

Volume 16—Studies in the Scriptures—No. 6
JUNE, 1937

THE SPIRIT CONFIRMING.

An “earnest” remains *the irrevocable possession* of its recipient until the bargain is consummated, and even then it is not taken from him. Therein an “earnest” differs from a “pledge,” for when a pledged article is returned, the pledge is taken back again. So too the “earnest” which Christians receive is irrevocable and inalienable: “For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance” (Rom. 11:29). As the Lord Jesus declared, “I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you *forever*” (John 14:16). How blessedly and how positively this intimates the eternal security of God’s elect! Jehovah has made with them “an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things *and sure*” (2 Sam. 23:5). Even now they have received “the firstfruits of the Spirit” (Rom. 8:23), and that is the Divine certification of the glorious harvest, the plentitude of God’s favour, yet to follow. Like Mary, the believer today, by yielding to the Lordship of Christ, has “chosen that good part, which shall *not be taken away*” (Luke 10:42).

“Now He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts” (2 Cor. 1:21, 22). It is to be duly noted that both the sealing and the earnest are for our “stablishing.” As one hymn-writer put it, “What more can He *say* than to you He hath said, to you who to Jesus for refuge hath fled?” And what more can He *do*, we may ask, than what He has done to assure His people of the glorious inheritance awaiting them? We have the Lord Jesus Christ in Heaven *with our nature*, to show that our nature shall yet come there: “Whither the Forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus” (Heb. 6:20). Nor is that all: we have the Holy Spirit sent down *into our hearts* as proof that we are not only children, but also the heirs of God: Romans 8:14-17.

“Now He that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit” (2 Cor. 5:5). That “selfsame thing” is *not* to be restricted unto a resurrected body: it is the “far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” of 2 Corinthians 4:17, the “things which are not seen” of 4:18. Having spoken of the everlasting bliss awaiting the saints on High, for which they now groan and earnestly long (5:4), the Apostle mentions two of the principal grounds on which such a hope rests. First, God has “wrought us for” the same, that is He has regenerated us, giving us a holy and heavenly nature which fully capacitates us to be with Himself. Second, He has given us “the earnest of the Spirit” as a guaranty of this glorious estate. Thus are we fitted for, and thus are we assured of the infinitely better life awaiting us.

“After that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory” (Eph. 1:13, 14). In this passage (1:3-14) the Apostle describes those wondrous and numerous blessings with which the saints are blest in Christ. Eternal election (v. 4), membership in God’s family (v. 5), acceptance in the Beloved (v. 6), the forgiveness of sins (v. 7), and understanding of Divine mysteries (vv. 8, 9), predestinated unto an inheritance (v. 11), sealed with the Holy Spirit (v. 13), and now the Spirit given to us as “the earnest of our inheritance”—a part-payment in promise and pledge of the whole. The dwelling of the Spirit in the believer’s heart is the guaranty of his yet taking his place in that holy and joyous scene where all is according to the nature of God and where Christ is the grand Centre.

According to the literal meaning of the figure, an “earnest” signifies the clinching of a bargain, that it is a sample of what has been agreed upon, that it confirms and ensures the consummation of the contract. And that is what the operations and presence of the Spirit in the believer connote. First, they supply proof that God has made a covenant with him “ordered in all things and sure.” Second, the present work of the Spirit in him is a real foretaste and firstfruit of the coming harvest. Is there not something of *the glorified eye* in that faith which the Spirit has implanted? Do the pure in heart see God face to face in Heaven? Well, even now, faith enables us to endure “as *seeing Him* who is invisible” (Heb. 11:27). Is there not now something of that *glorified joy* wherein they in Heaven delight themselves in God: “In the multitude of my thoughts within me Thy comforts *delight* my soul” (Psa. 94:19). And is there not now a real though faint adumbration of that *glorified transformation of soul* into the image of Christ? Compare 2 Corinthians 3:18 with 1 John 3:2!

The “earnest” ensures the consummation of that contract. It is so here. The first operation of the Spirit in the elect is the guaranty of the successful completion of the same: “being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you *will perform* it until the day of Jesus Christ” (Phil. 1:6). Thus, God has given us something in hand that we may confidently anticipate the promised inheritance. And this, in order that both our desire and our diligence may be stimulated. We are not asked to mortify sin, deny self, forsake the world, for nothing. If the “Earnest” be so blessed, what shall the Inheritance itself be! O what lively expectations of it should be cherished in our hearts. O what earnest efforts should be made in “reaching forth unto those things which are before” (Phil. 3:13).

And *what is* the Inheritance of which the Spirit is the “Earnest” unto the believer? It is nothing less than God Himself! The blessed God, in the trinity of His Persons, is the everlasting portion of the saints. Is it not written “If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ” (Rom. 8:17)? And what is Christ’s “inheritance”? “The LORD is the portion of Mine inheritance” (Psa. 16:5) He declared. The future bliss of believers will consist in the fullness of the Spirit capacitating them to enjoy God to the full! And has not the believer already “*tasted* that the Lord is gracious” (1 Peter 2:3)? Yes, by the Spirit. The Spirit is the utmost proof to us of God’s love, the firstfruit of glory: “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts” (Gal. 4:6).

God, then, grants His people a taste in this world of what He has prepared for them in the world to come. The gifts and graces of the Spirit in the elect affirm *the certainty* of the glory awaiting them: as surely as an “earnest” guarantees the whole sum, so do the “firstfruits of the Spirit” (Rom. 8:23) the coming harvest of bliss. *The nature of* the Christian’s “earnest” intimates both the character and the greatness of what is in store for him: even now He bestows a measure of life, light, love, liberty; but what shall these be in their fullness! One ounce of real grace is esteemed by its possessor more highly than a ton of gold: what, then, will it be like to bathe in the ocean of God’s favour? If now there are times when we experience that peace which “*passeth all understanding*” (Phil. 4:7) and are made to “rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory” (1 Peter 1:8), how incapable we are of estimating the full value of our Inheritance, for an “earnest” is but a tiny installment of that which is promised. O that the realization of this, faint though it be, may move us to look and long for the heavenly glory with greater vehemence.—A.W.P.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

114. *Christ our Sin offering*: 13:11, 12.

