as ‘conversion,’ or ‘repentance,’ or ‘a new heart,’ then our Lord's second answer, *i.e.*, His explanation, is more difficult than the matter of which it is the explanation; and the difficulty of course arises from the fact of his having associated in his second answer ‘water’ with ‘the Holy Spirit’ as concurring to produce in a man such a change as Regeneration—if, that is, Regeneration be what it is popularly but wrongly supposed to be.”

He finds it therefore impossible to escape the conclusion that there must be some deep mystery ‘connected with the application of the element of water.’ It must be “literal water, too, for no reason can be assigned why our Lord should double the difficulty to a sincere enquirer by explaining the single metaphor, being ‘born again,’ by a double metaphor, being ‘born of water and of the Spirit.’ “The water here alluded to can be,” he adds, “no other than that used in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism,” on account of the other places in which ‘salvation,’ ‘remission of sins,’ and a mystical ‘burial with Christ,’ are connected with it in Scripture.

Baptism “must be also an entrance into a state, and that state the Kingdom of God, or present Church of God. Now the things that are said of the Church, as the mystical body of Christ, are so great and mysterious, that a supernatural birth, as an entrance into it, seems required by the nature of things.”

This is Mr. Sadler's argument, almost in his very words. We may now look at the text on which he comments, and see how far it sustains the interpretation he would give.

And here, in the very first place, one thing strikes us, which seems to forbid such an interpretation altogether :—“Art thou a master of Israel,” asks the Lord of Nicodemus, “and **KNOWEST NOT *these things*?**” Yet, says Mr. Sadler, very truly from his point of view, “It is *clear* that this birth of water and of the Spirit was a *mystery* UNKNOWN to the Fathers of the Old Covenant, as we find no allusion to it in the books of the Old Testament”! Whence then the surprise that a “master,” or teacher “of Israel” should find difficulty, as such? The Lord's words imply that his knowledge of Old Testament Scripture should have enabled him to understand at once. Is it possible that he

could do so, if it were the announcement of a new mystery unknown before?

Some—not Mr. Sadler—have referred to John's baptism as what should have made all plain to Nicodemus. But the Lord says nothing explicitly of baptism, and there was nothing in John's to imply such a thing as the "sanctification of water" to the imparting of new life. It is true the Baptist had also spoken of the Lord as to baptize with the Holy Ghost, but that was in *contrast* with his own baptism of *water* (Matth. iii. 11; Jno. i. 33). There is not one word that we have of his which would imply that there was to be a baptism of water in connection with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Nor *were* they connected, as we have already seen; for certainly those who, our Lord says, should "be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts i. 5) had no accompanying baptism of water. Cornelius again was baptized with the Holy Ghost *before* he was baptized with water; those at Samaria, on the other hand, quite as distinctly *afterwards*. The confounding or uniting the two is against all Scripture.

See then the enormous difficulty in Nicodemus' way. He must have understood John the Baptist to intimate the Lord's baptizing with water, when *he* never said so. He must have linked the baptism of the Spirit with that of water, with which John had *contrasted* it, and with which in point of fact it was not to be united. And finally, he must have understood baptism as a "birth," without a word or a hint from any one! Surely the difficulties in this way are absolutely insurmountable when we think of the question, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?

Some have maintained that the priests and Levites even, apart from John's statements, expected Christ to baptize (Jno. i. 25). But this is a very evident mistake. They thought such an one as He *might* do it, that is all; for they say as much of Elias, and of "that prophet," whom in their ignorance they did not know to be the same as Christ.

Everything therefore is against Nicodemus understanding this new birth of water and the Spirit to mean baptism. The Lord does not speak of it as such; and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, with which this would unite the baptism of water, is a wholly separate thing.

But the difficulties in Nicodemus' way of understanding this of baptism are not yet ended: quite as serious ones remain behind. How should a "master of Israel" have understood a new mode of entrance into a new "kingdom of God" which Mr. Sadler tells us is "the *present* Church of God"? According to him

the *Jewish* Church was already the kingdom of God, and Nicodemus was in it. The *Christian* Church had never yet been spoken of. Mr. Sadler puts mystery upon mystery in Nicodemus' way in order to make things plain to him ; and thinks a Jewish teacher ought to have understood the new way by which he was to get into a new kingdom, himself being already in the only kingdom of God he had ever heard of, and it not even being told him that it *was* new, nor anything but what he ought to understand at once! Truly Mr. Sadler makes it strangely simple.

Many would perhaps object, however, to Mr. S.'s way of interpreting the kingdom of God here, and still hold to his general conclusion. In this case the kingdom of God can mean nothing else than the great *final* kingdom, which it is plain they thought "should immediately appear" (Luke xix. 11). And this commends itself at once, as being really the kingdom Nicodemus must have thought of as the one to come. In this case, however, it is plain that exclusion from this kingdom would involve the loss of future blessedness altogether. Many, it is known, if not Mr. Sadler, accept this result for their baptismal theory, and cannot believe in a little babe going to heaven except it have been regenerated by baptism. We, on the other hand, accept this as the result, but press it as subversive entirely of the application to baptism. Again, what an enormous conclusion for a Jewish teacher to be expected to reach, that some unnamed, unknown application of water was henceforth to be a necessity in order to everlasting blessing! Surely if such were to be the fact, if such *be* the fact, so tremendous a conclusion should be in mercy to men's souls made as plain as possible. No ambiguous sentence would be left us from which to draw an inference such as that! Why not say so much as, Except a man be *baptized* with water and the Spirit? Baptism with water is not so much as mentioned in this connection here or elsewhere. What escape then from the conclusion that neither is it meant?

Especially as we have seen that this is one birth which two elements concur to produce. So that if it be here "baptized" with water, with this the baptism of the Spirit must be joined. Yet it was not so joined, as we have seen. Water-baptism cannot be then intended.

Let us go on then to see what the Lord's words must mean, to be consistent with themselves and with other Scripture. And here it is natural to ask, and strange that Mr. Sadler should never think of asking, Are there no other passages which speak of new birth, and will help us to understand the expression here?

At once the passages in the epistles of Peter and John come to our mind. The latter assures us of the truth of a real spirit-

ual change taking place in new birth; "every one that *doeth righteousness* is born of Him;" "whosoever is born of God doth not *commit sin*, for *his seed remaineth* in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God;" "whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even your *faith*;" "whosoever is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not," (1 John ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 4, 18).

Thus, then, he that is born again is one who has a true, and overcoming *faith*, working by *love*, and leading to the avoidance of sin and the practice of righteousness; this seed, when in a man, "remaineth" in him, and the devil cannot touch him.

One has no difficulty in seeing that such a change as this must indeed have taken place in man for him to enter into the kingdom of God. We have no difficulty either in seeing that if *this* be to be born again, baptism does in no wise secure it. Yet here, if new birth be *one*, as Mr. Sadler's helpful words have taught us, the water and the Spirit must have concurred to produce it. Mr. Sadler objects that "regeneration," by which he means "new birth," cannot have the "popular meaning" of "conversion." What else would he consider to be intended by these expressions of the Apostle John?*

* At p. 108 of Mr. S.'s book, he remarks upon St. John's "ideal of the regenerate state as perfect freedom from sin." Which he explains by a passage from Augustine, upon which he comments thus: "In these words St. Augustine recognizes that there are two births, or rather two 'men,' in the Christian. To the one—the old—sin is natural: to the other—the new—sin is impossible. So far as we abide in the new we sin not. If we could perfectly abide in Him we should never sin. Whenever we sin we fall from Him. . . . If a man is 'in sin' he is 'out of Christ' till restored. . . . It must be remembered that a sinful man, though baptized, is *not* regenerate, if, that is, you look at his present state. But why? Because that which he *once* had does not remain in him, or he does not abide in that into which he has once been engrafted."