In the verses at which we have now arrived the Apostle once more sets before us the Old Testament shadow and the New Testament substance, which emphasizes the importance and necessity of *diligently comparing* one portion of the Scripture with another, and particularly those sections which record those ordinances that God gave unto Israel wherein the Person, office and work of His son were so vividly, so blessedly, and so fully foreshadowed. The study of the types, when conducted soberly and reverently, yields a rich return. Its evidential value is of great worth, for it affords an unmistakable demonstration of the Divine authorship of the Scriptures, and when the Holy Spirit is pleased to reveal how that type and antitype fit in to each other more perfectly than hand and glove, then the hidden harmony of the different parts of the Word is unveiled to us: the minute analogies, the numerous points of agreement between the one and the other make it manifest that one presiding Mind controlled the whole.

The comparing of type with antitype also brings out the wondrous *unity of the Scriptures*, showing that beneath incidental diversity there has ever been an essential oneness in God's dealings with His people. Nothing so convincingly exposes the principle error of the Dispensationalists than this particular branch of study. The immediate design and use of the types was to exhibit unto God's people under the old covenant those vital and fundamental elements of Truth which are common alike to all dispensations, but which have received their plainest discovery under the new covenant. By means of material symbols a fitting portrayal was made of things to come, suitably paving the way for their introduction. The ultimate spiritual realities appeared first only in prospect or existed but in embryo. Under the Levitical instructions God caused there to be shadowed forth in parabolic representation the whole work of redemption by means of a vivid appeal to the senses: "The law having a shadow of good things to come" (Heb. 10:1).

The passage just quoted warrants the assertion that a spiritual study of the New Testament types also affords a valuable *aid to the interpretation* of much in the New Testament. Just as the *doctrine* expounded in the Epistles rests upon and is illustrated by the central *facts* recorded in the Gospels, so much in both Gospels and Epistles can only be fully appreciated in the light of the Scriptures. It is to be deplored that so many Christians find the second half of Exodus and the whole of Leviticus little more than a record of meaningless and effete ceremonial rites. If the preacher would take his "illustrations" of Gospel truths from the types, (instead of searching secular history for "suitable anecdotes"), he would not only honour the Scripture, but stir up and direct the interest of his spiritual hearers in those portions of the Word now so generally neglected. *Christ* is set forth as conspicuously in Leviticus as He is in John's Gospel, for "in the volume of the Book" it is written of Him.

The pity is that many of the more sober-minded and spiritual among God's people have been prejudiced against the study of the types, and the valuable use of them in interpreting the New Testament, by the untimely efforts of unqualified novices. The types were never designed by the Holy Spirit to provide a field in which young men might give free play to their imagination, or exercise their carnal ingenuity so as to bring out a mystical meaning to the most prosaic facts, and startle their unlearned hearers by giving to trifles a far-fetched significance. The wild allegorizing of Origen in the past should serve as a lasting warning. There are essential principles and fixed rules of interpreting the

types which are never to be ignored. The interpreter must concentrate his attention upon central truths and basic principles, and not occupy his thoughts with petty agreements and fanciful analogies. The central and all-important subjects exemplified in the types are sin and salvation, the putrefying of the soul, and the dedication of the heart and life to God.

Again; familiarity with the types and the spiritual principles they exemplify is a great help to *the right understanding of prophecy*. A type necessarily possesses something of a prophetic character, for it is a symbolical promise of the ultimate thing yet to appear, and hence it is not at all surprising that in announcing things to come the Prophets, to a large extent, availed themselves of the characters and events of past history, making them the images of a nobler future. In the prospective delineations which are given us in Scripture respecting the final issues of Christ's kingdom among men, while the foundation of all lies in His own mediatorial office and work, yet it is through the personage and ordinances of the *old* covenant that things to come are shadowed forth. Thus, Moses spoke of the Messiah as a Prophet like unto himself (Deut. 18:18). David announced Him as Priest after the order of Melchizedek (Psa. 11). While Malachi predicted His forerunner under the name of Elijah (Mal. 3:1; 4:5). Herein are valuable hints for our guidance, and if they be duly observed there will be no more excuse for interpreting "the Son of David" (Matt. 1:1) in a carnal sense, than for literalizing the "we have an altar" of Hebrews 13:10.

From what has been pointed out above on the manifold value of the types—which might be indefinitely amplified, especially the last point—it should be quite evident that they greatly err who look upon the types as a mere kindergarten, designed only for the infancy of the Church. The very fact that the Holy Spirit has preserved a record of them in the imperishable Word of Truth is clear intimation that they possess far more than a local use and temporary purpose. The mind of God and the circumstances of the fallen creature are substantially the same in all ages, while the spiritual needs of the saints are the same now as they were four thousand years ago, and were the same then as they are today. If, then, the wisdom of God placed His people of old under a course of instruction through the types, it is our folly and loss if we despise the same today. A mathematician still has use for the elementary principles of arithmetic, as a trained musician scorns not the rudimentary scales.

The basic principles underlying the types were made use of by Christ at the dawn of the New Testament era, thus intimating that the fundamental methods employed by God are the same in all generations. Every miracle the Lord Jesus performed was *a type in history*, for on the outward and visible plane of Nature He displayed the Divine power and work which He came here to accomplish in the higher realm of Grace. In every act of healing men's bodily diseases, there was an adumbration to the eye of sense of that salvation which He would provide for the healing of the soul. In the demands which He made upon those whom He healed, a revelation was given of the principles by which His salvation may be procured by us. The *facts* of the Gospels are the key to the *truths* of the Epistles, and the types of the Old Testament are the key to the facts of the Gospel. Thus, one part of Scripture is made dependent on the other, just as no member of our body is independent of its fellow-members.

"For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. 13:11-12). In these verses the Apostle supplies a striking illustration and confirmation of what he had just

previously affirmed. In the preceding verse he had declared that Christ is the Altar of His people—the antitype of all that had been shadowed out by the typical altars of Old Testament times—which, as we showed, signifies not only that Christ is their atoning sacrifice unto God, but that He is also the sustenance, the food, for His people. Then followed the solemn statement that those who stubbornly and unbelievably continued to adhere unto Judaism, deprived themselves of the blessings enjoyed by Christians.

As we have so often pointed out, the Hebrew saints were being urged to return unto the Divinely-instituted religion of their fathers. In verse 9 the Apostle presents to them two further dissuasives. First, he assured them they now possess the Antitype of all the types of Judaism: why, then, be tempted by the shadows when they possessed the Substance! Second, he solemnly affirms that those who still clung to Judaism cut themselves off from the Christian's privileges: they had "no right," no Divine title to "eat" or partake of them. The application of this principle to us today is obvious. The same two-fold argument should suffice to draw off *our* hearts from doting upon ritualistic rites and performances: possessing Christ as our great High Priest, having access to the Throne of Grace, such things as bowing to the east, elevating the offering (collection), candles, incense, pictures, images, are needless and worthless, and if the heart be set on them and a saving value be ascribed to them, they effectually exclude us from an interest in Christ's salvation.

In last month's article we showed how strikingly and blessedly the Old Testament types pointed to Christ as the nourishment of His people: only parts of the sacrifices were burnt upon the altar, other portions thereof being allotted to the priests or the offerer and his family. But there was a notable exception to this, unto which the Apostle now directs our attention. "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp" (Heb. 13:11). The reference is unto the sin offerings. These were slain on the altar in the outer court, but their blood was carried inside the tabernacle and sprinkled before or upon the throne of Jehovah, while their carcasses were utterly consumed outside the camp. This was, of course, while Israel were sojourners in the wilderness and lived in tents; but the same order was observed after they entered Canaan and the temple was built in Jerusalem—the bodies of the sin offerings being carried out beyond the walls of the city to be consumed there.

The Apostle was referring to such passages as Leviticus 4:1-12, where provision was made for an atonement when a priest had unwittingly sinned against any of the commandments of the Lord. He was to bring a bullock unto the door of the tabernacle for a sin offering, lay his hand upon its head (as an act of identification, to denote that the doom awaiting *it* was what *he* deserved), and kill it before the Lord. Its blood was then to be brought into the tabernacle and sprinkled seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary, and upon the horns of the incense altar, and the remainder thereof poured out at the base of the brazen altar. The richest portions of the animal were then burned upon the altar, but the remainder of it was carried forth "without the camp," and there utterly consumed by fire. The same order was followed when the whole congregation sinned through ignorance (Lev. 4:12-21), the account closing with "He shall carry forth the bullock *without* the camp, and burn him as he burned the first bullock; it is a sin offering." The reader may also compare Numbers 19:3, 9.

But there is no doubt that the Apostle was alluding more particularly unto the chief sin offering which was offered on the annual day of atonement, when propitiation was made

for all the sins of Israel once a year, described at length in Leviticus 16. Concerning the blood of this sacrifice we read, "And he (the high priest) shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward; and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times" (v. 14). Regarding the bodies of those beasts used on this occasion we are told, "and the bullock for the sin offering, and the goat for the sin offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung" (v. 27). These passages, then, make it quite clear to which particular class of sacrifices the Apostle was referring in Hebrews 13:10, 11.

The question now arises, Wherein lies *the relevancy* of this allusion to these passages in Leviticus in our present text? What was the Apostle's particular design in referring to the sin offerings? It was twofold. First, to substantiate his assertion that they who served the tabernacle had "no right to eat" of the Christian's altar—i.e., had no title to partake of the benefits of Christ, who has, as our next verse shows, died as a sin offering. There was a Divine prohibition which expressly forbade any feeding upon the same: "And no sin offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be *burnt* in the fire" (Lev. 6:30). Those, then, who clung to Judaism are cut off from the Antitype's sin offering. Second, to exhibit the superiority of Christianity: those who trust in Christ *eat* His flesh and drink His blood (John 6:54-56).

But let us dwell for a moment on the spiritual significance of this particular detail in the type. It presents to us that feature in the suffering of Christ which is the most solemn of all to contemplate, namely, His being made sin for His people and enduring the penal wrath of God. "Outside the camp" was the place where the *leper* was compelled to dwell (Lev. 13:46), was the place where *criminals* were condemned and slain (Lev. 24:14 and cf. Josh. 7:24, 1 Kings 21:13, Acts 7:58), it was the place where the *defiled* were put (Num. 5:3), it was the place where *filth was deposited* (Deut. 23:12-13). And *that* was the place, dear Christian reader, that the incarnate Son, the Holy One of God, entered for you and me! O the unspeakable humiliation when He suffered Himself to be "numbered with the transgressors" (Isa. 53:12). O the unutterable mystery of the Blessed One "being made a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13). O the unspeakable anguish when the sword of Divine Justice smote Him (Zech. 13:7), and God forsook Him (Matt. 27:46).

Yet let it be emphatically insisted upon that Christ remained, personally and essentially, the *Untainted* One, even when the fearful load of the sins of His people was laid upon Him. This very point was carefully guarded by God—ever jealous of the honour of His Son—in the types, yea, in the sin offerings themselves. First, the blood of the sin offering was carried within the sanctuary itself and sprinkled before the Lord (Lev. 4:6), which was *not* done with any other offering. Second, "the fat that covereth the inwards" of the animal was burned upon the altar (Lev. 4:8-10), yea, "for a sweet savour unto the LORD" (v. 31), intimating that God still beheld that in His Son with which He was well pleased even while He was bearing the sins of His people. Third, it was expressly enjoined that the carcass of the bullock should be carried forth "without the camp unto a *clean* place" (Lev. 4:12), signifying it was still *holy* unto the Lord, and *not* a polluted thing.