No wonder Mr. S. finds the passage a difficulty. But it is only a sample of the hopeless self-contradiction in which his system involves him. Of how great value is then this baptismal regeneration, which, the moment a man sins—and "in many things we offend, all" is lost? And, then, being lost, what can *again* regenerate us? In this way, if a man sins once a month, he must anew be born again every month, and his baptism, after the first sin, has lost its efficacy! But again, Mr. S.'s doctrine is, that if a man sins he ceases to be born again,—the apostle's, that "he *cannot* sin, BECAUSE HE IS born again." Mr. S. says, if he sins, his seed does not remain,—the apostle, that "he doth not commit sin because his seed *does* remain." The apostle does not however by this assert the *absolute* or 'perfect' freedom from sin of one so born, but that righteousness, not sin, *characterizes* him in that condition. His *seed*—his new nature,—being absolutely opposed to sin, and *remaining*,—prevents his ever returning fully to his old state of sin.

Then, if we turn to the epistle of Peter, we shall find not merely what new birth is, but what is as much our purpose here, *how it is produced*. "Being born again," he says, "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth for ever." (1 Pet. i. 23.) I am aware that Mr. Sadler, or at least his co-religionists, would say, that is the baptismal formula, the consecrating "word" by which the water is "sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin." The apostle, however, excludes all possibility of such an application of his statement, for he adds, "And *this* is the word, which by the GOSPEL is preached unto you." Thus it is by the word of the gospel we are born again*; nor is this the only passage which asserts this. The Lord's words, for instance, Jno. v. 24, 25, are just as clear, though the precise word is not used: "He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life." This reception of new life, eternal life, by a man morally dead, is his new birth, manifestly—for what is new birth if not the beginning of new life? And Mr. Sadler himself, I suppose, would own it. This, then, is new birth by the Word, not baptism.

We have certainly the truth demonstrated, that if new birth is *one*, as Mr. Sadler himself truly asserts, and as that *one* new birth is manifestly by the Word, therefore the being "born of water and the Spirit" must be also by the Word. Clearly it is not by the Word *without* the Spirit, but the Word in co-operation *with* the Spirit, also, by which it is produced. See for instance the apostle's thankfulness for the Thessalonian converts, because (as he says) "our gospel came not unto you *in word only*, but also in power, and *in the Holy Ghost*" (1 Thes. i. 5). Here then, by the word and Spirit of God, were the Thessalonians converted. So that the apostle says in fact, by the *Word* and Spirit men are born again,—the Lord's words to Nicodemus say, by *water* and the Spirit. Can we explain the difference? Or is perhaps, (as it would seem *must* be the case) the "water" but the synonym and emblem of the word of God!

Here again, then, we turn to Scripture with this new enquiry.

* Some of very different views to Mr. Sadler, but who still consider baptism to be "new birth", though administering it only upon profession of faith,—contend for a distinction between "quickenings," which they allow to be by the word, and "birth," which they ascribe to baptism. The Scripture however here asserts "birth," not quickening merely, to be by the gospel, and never attributes either to baptism. It is the same expression (saving only the "again") as when Jesus is said to have been "born" in Bethlehem of Judea, which must certainly have been actual birth, as well as in many similar cases. The distinction in fact does not exist.

And the first point which naturally would strike us is, that the Lord, in this very gospel of John, uses figuratively and significantly this term "water." The "living water" that flows out of the believer in the seventh chapter, is interpreted for us there to be the Spirit itself: "this spake He of the *Spirit*." The "living water," springing up in the believer, in the third chapter, must needs be the same thing. "*Living water*" then is the emblem of the Spirit. But it is manifest that, as the Spirit is expressly mentioned in the words to Nicodemus, the "water" there cannot be the Spirit again; for the Lord could not say, "born of the Spirit and the Spirit." Moreover the Spirit is *living water*, this is "water." There is a plain connection, yet a difference. Take then some other texts: "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the *word*." (Eph. v. 26).^{*} Cleansing and refreshment are thus the two thoughts naturally connected with "water," and these two things are constantly associated with it in Scripture, as they are manifestly with the word of God itself. Thus the man whose delight is *in the law of the Lord* is like a tree planted by the rivers of water. (Ps. i.) Thus "the words of a man's mouth are as deep waters, and the well spring of wisdom as a flowing brook" (Prov. xviii. 4). Thus too the comparison in Amos (viii. 11—13), "not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord . . . they shall run to and fro to seek the *word of the Lord* and shall not find it; in that day shall the fair virgins and young men faint for *thirst*." Again, "my doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass" (Deut. xxxii. 2).

In these Old Testament passages it is the quickening, refreshing power of the word that is spoken of. In how many passages is there the other thought, of its cleansing and purifying energy! "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to Thy word" (Ps. cxix. 9). "By the word of Thy lips have I kept me from the path of the destroyer" (Ps. xvii. 4). "Now are ye clean through the word which I have spoken unto you" (Jno. xv. 3). "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy word is truth" (xvii. 17).

Thus water-washing for the soul is ascribed to the word of

^{*}This text is claimed too for baptism by Mr. Sadler's party, and I hope fully to consider it in its place. Here it may be allowed to pass for the moment as one among other texts of similar kind, and whose obvious resemblance to each other must go far to prove their identity of meaning.

God, as well as the refreshing, vivifying power of water also. Water is therefore a figure used for the word of God, and this enables us to see the beautiful distinction in Scripture between "water," and "*living* water." The latter is the type of the Spirit of God, as we have seen. But how does the Spirit of God refresh and invigorate the soul? Plainly it is as the "Spirit of *truth*" He does so, taking of the things of Christ and shewing them to us. It is the word through which the Spirit acts: thus the Spirit of God in man is *living* water; while, in the Lord's answer to Nicodemus, in order to shew separately the two elements that combine to produce new birth, the Spirit is named separately, and it is not "*living* water" that is the term used, but simply "water."

With this interpretation then, all is intelligible, consistent with the style and with the truth of Scripture. It remains only to consider how a "master of Israel" could be expected to understand this mode of speech. Here the common inference is no doubt the correct one. A Jewish teacher should certainly have known what was needed for Israel in order for them to enter the kingdom prophesied of in their oft-read prophets. And the full length statement is to be found in Ezek. xxxvi. No doubt the exact phraseology is not used, nor is the full thought of new *birth* to be found even once in the Old Testament. Perhaps the passage in question approaches the nearest of any to it, near enough for one who apprehended his own condition and that of the nation in general, to realize the force of the Lord's words. A mere quotation of the prophecy would have been no real test of the intelligence of the Jewish teacher. The new birth of water and the Spirit should have recalled to him that sprinkling of "clean water" upon them that they might be clean, in connection with the gift of a new heart and a new spirit, the taking away the heart of stone out of their flesh and giving them a heart of flesh. Such a mighty change must the nation yet undergo in order to enter into the kingdom of God; and such a change must every child of man experience in order to an "entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

But to say, "Except a man be born again," was more and other than to say, as Mr. Sadler suggests, "Except ye be good" (!), or "holy," or even than "Except ye repent," or "believe," or "be converted." It was to reveal man's condition as *dead* in sin, hopeless save with God, and needing all to be begun anew in him, even life itself. It was to stop the mouth of self-righteous Phariseeism with the announcement of the folly and worse of going about to establish one's own righteousness instead of bowing in the sense of guilt and brokenness of heart to

MATERIALISTIC DENIAL OF SPIRIT. 221

the righteousness of God and to His grace. Nor does the Lord leave Nicodemus, as we are now prepared to see, until He has instructed him further as to how this new life comes—until He has told him of the Son of man lifted up as the brazen serpent in the wilderness, that whosoever of the dying race of men believed on Him might not perish, but have “ETERNAL LIFE.” This eternal life begins, as we have found, when faith itself begins.

We shall hope to take up Mr. Sadler’s other baptismal texts in a future paper. In the meantime we may be fully assured that Baptism, whatever else it be, is *not* the new birth of water and the Spirit that his view would make it.

**THE MATERIALISTIC DENIAL OF THE
SPIRIT OF GOD.**

MR. ROBERTS next comes to the definition of “spirit.” He contends against the derivation of the secondary meaning of *ruach* or *pneuma* (the Hebrew and Greek words for it) from the primary meaning “breath” or “wind,” by reason of these being taken as “types of viewless activity.” He characterizes this statement as substituting opinion for facts, dogmatism for demonstration. But in doing this it is he himself who overlooks the facts.

He tells us :—“A substantive derived from a verb draws its meaning from the act expressed by the verb. *Ruach* is *ruach*, because it is the thing *ruached*, so to speak, and not because the act of ruaching is invisible.” Of course : but that is not at all the question. The question is not about the primary meaning of the word at all, but about the secondary. Mr. R. ignores a distinction which is nevertheless as simple as possible. *Breath* is the thing *breathed*, no doubt; but when I speak of a “breath of air,” I do not speak of anything breathed, nevertheless. But I use breath in a secondary sense, applying it to something which in some way it resembles. A large number of the words of any language have these secondary meanings, which do not depend upon etymology at all, but are a necessity resulting from the expansion of thought beyond its previous limits. How many words in the New Testament are thus adapted from what in heathenism had a very different sense, I need not surely point out to Mr. Roberts. The new revelation needed new modes of expression ; and it found these, not generally in the invention of new words, but by the adaptation of older ones, used till then

with a different meaning. This is so certain, and so acknowledged a principle in all languages, that it is strange to find Mr. Roberts ignoring it, as he does, by telling us that *ruach* must be the "thing *ruached*," and can be nothing else!

Once admit, as he does, that there are secondary meanings, and then it is plain that the secondary meaning need have nothing to do with the primary derivation of the word at all. Breath, as I have said, may be, primarily, a "thing breathed" forth; but when I say, "not a breath stirred the leaves," I do *not* speak of anything breathed at all, but I compare the air in motion to what *is* breathed, although not really so.

Then comes in John iii. 8 to show us what is the real ground of comparison between the primary and secondary meanings of *pneuma* (the equivalent of the Hebrew *ruach*). "The *wind* (*pneuma*) bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the, *Spirit* (*pneuma*)."
Mr. Roberts deems it wiser apparently to say nothing of this, although appealed to in the book he is reviewing. But surely the Lord does there shew us how the material may be compared with the spiritual *pneuma*. It is by reason of their being alike invisible agencies inscrutable by man, but manifest in power where they are acting. Is not this from the Lord's lips a much better suggestion of how the secondary meaning of *ruach* came about, than Mr. R.'s that "the power which gives life was in the first instance spirited, *breathed forth* from the Eternal Source of life and light"? This is indeed a mere "opinion, having no deeper foundation than the ingenuity of those who have given birth to the speculation."

To this moreover we answer by bringing forward the passage which Mr. R. rightly foresees would be against him—"God is Spirit." Who then "breathed forth" this? Was the nature of God an emanation from something else? Mr. Roberts anticipates this objection, and tries to provide for it by telling us that 'spirit' "comes by association with subsequent manifestation to stand in its New Testament use as the synonym of the divine nature—but this by association merely, and *not* by philological derivation." But how then is he so sure that there is 'philological derivation' in the former case? This is evidently a second conjecture, to uphold the previous one, and how baseless is not hard to shew. For with so called Christadelphianism the theory (as is well known) is, that while "spirit" is a thing "spirited forth" from God, *out of* this spirit all things were made. How strange to take thus what is the *raw material* of all creation, so to speak, and to identify that with God's very nature! If this

MATERIALISTIC DENIAL OF SPIRIT. 223

be Mr. R.'s "association with subsequent manifestation," it is one which will be repudiated by the simplest soul that is taught of God.

I may quote then, and leave, untouched as it is by Mr. Roberts' attack upon it, the statement of the book he is reviewing; that, referring to Jno. iii. 8: "here manifestly the thought is of invisible activity beyond control; the effects are manifest, the power which produces them unseen and uncontrollable. In the formation of language, where that which can be conceived of only, gets its name from that which is recognized by the senses, what more simple than that "wind" should give its name to the power that, omnipresent in its activity, acts unseen and uncontrolled. Hence 'God is spirit,' and the third Person of the Trinity, whom Scripture represents as the immediate mover, both in creation and in new creation, is pre-eminently 'the *Spirit* of God.'"

I turn now to Mr. Roberts' attack upon the personality of the Spirit of God:—

"Mr. Grant thinks that the last words of the text (1 Cor. ii. 11) affirm the personal separation of the Spirit of God from God as a knowing agent. We submit that the actual phraseology and the context alike exclude such a construction of the words. There is a parallel: 1. Man and the spirit of man; and, 2, God and the Spirit of God. Now, does Mr. Grant mean to contend that the spirit of man is one person knowing the things of man another person? Surely not. Yet this is what his view would require if he is right in maintaining that the Spirit of God is one person, knowing the things of God another person."

The answer is very simple, that Mr. Grant's view requires nothing of the sort. "The things of man" are just *human things*, as the "things of God" are *divine things*: it is not a question of "another person" there at all. But if the Spirit of God KNOWS Divine things, then he is *conscious* and *intelligent*, just as also is the "spirit of man" in human things.

But I know not what argues personality more than consciousness and intelligence. Does Mr. Roberts? Of course this infers the personality of the spirit of man, and this is obnoxious to him; but it is really the truth nevertheless that the passage before us plainly intimates that the essence of personality in man is in his spirit. "What *man* knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man, which is in him?" This is a very important point, which will come up again in its place, but which Mr. Roberts will do well to think over. Personal identity is thus plainly much more due to the spirit than the body; indeed this latter is continually undergoing changes, as is well known; and the proof of resurrection for the body itself which our Lord gives (Luke xx.

37, 38) is that, though the body be dead, the *man* lives. "The man" is thus (as what makes him in the highest sense what he is) "the spirit of man which is in him."

There are not then the two things here—"1, man and the spirit of man; 2, God and the Spirit of God," but the intelligence of the Spirit of God in Divine things asserted, and compared to the intelligence of man's spirit in human things. Now where intelligence is, personality is; and Mr. Roberts will hardly venture to dispute it.

His second objection is that "by making the Spirit a person, the Father is displaced from his position as a revealer *by* the Spirit," according to ver. 10. But in what way He is so, I am not aware. I believe fully that the blessed Spirit of God, co-equal with the Father and the Son, has been pleased to take the place of One sent *by* the Father and the Son, and that in this way the words are true: "He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak" (Jno. xvi. 13). So that it is suggested, He *might* speak of Himself, although He does not. And it is plainly said, that He *does* hear and speak. If this again be not a person, I know not what could prove personality.