Christ was “as pure, as holy, and as precious in the sight of God whilst groaning under the infliction of damnatory wrath on the accursed tree, as when He was in the bosom of the Father before all worlds—the very same moment in which He was ‘bruised’ and ‘made a curse’ for us, being also that in which He offered Himself for us ‘an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.’ Never was the character of Jesus exhibited in more transcendent excellency; never were His relations to God and to man maintained in greater perfectness than during the time that He suffered for us on the Tree. Never did the Father more delight in and appreciate the excellency of the Son of His love; never did the Son more love and honour and delight in the Father than when He uttered that bitter cry, ‘My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?’ The very circumstances which placed Jesus, outwardly, in the extreme of distance from Heaven and from God, only proved that there was an essential nearness—an everlasting moral nearness, which not even the fact of His being the Bearer of damnatory wrath could for one moment alter” (B. W. Newton).

The *immediate* reason why none of the Israelites, not even the high priest, was allowed to *eat* any portion of the sin offering, and why its carcass was burnt outside the camp rather than upon the altar, seems to lie in the distinctive nature and special design of this offering. Had the priest eaten of any portion thereof, *that* had given it the character of a peace offering, and had the whole been consumed upon the altar it had too closely resembled the burnt offering. But, as we have pointed out before, the *ultimate* reason and deeper design was to denote that Judaism had to be abandoned before one could “eat” or derive benefit from the Christian “altar.” Herein lies the superiority of Christianity, that *we are permitted* to feed upon a Sacrifice of the highest and holiest kind, receiving those blessings and benefits which Christ has procured for His people by the shedding of His precious blood.

The Apostle, then, has furnished clear proof of what he had asserted in verses 9, 10, and that from the Old Testament Scriptures themselves. There he had said, “it is good that the heart be established with grace,” which means for the mind to have such a fixed persuasion of the Truth as to enjoy peace with God, without which there can be no real and solid tranquillity. Then the Apostle had said, “Not with meats, which have *not profited* them that have been occupied therein,” which must be understood in the light of the previous clause: the ceremonial distinctions of the Levitical law were altogether inadequate for justification and peace with God. Moreover, that sacrifice which made atonement for *sin* provided *no food* for those who offered it, and the heart cannot be established before God where sins are not remitted.

“Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate” (Heb. 13:12). Here is the Christian’s altar, here is the all-sufficient sacrifice offered once for all upon it, and here is the blessed effect thereof, his sanctification. The opening “wherefore” of this verse called for the line of thought developed in the opening paragraphs of this article. It intimated that it was for the express purpose of meeting the requirements of the Old Testament types that the Lord Jesus was “led as a lamb to the slaughter” and suffered the horrible ignominy of being cast out of the holy city and put to death in the place where the worst criminals were executed. What honour did the Substance now place upon the shadows! A wide field of study is here suggested to us, and a reverent and patient survey of it will well repay our efforts.

How frequently in the four Gospels has the Holy Spirit assigned as the reason for what Christ did “that the Scriptures might be fulfilled.” That expression is *not* to be restricted to Christ’s design in accomplishing the terms of Messianic *prophecy*—though, of course, that is included—for it also and often has reference to His so acting in order that *the types* which foreshadowed Him might be realized. The will of God concerning the Mediator had been intimated in the legal institutions, for in them a prefiguration was made of what Christ should do and suffer, and His perfect obedience to the Father moved Him unto a compliance therewith. Consequently, the fuller be our knowledge of the types, the more shall we be able to understand the recorded details of our Saviour’s earthly life (particularly of His last week), and the more can we appreciate the motive which actuated Him—complete subjection to the will of the One who had sent Him. That particular which the Holy Spirit notes in our text is but one illustration from many, if we take the trouble to search them out.

“The complete answering and fulfilling of all types in the Person and office of Christ, testifieth the sameness and *immutability* of the counsel of God in the whole work of the redemption and salvation of the Church, notwithstanding all the outward changes that have been in the institutions of Divine worship” (John Owen). But it did something else too: it left the unbelieving Jews *without excuse*: Christ’s implicit compliance with the types, His complete and perfect production of all that had been foreshadowed of Him, furnished the most indubitable demonstration that He was the promised Messiah, and therefore His rejection by the Nation at large sealed their own doom, and was the reason why, a little later, God destroyed the sanctuary, city, and heritage.

“Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate” (Heb. 13:12). Christ Himself is the all-sufficient sin offering of His people. Just as all the iniquities, transgressions and sins of natural Israel were, in a figure, transferred to the typical offering (Lev. 16:21), so all the iniquities, transgressions and sins of the Spirit Israel were imputed to their Surety (Isa. 53:6, 7, 11, 12). Just as the goat bearing the iniquities of natural Israel was sent away “into a land not inhabited” (Lev. 16:22), so “as far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us” (Psa. 103:12). And just as “on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be *clean from all your sins* before the LORD” (Lev. 16:30), so “The blood of Jesus Christ His Son *cleanseth us from all sin*” (1 John 1:7).

Observe that in strict keeping with the fact that the Redeemer is here contemplated as the antitypical Sin-offering, He is referred to simply as “Jesus,” and *not* “Jesus Christ” as in verses 8, 21, still less “our Lord Jesus” as in verse 20. He is not alluded to in these different ways at random, nor for the mere purpose of variation. Not so does the Holy Spirit order *His* speech: there is nothing haphazard in His language. The various designations accorded the Saviour in the Word are selected with Divine propriety, and nothing affords a more striking evidence of the *verbal* inspiration of the Scriptures than the unerring precision with which they are used. “Jesus” is His *personal* name as man (Matt. 1:21); “Christ” is His official title, as the One anointed of God (Matt. 16:16, 20); while “The Lord Jesus” points to His exalted *status and authority* (John 13:13, Acts 2:36). When “Jesus” is used alone, it is either for the special purpose of identification (as in Acts 1:11), or to emphasize the infinite depths of humiliation into which the Son of God descended.