His third objection, as I understand it, is that, in the passage in question, the apostle is speaking simply of "inspired knowledge," i. e., the knowing was after all the apostle's knowledge, by the Spirit indeed, but not the Spirit's own. This is similar to what he says of the 10th verse: "the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God,"—

"This describes the *apostolic experience* of the Spirit. It was with them. It was the 'overshadowing of the power of the Highest,' and 'the Holy Spirit' which are one and the same thing (Lu. i. 35). It was not separate from the Father. It was the Spirit of the Father, as Jesus had foretold (Matth. x. 20), yet 10 THEIR SENSATIONS, as we may say, it was, separately from themselves an Enlightener, a Penetrator, a Comforter, a Witness, and therefore described in language that *reads* as if these functions were personally separate from the Father. To call the Spirit of the Father a person is to put forward an unscriptural form of speech without simplifying a matter sufficiently beyond us on its own mighty merits, and to confound what is revealed concerning the personal unity of God."

So then the language *does* read as if what Mr. Roberts calls "these functions" were "personally separate from the Father"! Why did he not admit this at first, instead of contending against it? The truth after all is too strong for the theory. But then this must be made to be merely according to human 'sensations.' It had to be described as if the Spirit of God was "separately from themselves an Enlightener," &c. Now, *was* that the human sensation? Did what they knew by the Spirit seem to their

MATERIALISTIC DENIAL OF SPIRIT. 225

sensations separate from themselves, and so much so that there was no way of describing it but by such misleading words? Why could it not be otherwise described? Mr. Roberts himself can and does describe it differently. Why could not the apostles? And why, above all, must this spiritual influence be personified as distinct not only from their own minds, but also from the Father? Why should not the Father be the Enlightener &c.?

It is false then to say that the language used was according to their sensations, still more untrue that it was necessitated by them. On the contrary, on Mr. Roberts' hypothesis it is merely and most unnecessarily misleading. The words *do* read as if the Spirit were a person, our adversaries themselves being judges, and they speak not merely of inspired knowledge, but of the *competency of the Spirit* to reveal. And then is further added (ver. 12), "Now we have received the Spirit"—this Spirit so competent in knowledge—"that we might know." The doctrine is thus complete that apostolic knowledge was the result of the reception of One who had it in His own power to impart such knowledge.

But the real trouble with the language here Mr. Roberts shews in the concluding sentence, "To call the Spirit of the Father a person is to put forward an unscriptural form of speech . . . and to confound what is revealed concerning the *personal unity* of God." It is Mr. R.'s doctrine of the personal unity of God which is in the way. But I venture to say he cannot produce one Scripture for this "personal" unity. It is he himself who is here putting forth not merely an unscriptural, but an anti-scriptural form of speech. That God is one, is true and scriptural. That this one God is also a true and personal God, Scripture declares. But that this one and personal God is *but one Person*, Scripture refuses, (not reveals) and that from Genesis to Revelation.

It refuses it in the very first chapter of Genesis where a plural noun, as is well known, is taken to express the Godhead (Elohim), this plural noun being joined with a verb in the singular, to express the Unity of this Plurality in the Divine Essence: not three Gods but three Persons in One God.

It refuses it, where this One God is represented taking counsel with Himself, saying, "Let *us* make man in *our* image after *our* likeness," and so God made man in His own image.

It refuses it, where in John xii. 41 the apostle tells us that the glory of the Lord which Isaiah saw in the temple (ch. vi), centuries before the incarnation, was the glory of *Christ*.

But why quote testimony which is the one consistent testimony of the Word all through? Let Mr. Roberts produce, if

he can, this revelation of the Personal Unity of God, from the Word of God. He is Personal, of course, and One : that Scripture says, and we believe. That He is one only Person, that Scripture, and therefore we, deny.

Mr. Roberts next attempts to uphold his theory of the Spirit of God being the same as the breath of life, and thus "common to every living thing."

He allows that the "Spirit of God in the nostrils" in Job xxvii. 3 may be translated "breath" according to the very common meaning of the word, and may refer to Genesis ii. 7. And yet he thinks this "looks as much like a manoeuvre as possible," and spends a page to prove what no one will deny, that the "*ruach Eloah*" of Job, and the "*nishmath chayim*" of Genesis are "doctrinally identical." How is it he does not see that that is the very thing which Mr. Grant, as he thinks so dogmatically, asserts? The real question lies somewhat deeper. It is this. Is the breath of God in the nostrils, which Job speaks of, the same as that Spirit of God, who, to quote the same book, made man (xxxiii. 4)? The argument for this, if it can be called so, is that *ruach* is the word for breath, and also the word for Spirit, as we have seen, and therefore spirit and breath must be identical! Upon the same principle we may be sure from John iii. 8, that, inasmuch as it is the same word, *pneuma*, which is used for 'wind' and 'spirit,' to be born of the Spirit is simply to be born of the wind! *That* argument I need hardly deal with. He goes on,—

"But Mr. Grant is mistaken if he supposes that this verse in Job is the only support to the doctrine that the Spirit of God is the means of universal life. The statements quoted four or five sentences back, (Ps. xxxvi. 9; Acts xvii. 25; Job xii. 10) indirectly, (and not very indirectly) show the same thing. In addition we have to consider such passages as these: 'Whither shall I go from THY Spirit? Whither shall I flee from THY presence?' (Ps. cxxxix. 7. What conclusion can we come to from this, but that the universal presence of God, who personally dwells in heaven (Ps. cxxiii. 1; Eccles. v. 2; Mt. vi. 9; 1 Kin. viii. 30), is the universal Spirit, invisible power or energy breathed or radiated from the Father, and therefore called spirit, or that which is breathed? Again, 'the Spirit of God (*ruach El*) hath made me: the breath of the Almighty (*nishmath Shaddai*) hath given me life' (Job xxxiii. 4). Again, 'Thou sendest forth THY SPIRIT: they (the living creatures) are created' (Ps. civ. 30). Hence 'in Him (by the Spirit) we live and move and have our being' (Acts xvii. 28). Hence 'if He gather unto Himself His SPIRIT (*ruach*), and His breath (*nishmath*) ALL FLESH shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust' (Job xxxiv. 14)."

Here then we have the strength of Mr. Roberts' doctrine. It is very plain it is his, and that he goes to Scripture, as so many do, just to find "support" to it. What an amazing inference

MATERIALISTIC DENIAL OF SPIRIT. 227

that, if a man cannot go from the Spirit, nor flee from the presence of God, that therefore 'Spirit' and 'presence' must be just the same thing! and moreover that this must be an 'irradiated power or energy breathed from the Father'! By the same process of reasoning, what may we not make of Scripture? The trouble is that Mr. R. is so absolute a materialist that with Him even God Himself must be material, and there must be a *material* presence or none! The reasoning may be infallible from his point of view, just as much as the 'conclusion' of a blind man that there is no light from his own seeing none. To others it will appear as if Mr. Roberts had better give us the grounds of such a conclusion, rather than assume it simply. His other texts are similarly pressed into a service for which they seem quite unsuited. For we all believe that the Spirit of God has made us, and the breath of the Almighty given us life. Does that prove the identity of these two? and if so, how?

Again, in what way does God *send forth* His Spirit when He creates, according to Mr. Roberts? To us it looks very like the doctrine of a living, personal agent, in which we believe.

So again, he puts 'by the Spirit' into Acts xvii. 28, where it is not found, nor anything like it, to persuade us that we can "live and move and have our being in" God noway save materially!

Then in the last passage Mr. Roberts finds the advantage of a capital letter where it can be inserted with a wise regard to the interests of his theory. For who would not of course take, "If He gather unto Himself *His* SPIRIT and *His* breath," as being *God's* Spirit and *God's* breath? whereas if written, "If he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath," especially if preceded by *what Mr. R. leaves out*, "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath," it would certainly be believed to be *man's* spirit and *man's* breath. And this is indeed the truth. But then the materialistic argument disappears: added to which "all flesh" is "all mankind," just as in Matth. xxiv. 22; Gen. vi. 12; Ps. lxxv. 2; Isa. lxvi. 23, &c., and not "all living creatures" as Mr. R. would evidently understand.

This is then the total result of the appeal to Scripture as to this so weighty a point to be established, as that the Spirit of God is an emanation of something sometimes spoken of as a material substance, sometimes more vaguely and somewhat contradictorily, as power or energy breathed forth from God, and which is the basis of life in all living creatures. Where, let us ask, is the doctrine of such an emanation in these Scriptures? Certainly in none of them. Where is it said, that the Spirit of God is the basis of life in all creatures? In not one of them.

With Mr. Roberts the Spirit of God is the material of creation ; in Scripture the Creator, as indeed he owns ; thoughts which are contradictory of each other, as long as Creator and creature are distinct in more than the idea.

Mr. R. goes further. He admits that this (impersonal!) "Spirit was a teacher, more particularly in the apostolic era, when it was bestowed on all who believed the word, enabling them to work miracles, speak with tongues, understand mysteries, according as the Spirit WILLED"! How strange an impersonality is this: creating, teaching, willing, searching, hearing, knowing, and yet not a person! Of course this language must be a mere and strangely imperfect human speech! Scripture only seems to say this: but, although it says nothing else, we must believe it to *mean* something, that it never even seems to say!

"This teaching of the Spirit came to be in contrast with the teaching of the natural mind, and was called by the name of the Spirit, on the principle of metonymy. Thus Jesus saith: 'The words that I speak unto you, they are SPIRIT, and they are life' (John vi. 63). Again, John the apostle: 'The Spirit is THE TRUTH' (1 John v. 6). In this sense those who received the truth received the Spirit."

Is it '*the truth*,' then, that "itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered," and it is the "mind of the *truth*" that the heart-searching God knows, when *it* makes intercession for the saints"? Surely it is in vain to follow further the phantasmagoria of a diseased imagination. I had not followed so far, only in the hope and trust that even in these depths of delusion might be found some who in the infinite pity of God might yet find an ear to hear; and that peradventure some who, ignorant of its true character, may have been listening to its more plausible sophistries, might profit by the mere bringing into daylight of what are (so-called) 'Christadelphian' teachings—teachings which not a few are listening to, folly as they may be, and worse! In spiritual things nothing is so grossly foolish, that professing "wise" men will not fall into.

"HE MAKETH HIS ANGELS SPIRITS."

IN the book Mr. Roberts is reviewing, there is a sentence or so as to the spirituality of the angels, the argument as to which is stated thus :—

"There are spirits, whose existence as separate personalities cannot be denied. And if this be so there is no reason, at least, beforehand, why man's spirit should not be also an individuality, a real and living entity, though in him united to a body which is of the dust."

Mr. Roberts admits that angels are spirits, and then asks, "But how is Mr. Grant's argument assisted by this admission? Not at all. For what are the angels? Are they 'viewless activities?' Are they immaterial, impalpable, invisible entities, such as Mr. Grant tries to prove the human spirit to be?" He then answers the question as to their invisibility by citing various cases in which angels were *seen*. He goes on to say, "As to their nature, the evidence is equally definite. They are *corporeal*," and gives as proof Jacob's wrestling, and the visits to Abraham and Lot. He adds :—

"In all these cases, they were mistaken for men, which shews their form to be human; or rather (as it ought truly to be expressed) that the human form is angelic, as saith David and Paul (Ps. viii 5; Heb. ii. 7). 'Man is made a little lower than the angels:' lower as to nature, but in their image as to form (Gen. i. 26); and is destined, in the purpose of God, to become *equal to them* (Luke xx. 36): dying no more, and neither marrying nor giving in marriage. This equality is to be attained *at the resurrection*, as is evident at once from the words: 'They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, shall . . . be equal unto the angels;' and this is brought about by a *change of bodily nature*, as we read, 'He shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned LIKE UNTO HIS OWN GLORIOUS BODY' (Phil. iii. 21). . . . When this takes place, the subjects of the change will have attained to the divine nature, which is styled 'spirit' for the reason formerly mentioned. Thus it is said of the body of such: 'It is sown a natural body, it is raised a '*spiritual body*.' . . . Now when a mortal body is quickened by the Spirit, it becomes assimilated in nature to the quickening power, and is spirit, as in the case of Jesus, who is styled 'The Lord the Spirit,' and as declared by Himself, 'that which is born of the Spirit *is spirit*' (John iii. 6). So that not only the angels, but the saints made like them and equal to them at the resurrection, will be 'spirits' in the generic sense."

He then paraphrases Mr. Grant's argument as follows :—
"There are visible, glorious, incorruptible corporeal beings, styled angels, who are also generically described as 'spirits,' whose existence as separate personalities cannot be denied. And if this be so, there is no reason why man's spirit, which is invisible, inglorious, decaying, and incorporeal, should not also be an individuality, &c. The logic of this is behind that which

would contend, that because God as a Spirit is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient, man as a spirit is endowed with similar attributes." And he holds also that what applies to man as a spirit must hold good of the brutes, for there is, also the "spirit of a beast" (Eccles. iii. 21).

Let us examine Mr. Roberts' argument first, before we take up the doctrinal statements to which he has committed himself.

He allows that angels are "spirits": he could not well do otherwise, for the statements of Scripture are too direct and positive to be evaded. He adduces as opposed to the argument from this the difference between the human and the angelic spirit. We will look at all he says directly, for "he that doeth truth cometh to the light," and we are thoroughly willing to have Scripture judge of all; but first, let me say, no amount of *difference* can affect an argument based upon what is allowed to be *common* to each. The angel is a "spirit," a separate individuality as such. That is admitted. It is the separate individuality of a "created "spirit," that is in question. Man has such a spirit, though with him it is not the whole of his being. With Mr. Roberts and such as side with him, man's spirit is no separate individuality. It is a portion of an universal principle—stated by himself and others to be *electricity*—a sort of atmosphere, and indeed contained *in* the atmosphere,—as they delight to quote, "the Spirit of God *in the nostrils*." Now, inasmuch as the part is not greater than the whole, the spirit thus can be no more than the air we breathe, of which it is a part. There is thus no individuality about the spirit of man: it is, as they put it, "*God's* spirit and God's breath," no more really an integral part of him than his breath, nay, clearly, only a part of his breath. It may be the instrument of life to him: it is not in the proper sense *himself*. On this account, and only on this, was the appeal made to the undeniable fact of angels being spirits, to show that there being evidently beings of spirit-nature entirely, there was so far much for, and nothing against, *man's* spirit-nature being an individuality. This is unaffected altogether by Mr. Roberts' argument, as I have said, for it is founded upon what is confessedly common to each, and cannot be touched by diversity *in other respects*.

As for as much being proved in this way for the beast as for man, on account of there being equally a "spirit of the beast," it is denied that there is such a doctrine in Scripture as that there is a spirit in the beast. But this we shall hope to look at presently.