“Wherefore (in fulfillment of the types which had defined the path He should tread), Jesus also (the Antitype, the Just who had entered the place of the unjust, the infinitely

Glorious One who had descended into such unfathomable depths of degradation), that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, *suffered* without the gate” (Heb. 13:12). This was the particular feature made most prominent in the type, for the sin-offering was not only slain, and its carcass taken outside the camp, but there it was *utterly consumed*. It spoke of Christ as the Sin-bearer enduring the fiery indignation of a sin-hating God, suffering His penal wrath. It spoke of Christ offering Himself to God as a sacrifice for the sins of His people, to make atonement for them, for His blood was shed, and *blood* was never employed under the types except to make atonement (Lev. 17:11).

“That He might sanctify *the people*.” Ponder carefully, my reader, the definiteness of the language here used. Scripture knows nothing of a vague, general, undeterminable and futile shedding of the precious blood of the Lamb. No indeed: it had a predestined, specific, and invincible hand in view. That blood was *not* shed for the whole human race at large (a considerable portion of which was already in Hell when Christ died!), but for “the people,” each of whom are sanctified by it. It was for “the *sheep*” He laid down His life (John 10:11). It was to gather together in one “the *children of God* that were scattered abroad” that He was slain (John 11:51, 52). It was for “His *friends*” He endured the Cross (John 15:13). It was for *the Church* He gave Himself (Eph. 5:25).—A.W.P.

The Life of David.

66. *His Being Cursed.*

In an earlier article we emphasised the fact that in his flight from Jerusalem, David is to be viewed as a contrite penitent. His refusal to stand his ground when Absalom rose up in rebellion against him, is to be attributed not to moral weakness, but to spiritual strength. Apparently this had been preceded by a lengthy and debilitating illness which had hindered him nipping that rebellion while it was in the bud, but the king had recovered by the time the conspiracy had come to a head. No, in his son's rebellion David saw the righteous retribution of God upon his fearful sins against Bathsheba and Uriah, and accordingly he humbled himself beneath His mighty hand. He recognized the ways of God in His moral government, so instead of vainly flinging himself against the bosses of Jehovah's buckler (rebelling and murmuring at His providences), he meekly bowed before His chastening rod. This was "bringing forth fruits meet for repentance"—as lovely, and as acceptable to God, as are "the fruits of righteousness" in their season.

It is, then, in the viewing of David *as an humble penitent* that we obtain the key to most of what is recorded in 2 Samuel 15 and 16. His sin had found him out and brought him to remembrance before the Holy One of Israel, and he bowed his head and meekly accepted His reproofs. It was for this reason that he bade his loyal followers go back, and leave him alone in his trouble. It was in that spirit he had ordered the priests to carry back the ark to Jerusalem—he felt utterly unworthy that *it* should accompany him on his flight. It was in that same spirit, as an humble penitent, he had crossed the Kidron and ascended Olivet, barefooted and in tears. It was as *the mourner before God* that David had now turned his face toward the wilderness. All of this has been before us on a previous occasion, but we deemed it necessary to repeat the same, for it explains, as nothing else does, his amazing attitude in the incident we are about to contemplate.

As the fugitive king and his little following began to descend into the valley leading to the Jordan, a man who belonged to the family of the house of Saul came forth, and *cursed* him, charging him with a fearful crime he had never committed. Meeting with no opposition, this wretched creature cast stones at the king and his men. Now David was not the man, naturally speaking, to suffer such indignities to pass unnoticed: why, then, did he now endure them in silence? Abishai, one of the king's followers, asked permission to avenge his master of these insults by slaying the offender; but David restrained him, and suffered Shimei to continue his outrageous conduct. But what seems stranger still, David attributed this humiliating experience unto God Himself, saying "*The Lord* hath said unto him, Curse David"—language which raises a problem of the first magnitude: the relation of God to evil; for David was not guilty of speaking rashly and wickedly, but gave utterance to a most solemn and weighty truth. But to keep to our main thought.

"He saw God in every circumstance, and owned Him with a subdued and reverent spirit. To him it was not Shimei, but the Lord. Like Peter afterwards, when he sought to defend his beloved Master from the band of murderers sent to arrest Him. Both Peter and Abishai were living upon the surface, and looking at secondary causes. The Lord Jesus was living in the most profound subjection to the Father: 'the cup which My Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it?' This gave Him power over everything. He looked beyond the instrument to God—beyond the cup to the hand which had filled it. It mattered not whether it were Judas, Herod, Caiaphas, or Pilate; He could say, in all, '*My Father's cup.*' Thus, too, was David, in his measure, lifted above subordinate agents. He looked

right up to God, and with unshod feet and covered head, he bowed before Him: 'The Lord hath said unto him, Curse David.' This was enough.

"Now, there are, perhaps, few things in which we so much fail as in apprehending the presence of God, and His dealings with our souls, in every circumstance of daily life. We are constantly ensnared by looking at secondary causes; we do not realize God *in everything*. Hence Satan gets the victory over us. Were we more alive to the fact that there is not an event which happens to us, from morning to night, in which the voice of God may not be heard, the hand of God seen, with what a holy atmosphere would it surround us! Men and things would then be received as so many agents and instruments in our Father's hands; so many ingredients in our Father's cup. Thus would our minds be solemnized, our spirits calmed, our hearts subdued. Then we shall not say with Abishai, 'Why should this dead dog curse my lord the king? let me go over, I pray thee, and take off his head.' Nor shall we, with Peter, draw the sword in natural excitement. How far below their respective masters were both these affectionate though mistaken men! How must the sound of Peter's sword have grated on his Master's ear, and offended His spirit! And how must Abishai's words have wounded the meek and submitting David! Could David defend himself while God was dealing with his soul in a manner so solemn and impressive? Surely not. He dare not take himself out of the hands of the Lord. He was His for life or death—as a king or an exile. Blessed subjection!" (Charles H. Spurgeon).

"And when king David came to Bahurim, behold, thence came out a man of the family of the house of Saul, whose name was Shimei, the son of Gera: he came forth, and cursed still as he came" (2 Sam. 16:5). What a contrast is this from what was before us in the preceding verse! There we saw the hypocritical Ziba fawning upon David, pretending that he desired to "find grace" in his sight, and addressing him as "my lord, O king." Here we find Shimei "cursing" the king, and denouncing him as "thou man of Belial." Ziba presented David with an elaborate present, whereas Shimei threw stones and cast dust at him. Unto the flatteries of the former, David reacted by grievously misjudging Mephibosheth; whereas to the revilings of the latter, he meekly bowed before God—ah, my reader, the Christian has good reason to fear the smiles of the world, far more than he has its frowns.

"And when king David came to Bahurim, behold, thence came out a man of the family of the house of Saul, whose name was Shimei, the son of Gera: he came forth, and cursed still as he came." The first book of Samuel furnished the background to this dark scene. Saul had been Israel's king, and upon his death a determined effort had been made to preserve the throne in *his* family: see 2 Samuel 2:8 to 3:2. But the attempt of Abner and the determination of Ishbosheth to reign as king over Israel was in direct defiance of Jehovah's ordination (1 Sam. 16:1-3; 2 Sam. 2:4). But Shimei disregarded this Divine appointment, and his heart was filled with enmity against David, whom he wrongly regarded as the usurper of the throne. While David was in power, he dared not openly anathematize him—though he hated him just the same; but now he was fleeing from Absalom, Shimei took the opportunity to vent his malice, which shows his utter baseness in taking advantage of David's trouble at this time.

"And he cast stones at David, and at all the servants of king David: and all the people and all the mighty men were on his right hand and on his left" (2 Sam. 16:6). The rank hatred of Shimei's heart now burst forth in full force. With savage vehemence he curses the king, and flings stones and dust in the transports of his fury; stumbling along among

the rocks high up in the glen, he keeps pace with the little band in the valley below. But ere passing on, let us not overlook the fact that Bahurim has been mentioned previously in this book: see 2 Samuel 3:18 and context. Did David now recall how the husband from whom he had torn Michal had followed her to this very place, and then turned back weeping to his lonely home? We cannot be sure, but the remembrance of later and more evil deeds now subdued David's spirit, and caused him to meekly submit to these outrageous insults.

“And thus said Shimei when he cursed, Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial: The LORD hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned; and the LORD hath delivered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son: and, behold, thou art taken in thy mischief, because thou art a bloody man” (2 Sam. 16:7, 8). The different scenes presented in these chapters require to be viewed from various angles, if their manifold signification is to be perceived. This we endeavour to bear in mind as we pass from incident to incident. Shimei is not only to be regarded as the Lord's instrument for chastening David, as a figure of the Devil as a “roaring lion”—raging against David because he had come into the enemy's territory (see last month's article); but also as a type of those who slandered and persecuted Christ Himself. It is this many-sidedness of these historical pictures which give to them their chief interest for us today.

When the parents of the infant Jesus presented Him to God in the temple, old Simeon was moved by the Spirit of prophecy to say, “Behold, this Child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against . . . *that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed*” (Luke 2:34, 35). How truly the terms of this prediction concerning the Antitype was adumbrated in the type. All through his checkered career, but especially that part of it we are now considering, David's various experiences served as occasions that “the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed.” Much that was hidden beneath the surface was forced out into the open. Those who were loyal to him at heart were now unmistakably manifested as his staunch supporters and faithful friends: his “mighty men” continued to cling to him despite the drastic change of his fortunes. It now became clear who really loved him for his own sake,—like Mary and Martha and the Apostles. On the other hand, hypocrites were exposed (Ahithophel, the forerunner of Judas), and bitter enemies openly reviled and condemned him—this was the lot of our Lord.

The conduct of Shimei on this occasion was base and vile to the last degree. In the first place, it was in direct defiance of the express commandment of the Lord: “Thou shalt not revile the judges, nor curse the ruler of thy people” (Exo. 22:28); “Curse not the king, no not in thy thought” (Eccl. 10:20). Second, it was despicable beyond words that Shimei should wait to vent his malice upon David till the time when his cup of sorrow was already full, thus adding to his grief: “For they persecute him whom Thou hast smitten; and they talk to the grief of those whom Thou hast wounded” (Psa. 69:26). Third, the awful charge he now preferred was absolutely false, and against the plainest evidence: so far from David having slain Saul, he had again and again spared his life when he was at his mercy. He was many miles away at the time of Saul's death, and when the tidings of it reached him, he made lamentation for him: (2 Sam. 1:12).

“And thus said Shimei when he cursed, Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial: The LORD hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul,

in whose stead thou hast reigned; and the LORD hath delivered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son: and, behold, thou art taken in thy mischief, because thou art a bloody man” (2 Sam. 16:7, 8). What a solemn case is this of the holy name of the Lord being found upon the lips of the wicked!—a warning to us that all who make use of the name of Christ do *not* “depart from iniquity” (2 Tim. 2:19). Observe too how Shimei undertook to interpret the Divine dispensations toward David, showing us that wicked men are ever ready to press God’s judgments into their service, for they judge right and wrong by selfish interests. May Divine grace preserve both writer and reader from the folly and sin of attempting to philosophise about God’s dealing with others.