Again, to say that it is the same as saying that "because God as a Spirit is omnipotent," &c., therefore "man as a spirit

"HE MAKETH HIS ANGELS SPIRITS." 231

is endowed with similar attributes," is only to expose the folly of him who says it. It is not because God is a Spirit that He is omnipotent; it is because He is God. Nor is it sought to prove that man must have the *attributes* of angels because he has their nature; but only that, *having* their nature there is *nothing against* (and I now add, but much for) the individuality of his spirit as of theirs. There is a class, in short, of created spirit-beings; and to that class, in one side of his nature, man belongs.

And now as to the diversities in question between men and angels: how will Mr. Roberts prove that man's spirit, in contrast with the angels, is "invisible," and "decaying"? Certainly he has not proved this from Scripture, and he should prove it rather than assert it merely. I will undertake to prove the exact opposite from Scripture. And—

I. As to *invisibility*. This means more of course than that it ordinarily is not seen. The angels—those "ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation"—are not *ordinarily* seen upon this their constant mission. Mr. Roberts can have no difficulty in recalling the fact that Balaam did not see the angel that his ass *did* see, till "the Lord opened his eyes." Similarly that Elisha's servant did not see the hosts around Elisha at Dothan, till "the Lord opened his eyes." The imperfection of human vision (which of course God can rectify as He pleases) may be thus the secret of our not seeing such sights continually, and no *inherent* invisibility of these blessed beings. And so exactly as to the human spirit. When the disciples mistook the risen Lord for a "spirit," He did not correct their thoughts by letting them understand that a "spirit" could not be seen; but on the contrary, assuming the truth of the spirit being visible, He *distinguishes* for them by bidding them handle Him and see, "*for a spirit* hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have.*"

* Mr. Roberts' criticism upon this belongs properly to another place. Having quoted the passage, however, I shall as a matter of fairness anticipate it here. Upon the authority of "some ancient MSS. of Luke" he would substitute "*phantasma*" for "*pneuma*" in ch. xxiv. 37, and then, *without* authority, make "*pneuma*" mean "*phantasma*" in the 39th verse. Having thus converted "spirit" into "phantasm," he makes the whole a question of "reality or a spectral illusion."

But Mr. R. can find no such meaning for "*pneuma*" in the New Testament, or in the Greek language anywhere, as "phantom" or "spectral illusion," and he must know he cannot. Hence his anxiety to import "*phantasma*" into the text in ver. 37, a reading unanimously rejected by every editor of the Greek that I am acquainted with, and disproved by the simple fact of its being unquestionably *pneuma* in the 39th: for, if their thought had been

The Pharisees in the council (Acts xxiii. 9) admitted similarly that "a spirit or an angel" might have spoken to Paul, and of course, have been seen by him; and Paul himself in that council avows himself a Pharisee *as to what distinguished them from the Sadducees*, of which this doctrine of the spirit is there stated to be a part. Similarly the spirit of Samuel appeared to the witch of Endor, not indeed at her bidding, but to her own confusion rather, but still appeared; for we have the express testimony of Scripture, which nothing can set aside, that it was Samuel himself who spoke to Saul. Yet as certainly he was not risen, but in the state of the dead still, as only in that way could he speak of Saul and his sons being "with him" on the morrow.* Moses on the mount of transfiguration is another witness to the same truth, that the spirit's invisibility is precisely that of the angel's, neither more nor less.

Then (2) as to its being "decaying," there is an utter absence from Scripture of the least hint of decay or death attaching to the spirit of man. So well known is this that the common escape of annihilationists is, that it is *not* mortal, only because not a living thing at all. Thus for instance speak the authors of the "Bible versus Tradition,"—"Eccles. xii., 7, says the *ruah* goes to God who gave it. Now if God intends to restore this *ruah* to the man so that he may live again, where does God bring this *ruah* from? We shall see that it is not the SAME RUAH, but *ruah* of the same kind, though perhaps less diluted with atmospheric air" (!). Then after quoting Ezek. xxxvii., they say, "Thus we see that the *ruah* in Eccles. xii. 7 went to the *four winds*, and at the resurrection comes again from the four winds. Thus we see that it is God's *ruah*, one universal principle pervading the atmosphere, *and not many distinct ruah*, as theologians teach, and is *not a living thing*, though the cause of life" (p. 89, 90). How this differs from Mr. Roberts'

that it was a mere *illusion* what they saw, the Lord would not have answered it by saying "a *spirit*" &c.

It was not then a question with them as to illusion or reality, but as to bodily or spiritual presence. I know that Mr. R. objects that the Lord says, "it is I *myself*," and that His spirit, according to the common belief, would have been *Himself*. But all depends upon the point of view. To those who had had Him as the living man amongst them, the mere visit of His departed spirit would *not* have been "Himself": for it is no question of metaphysical accuracy, but of *heart*, to which the Lord responds. They saw Him, did not believe Him risen, thought they saw a spirit, to which he answers by bidding them prove His having flesh and bones. Thus it was really what their hearts would call *Himself*.

* The full examination of this is reserved for another place.

"HE MAKETH HIS ANGELS SPIRITS." 233

own view it would be hard enough to say. But here, then, from the very nature of things, there is the very opposite idea from that of the spirit "decaying." It is not a real existence in the mortal man at all, and of course does not partake of his mortality. It is in short, Mr. R's "Spirit of God in the nostrils" very precisely.

How, upon his view of it, the spirit of man (which is for him the Spirit of God) is "inglorious," it is also hard to see. *Man* is certainly a poor fallen creature; but it would be too much to argue, that because an angel was a glorious spirit, therefore an inglorious spirit could not be!

The difference between the angels and the human spirit is not made out then at all to the extent that Mr. Roberts assumes. If he could prove the angels "corporeal" it would be more to his purpose, no doubt; but his citations will hardly sustain the argument. For example, Jacob wrestled with One who is represented as "a man," but as to whom he says afterward, "I have seen *God* face to face. Hos. xii. 4, 5 definitely proves that it was "Jehovah, God of hosts," come in that wonderful way to meet him. Doubtless he is also called "the Angel" in Hosea, being indeed that "Angel of Jehovah," who constantly identifies himself and is identified with the Jehovah whom He reveals. We with our Christian knowledge have no difficulty in finding here Him who before His incarnation was still the Word of God and God.

This is therefore no manifestation of the *angelic nature*, but the assumption of human form by the Lord of angels. And it is distinctly as "*man*" He appears. Whatever the wonder be then, and however little we may explain it, it certainly does not serve Mr. Roberts' argument.

The same thing may be said as to the appearances to Abraham and Lot. Three "men" stood by Abraham at his tent door. one of these is found in result to be Jehovah: the two others go on to Sodom and are there called "angels." But it has pleased the Lord that they should come as "men," and as men they speak and act all through. There may be mystery in this, doubtless. Our human knowledge very easily finds impassable limits; but certainly nothing can be gathered as to the real nature of angels, from cases in which we find they are *personating men*.

Thus vanishes at a first touch this corporeality of angels. Mr. Roberts' attempt to prove that man was made in the image of angels by a reference to Gen. i. 26, I shall leave until he has proved that the angels created man. Nor does being "*equal to them*" at the resurrection show very clearly that this is to be

brought about by a change of *our* bodies into such as he conceives to be *theirs*. That "spirit" and "spiritual *body*" are the same thing is another baseless opinion, without so much as a shadow of proof advanced, as it is also that *then* the "subjects of this change will have attained to the divine nature."