“Then said Abishai the son of Zeruah unto the king, Why should this dead dog curse my lord the king? let me go over, I pray thee, and take off his head. And the king said, What have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruah? so let him curse, because the LORD hath said unto him, Curse David. Who shall then say, Wherefore hast thou done so?” (2 Sam. 16:9, 10). Here again the type merges into the Antitype, and that in two respects. First, how this well-meant but fleshly suggestion of David’s devoted follower reminds us of that request of Christ’s disciples concerning those who “did not receive Him,” namely, “Lord, wilt Thou that we command fire to come down from Heaven, and consume them, even as Elias [Elijah] did?” (Luke 9:54). As Christ answered “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of,” so David restrained Abishai—clear proof he was *not* the “bloody man” Shimei had called him! Second, David refused to return railing for railing, reminding us of “when He (Christ) was reviled, (He) reviled not again” (1 Peter 2:23), in this leaving an example for us to follow. But turning from the typical, let *us* consider the practical.

Though the fact itself be not here specifically mentioned, David realized that he *deserved to be* both cursed and stoned, and this consciousness thereof must have taken off the edge from this cutting experience: “Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins?” (Lam. 3:39). Though the blood of Saul did not rest upon David, that of Uriah did; this he knew full well, and therefore bowed to God’s righteous chastisement, and spared Shimei—both Absalom and Shimei were instruments in the hand of God, justly afflicting him—though the guilt of their conduct belonged to them. A parallel case is found in Aaron: the remembrance of his great wickedness in making the golden calf, composed his mind under the fearful trial of the death of his sons (Lev. 10:1-3)—knowing he deserved yet sorer judgment, he was silent.

“And the king said, What have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruah? so let him curse, because the LORD hath said unto him, Curse David” (2 Sam. 16:10). David saw the hand of God in this experience, afflicting him for his sins against Bathsheba and Uriah. Shimei had received a commission from Heaven, to curse David, though that no more excused him or took away his guilt than the crucifiers of Christ were guiltless because they did what God’s hand and counsel “determined before to be done” (Acts 2:23; 4:28). God has foreordained *all* that comes to pass in this world, but this does not mean that He regards the wickedness of men with complacency, or that He condones their evil. No indeed. In their zeal to clear God of being the Author of sin, many have denied that He is the Ordainer and Orderer of it. Because the creature cannot comprehend His ways, or perceive how He is the Author of an act without being chargeable with the evil of it, they have rejected the important truth that sin is under the absolute *control* of God, and is as much

subject to His moral government, as the winds and waves are directed by Him in the material sphere.

The subject is admittedly a difficult one, and if we are spared, we hope to write more at length upon it in the future. Meanwhile, we content ourself by giving a quotation from the Westminster Confession: "God's providence extendeth itself to all sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and other wise *ordering and governing* them, in a manifold disposition unto His own holy ends; yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature, and not from God" (Chapter 5). The holiness of God is no more sullied by directing the activities of evil men than the beams of the sun are defiled when they shine upon a filthy swamp. The hatred of his heart belonged to Shimei himself, but it was God's work that that hatred should settle so definitely on David, and show itself in exactly the manner and time it did.

"And David said to Abishai, and to all his servants, Behold, my son, which came forth of my bowels, seeketh my life: how much more now may this Benjamite do it? let him alone, and let him curse; for the LORD hath bidden him. It may be that the LORD will look on mine affliction, and that the LORD will requite me good for his cursing this day" (2 Sam. 16:11, 12). Two further considerations are here presented; David calmed himself under the lesser affliction of Shimei's cursing him, by reminding himself of the greater trial of Absalom's rising up against him. And he sought comfort in the possibility that God might yet overrule this trouble for his own ultimate blessing. The *practical* value of this incident is the valuable teaching it contains on how a saint ought to conduct and console himself under severe trials. Let us summarize. First, David comforted himself with the thought that his sins deserved sorer chastisement than he was receiving. Second, he looked beyond the afflicting instrument, to the righteous hand of God. Third, he considered the minor affliction unworthy of consideration in view of the major. Fourth, he exercised *hope* that God would yet bring "good" out of evil. May grace be granted us to do likewise.—A.W.P.

The Divine Covenants.

5. The Siniatic.

In bringing to a close these articles on the Siniatic Covenant we propose to review the ground which has been covered, summarize the various aspects of Truth which have been before us, and endeavour to further clarify one or two points which may not yet be quite clear to the interested reader. We began the series (June/36) by asking a number of questions which we will now repeat and briefly answer.

“What was the precise nature of the covenant which God entered into with Israel at Sinai?” It was an arrangement or constitution which pertained to them *as a Nation*, and was for the regulation of their religious, political, and social life. “Did it concern only their temporal welfare as a nation, or did it also set forth God’s requirements for the individual’s enjoyment of eternal blessings?” The latter, for the substance of the covenant was according to the unchanging principles on which God’s Throne is founded: none but those who are partakers of the Divine holiness and are conformed to the Divine righteousness can commune with God and dwell with Him forever. “Was a radical change now made in God’s revelations to men and what He demanded of them?” No, for it had for its foundation the everlasting Covenant of Grace, while in substance it was a renewal of the Adamic Covenant of Works. Moreover, as we have shown, the Siniatic transaction must not be considered as an isolated event, but as an appendage to the Abrahamic Covenant, the ends of which it was designed to carry forward to their accomplishment.

In saying that the Mosaic economy was founded upon the everlasting Covenant of Grace we mean that it was owing to the eternal compact which the three Persons of the Godhead had made with the Mediator, Christ Jesus, that the Lord dealt with Israel in pure grace when He delivered them from the bondage of Egypt and brought them to Himself. When we say that in substance it was a renewal of the Adamic Covenant of Works, we mean that Israel was placed under the same law (in principle) as the federal head of the race was, and that as Adam’s *continued* enjoyment of Eden was continued upon his obedience, so Israel’s *continued* enjoyment of Canaan was conditioned on their obedience. In saying that the Siniatic constitution was an appendage to the Abrahamic Covenant we mean that it gathered up into itself the Primordial and Patriarchal institutions—the Sabbath, sacrifices, circumcision—while it added a multitude of new ordinances which, though in themselves “weak and beggarly elements,” were both instructive symbols and typical prefigurations of future spiritual blessings.