One would easily smile at all this being advanced as *argument* when we see in it the proof of how deep must be the delusion of those who cannot perceive that they have a lie in their right hand, one could rather weep

LETTERS TO AN INFIDEL

IV

"EYES OF FAITH"

To Mr B F Underwood—

SIR,—You are reported in your Aylmer speeches as saying, that you "believed the people who came there came with the determination to judge from the amount of evidence brought before them, and not with the determination to believe one way." Undoubtedly you meant that in praise of your hearers. For yourself it might not be without its gratification to suppose yourself thus able to settle men's belief for them, and that they had been waiting in suspense upon your coming to hear your "evidence." But, however satisfactory to you, it might be somewhat *unsatisfactory* to them. I have already shewn that Scripture proposes to all a much simpler and speedier test, accessible to the most ignorant as to the most scientific. Multitudes believe thus in the blessed Word of God with an assurance to which no facts or reasonings of scientific men can add one iota, nor from which they can take one tittle either. It is not, however, that they are "determined to believe," *ie*, in the face of evidence, but that they *do* believe, and that upon the most abundant "evidence" already.

You may, I know, call this credulity. And as long as any department of human knowledge has still to tell its tale, you may deem it premature to hold this question settled. But on your part you hold many a thing settled, as to which this is the case, and rightly. Were this not possible, hardly any knowledge would remain. Science would be a chaos of unproved theories. Surely then we may have proof to demonstration of the truth of the Bible, apart from the whole train of modern facts and reasonings.

But my object now is to show rather that your modern philosophers have a faith of their own, which it is perfectly and scientifically accurate to hold, although, strange to say, it is even confessedly unproved. Dr Tyndall, as we have seen, thus "holds"—"that the *nebulæ* and all subsequent life stand to each other in the relation of the germ to the finished organism," yet in holding this he does not know that it is so, it is only a protest against the "assumption of knowledge" implied in the "creative hypothesis." So, also, with yourself, you, sir, have "contended for ten years" that "we must either accept the [idea of] creation or change our idea of matter. The old idea, that matter is *just what it appears to be*, must be abandoned, and matter granted to be something more." Here is, indeed, something like "a determination to believe one way." Evolution is the only escape from the idea of creation, *therefore*, we are to believe in evolution.

Now it is somewhat serious that for a large number of so-called "facts" of science, we are indebted to possessors of a faith like this. Who shall assure us that the facts are not due to, or very materially affected by, the 'faith' of the observers? For instance, take the "flint implements" of the Somme, supposed to be the earliest traces yet discovered of the hand of man. M. Figuier allows as to these, that the flints "were so rough, and presented such very indistinct traces of chipping, and the angles were so blunted, that it was certainly necessary to see with the eyes of faith, in order to discern man's work," (*Primitive Man*, p. 9). "*I had* these eyes of faith," says M. B. de Perthes, the first collector of these implements. But faith in what, one may naturally ask? Why, that instead of man being a fallen creature, degraded below his original level, he is, on the contrary, a being rising from one far lower, some "anthropoid animal" rather than a man. Of course, therefore, his earliest traces would be ruder than any other, rude enough to be questioned if of man at all. Faith, then, of this sort, reasoning after its own fashion, easily solves the difficulty of origin, and finds remarkable confirmation of its own previous view!*

* It would be out of place here to discuss this, but Mr. Whitley, hon. secretary of the Royal Institute of Cornwall, and who has made extensive researches into the matter, believes them to be the effect of natural fracture from exposure to heat. At Spiennes he found them in a stratum six inches thick and two feet under the soil, and traced them for half a mile. Tons of them might be collected in a few hours. "The flints," he says, "bear no indications of design, nor any evidence of use" (*Popular Science Review*, January, 1869).

So Sir C. Lyell tells us of the "nearly equal amount of surprise" among naturalists at the Engis and Neanderthal skulls: at "that of Engis, because being so unequivocally *ancient*, it approaches so near to the *highest* or Caucasian type; at that of the Neanderthal, because, having *no* such decided claims to antiquity, it departs so widely from the normal standard of humanity" (*Antiquity of Man*, p. 94)! There, as it happened, the facts and the faith did *not* agree. The Neanderthal skull, declared by Mr. Huxley to be "the most *ape*-like skull he had ever beheld," ought of course to have been the most ancient: man's derivation from the ape might then have been considered established. Unfortunately it was not so; and the Engis skull, undoubtedly so very ancient, approaches near to the highest type! Well, so much the worse for the facts then!—this only proves "that the first traces of the primordial stock whence man has proceeded need no longer be sought, by those who entertain any form of the doctrine of progressive development, in the newest tertiaries; but that they may be looked for in an epoch more distant from the age of the *Elephas primigenius* (the mammoth) than that is from us" (*Ant. of Man*, 93). That is, this puts off the traces of man's original to an age where there is *no* trace found of anything at all like him! Thus Mr. Huxley; while as to the more modern but most ape-like Neanderthal skull, Sir C. Lyell quietly remarks: "If we conceive the cranium to be very ancient, it exemplifies a less advanced stage of progressive development and improvement. *If* it be a comparatively modern race, owing its peculiarities of form to degeneracy, it is an illustration of what botanists call 'atavism,' or the tendency of varieties to revert to an ancestral type, which type, in proportion to its antiquity, would be of lower grade" (p. 97)!

Thus easily are the facts provided for. Since that was written, other skeletons have come to light, as e g, three at Cro-magnon and one at Mentone; of which a geological authority of acknowledged eminence says: "If their antiquity be conceded, they really take away all *semblance of probability* from the doctrine of the origin of man by derivation," (*Nature and the Bible*, p. 174). But the doctrine goes on nevertheless; for there is no alternative between *derivation* and *creation*.

This "faith" of modern science is thus not by any means a lifeless or unpractical thing: it is, on the contrary, a thing most potent in the so seemingly unplastic domain of science. Its logic is no longer the sceptical one, "seeing is believing," but rather it is, "believing is seeing." Thus if "side by side with the remains of Arctic animals" have been found, in certain

strata, "others indicating a warm climate, such, for instance, as the hippopotamus," Sir John Lubbock finds no difficulty in interposing 10,000 years between the two, (*Prehistoric Times*, p. 415), although he would by no means consent to interposing a similar period between man and the mammoth, when found together after the same fashion. If the "remarkable distribution" of the negro race is to be accounted for, he easily imagines, since they came into existence, "an immense tract of land or a chain of islands stretching from the eastern coast of Africa right across the Indian Ocean, and secondly, that sea then occupied the area of the present great desert," (*P. T.*, p. 388). To such writers, with unlimited command of time and space, and plenty of imagination, nothing is impossible, except (alas) as it would seem, to realize their littleness." "They set their mouth against the heavens; and their tongue walketh through the earth."

The one principle, to which the scientists of this school cleave, however, is one simple enough, if it were only tenable, viz., to explain everything in the geologic past by what is occurring under our eyes at present. But creation does not occur: creation therefore is to be rejected. We see no miracles: therefore there never were any. I quote such a writer to show how this principle necessarily influences all their views of the facts before them:—

"The older geologists held, *what probably every one would be tempted to think at first*, that the close of each formation was characterized by a general destruction of the forms of life of the period, and that the commencement of each new formation was accompanied by the creation of a number of new animals and plants, destined to figure as the characteristic fossils of the same. This theory, however, not only *invokes forces and processes, which it can in no way account for*, but overlooks the fact that most of the great formations are separated by lapses of time, UNREPRESENTED PERHAPS by any deposition of rock, or represented in some particular area, and yet, *perhaps*, as great as, or greater than, the whole time occupied in the production of the formation itself" (*Nicholson's Manual of Palæontology*, p. 20). Again,—*"In our inability to accept this view"* (of successive productions and creations), *"we must seek for some other explanation of the observed facts,"* (p. 15). "What are we to believe occurred at the close of any great geological period—say, the Cretaceous period? *If we reject the view that the close of the period was marked by a sudden and universal destruction of the characteristic Cretaceous forms of life, there is only one other view which we can take"* (p. 21). *"Upon any theory of 'evolution,' at any rate, it is certain that there can be no total break in the great series of the stratified deposits, but there must have been a complete continuity of life" &c.* But, *"we can never hope to discover all the lost links of the geological chain, and the great formations will always be separated from one another by more or less evident physical or palæontological breaks, or by both combined"* (p. 23.)

How plain that in all this it is not scientific necessity, or the nature of the facts, that controls the reasoning, but the primary

principle that creation there shall not be. It is not facts that compel; nature is not against her God: alas, man's heart is. Evolution without an intelligent God—which you, sir, deny Him to be—leaves *you* to be as God: before a Creator you must BOW; and this you will not! But what then of the carefully culled and chosen “evidences” which you will present for the acceptance of your hearers? Have we no cause to distrust the long and elaborate trains of reasoning upon facts got mostly at second hand, and “seen with eyes of faith” for whatever “unproved hypothesis” leaves God out?

The facts are not in dispute between believers in creation and Prof. Nicholson. He does not deny that there *are* breaks apparently in the succession of life upon the Pre-adamic earth. Between the Chalk period, to which he specially refers, and the succeeding Eocene, there is admitted by himself “a *complete break* in the life”-forms. How does he know that there was not here a destruction of life on the one hand, and a creative interposition to fill up the void again? Well, he allows, “it is of course open to believe” so; but “this theory calls upon the stage forces of which”—not believing in the Bible—“we know nothing, and is CONTRADICTED (!) by the whole tenor of the operations which we see going on around us at the present day”! Well, if we *did* see creation going on at the present day, *that* would contradict Scripture, would it not, for it says “the works were finished”? Yet our *not* seeing creation going on somehow contradicts Scripture too! Does our *not* seeing a thing then contradict the thought of its ever having been? Did we ever see a new species come into existence at all? Must we believe then that none ever did? Nay, they surely did, for there they are. How then may we believe they came into existence? Well, the old species changed into the new! Did we ever see this change? No, for all species change so slowly,* that the few thousand years of which we have any knowledge are not sufficient for this purpose. Well, how do you know then that this ever occurred? “Upon any theory of evolution,” it must have been so! And out of what did the first species that ever was evolve? It has already been said, that “the *nebulæ* and all subsequent life stand to each other in the relation of the germ to the finished organism.” And out of what did the *nebulæ* evolve?

* Judging from what we can observe (!) at the present day, the palæontological break between the Chalk and the Eocene indicates a perfectly incalculable lapse of time; for *all species change* or die out *slowly*, marine species especially so; and we have the disappearance of a large fauna almost in its entirety, and its replacement by another *wholly distinct*.” (Man. of Palæont. p. 33).

Well, no one knows ; but then *this* is the "method which it has been the triumph of science to disclose." That ends the matter.* It is the Ultima Thule beyond which no man may venture. And if you ask, does not this then "call upon the stage forces of which we know nothing?" and must not this then, too, "be contradicted by the whole tenor of the operations going on around us at the present day," in which we see nothing of the kind? what can they say but with Mr. Huxley,—

"Let us ask ourselves whether *any amount of evidence which the nature of our faculties permits us to attain*, can justify us in asserting that any phenomenon is out of the reach of natural causation. To this end it is obviously necessary that we should know *all* the consequences to which *all possible* combinations, continued through unlimited time, can give rise. If we knew these, and found none competent to originate species, we should have good ground for denying their origin by natural causation. *Till we know them*, ANY hypothesis is better than one which involves us in such *miserable presumption*!" (Lay Sermons, p. 282).

I ask again, on my side, have we not cause enough to distrust such reasonings upon facts, seen with such "eyes of faith" for whatever unproved hypothesis may only have this merit, that it leaves God out?

* * *

THE SCRIPTURE RECORD OF CREATION.

V.

SIR,—Having already, though with another purpose, got so far upon the ground of science and the sayings of its votaries, I shall allow myself to deviate from the order I had originally proposed, and take up at once what is the question of the day in that domain, as we have already pretty well seen—the question of CREATION.

Scripture itself asserts that it is "by *faith* we understand

* And yet Dr. Tyndall allows that all known facts are against him. The following I clipped out of a newspaper but the other day.

Professor Tyndall closed his recent lecture on germs, or the origin of life, before the Royal Institution, London, with these words :—"This discourse is but a summing up of eight months of incessant labour. From the beginning to the end of the enquiry there is not, as you have seen, a shadow of evidence in favour of the doctrine of spontaneous generation. There is, on the contrary, overwhelming evidence against it ; but do not carry away with you the notion sometimes erroneously ascribed to me, that I deem spontaneous generation 'impossible,' or that I wish to limit the power of matter in relation to life. My views on this subject ought to be well known. But possibility is one thing and proof is another ; and when in our day I seek for experimental evidence of the transformation of the non-living into the living, I am led inexorably to the conclusion that no such evidence exists, and that in the lowest, as in the highest of organized creatures the method of nature is that life shall be the issue of antecedent life."

that the worlds were framed by the word of God " (Heb. xi. 3), and it is very simple how it should be so. That the creature should have no *experience* of the process by which it was brought into being is not strange. "The works are *finished*," and he can have no personal knowledge of what is not going on about him. Science may deal with the results : it can do nothing but conjecture as to the cause or causes. And conjecture is *not* science, and cannot be. No eye—no *human* eye—saw God creating. No eye has seen Nature—the modern goddess—at any such work. No eye has seen the evolution of life at all out of the red-hot globe we have learnt (so many of us) to believe in, still less out of the nebula of Dr. Tyndall's belief. The absence of facts may allow the wider range to speculation, but speculation it is, and nothing more ; nor, except God have been pleased to give us His account of the matter, can we have any hope of certainty at all. The elements of doubt must ever preponderate in any hypothesis of man's formation, and scepticism as to it be the only reasonable and right thing.

Bring God in, and you have at once what disorganizes the most probable theories. You introduce a supreme will that cannot be dictated to,—a power, call it omnipotence or whatever else, you cannot measure ; an unknown quantity which you can never reduce to an equation. "Canst thou by searching find out God ? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection ? It is as high as heaven, what wilt thou do ? deeper than hell, what canst thou know ?"

You acknowledge this by your own confession of what seems to you "Unknowable." And yet you speculate as fearlessly, as if your feet were on safe bottom in this abyss. You ignore the Unknowable while you confess it, and fill up the blank you have made with your own dreams. Allow me to illustrate to you how this one thing left out of your calculations may spoil them all.

It may not be a new illustration, but it is at any rate a true one. Suppose (what I believe was once the fact) that God created an oak-tree full grown. And suppose, you had this very tree in the hands of your scientific men. There would of course be its rings of apparent growth, and by these they would calculate its growth to a nicety. But that apparent age, to which they would be led by the most approved and infallible inductive process, would *not* be its true age nevertheless. That would be a small matter very likely, but small or great is not the point. What might happen in a small way, might happen in a larger. I am only illustrating.

(To be continued.)