“Was an entirely different ‘way of salvation’ now introduced?” Most certainly not. Salvation has *always* been by grace through faith, never on the ground of works, but always producing good works. When Jude says that he proposed to write of “the *common* salvation” (v. 3), he signified that the saints of *all* ages have participated in the same salvation. The regenerated in Israel looked beyond the sign to the thing signified and saw in the shadow a figure of the substance, and obtained *through Christ* acceptance with God. Every aspect of the cardinal truth of Justification is found in the Psalms just as it is set forth in the New Testament. First, the same confession of sin and depravation: Psalm 14:1. Second, the same acknowledgement of guilt and ill-desert: Psalm 40:12, 13. Third, the same fear of God’s righteous judgment: Psalm 6:1. Fourth, the same sense of inevitable condemnation on the ground of God’s law: Psalm 143:2. Fifth, the same cry for undeserved mercy: Psalm 51:1. Sixth, the same faith in God’s revealed character as a just God and Saviour: Psalm 25:8. Seventh, the same hope of “mercy” through “redemption”:

Psalm 130:7. Eighth, the same pleading of God's name: Psalm 25:11. Ninth, the same trust in another righteousness than his own: Psalm 71:16; 84:9. Tenth, the same love for "the Son": Psalm 2:12. Eleventh, the same joy and peace in believing: Psalm 89:15, 16. Twelfth, the same assurance in God's faithfulness to fulfill His promises: Psalm 89:1, 2. Let the reader carefully ponder these passages from the Psalms, and he will discover *the Gospel itself in all its essential elements*.

"Wherein is the Siniatic Covenant related to the others, particularly to the everlasting Covenant of Grace and the Adamic Covenant of Works?—was it in harmony with the former or a renewal of the latter?" *These* questions raise an issue which presents *the chief difficulty* to be elucidated. In seeking its solution several vital and basic considerations must needs be steadily borne in mind, otherwise a one-sided view of it is bound to lead unto an erroneous conclusion. Those important "considerations" include the relation which the Siniatic compact bore to the Abrahamic Covenant; the distinction which must be drawn between the relation that existed between Jehovah and the Nation at large, and between Jehovah and the spiritual remnant in it; and the contribution which God designed the Mosaic economy should make toward paving the way for the advent of Christ and the establishing of Christianity.

Now the Holy Spirit has Himself graciously made known to us in Galatians 3 the relation which the Siniatic Covenant sustained to the Abrahamic. The latter did not, "*cannot disannul,*" the former (v. 17), it was "added" thereto (v. 19), it is "not against" it (v. 21), it had a *gracious* design (vv. 23, 24). It was "added" not by way of amendment or alteration, not to discredit it, nor to be blended with it as water may be mixed with wine; no, it still remained subservient to the promises made to Abraham concerning his seed. And yet it was *not* set up by itself alone, but was brought in as a necessary appendix, which clearly proves that God gave Israel the law with an *evangelical* design and purpose.

"It was added *because of transgressions,*" which probably has a *double* reference. First, because sin was then so rampant in the world, and Israel had acquired so many of the ways of the heathen during their long sojourn in Egypt, the Law (both moral and ceremonial) was formally given at Sinai to serve *as a restraint*, and preserve a pure seed till the Messiah appeared. Second, in order to *convict Israel* of their guilt and convince them of the need of another righteousness than their own, thus preparing their hearts for Christ. If I preach the Law to the unsaved, showing its spirituality and the breadth of its requirements, pressing upon them the justice of its demands, proving they are under its righteous condemnation, and all of this with the object of driving them out of themselves to Christ, then I make a right and legitimate service of the Law, I "use it lawfully" (1 Tim. 1:8) and do not pit it against the Gospel.

In the historical order and dispensational relation between the Abrahamic and Siniatic Covenants we see again that marvel of Divine wisdom which conjoins such opposites as law and grace, justice and mercy, requirement and provision. The fact that the latter was "added to the former," shows that the one was not set aside or ignored by the other, but was acknowledged in its unimpaired validity. Now under the Abrahamic Covenant, as we saw when examining the same, there was a striking conjunction of grace and law, yet the former more largely predominated—as is evident from the frequent references [and allusions] to the "promises" (Gal. 3:7, 8, 16, 18, 21) and from the "preached before *the Gospel* to Abraham" (Gal. 3:8); so too under the Mosaic economy grace and law were both

exhibited, yet the latter was far more conspicuous—as is clear from the contrast drawn in “for the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (John 1:17).

The Sinaiic Covenant was supplementary and subsidiary to the Abrahamic, serving to promote both its natural and spiritual ends. Its object was *not to convey*, but to *direct* life. Its immediate design was to make clear to Abraham’s seed how it behooved them to act toward God and toward each other, as a chosen generation, as the people of Jehovah. It made evident the character and conduct required from those who were partakers of the grace revealed in the promises. It made manifest the all-important principle that redemption carries in its bosom a conformity to the Divine will, and that only when the soul really responds to the righteousness of Heaven is the work of redemption completed. It trained the mind and stimulated the conscience of the regenerate unto a more enlightened apprehension of the mercy revealed, and which its instituted symbols served more fully to explain.

It was grace alone which delivered Israel from Egypt, but as God’s acknowledged people they were going to occupy for their inheritance that land which the Lord claimed as more peculiarly His own. They must go there, then, as (typically, at least) partakers of His holiness, for thus alone could they either glorify His name or enjoy His blessings. Hence the *holiness* of Israel was the common end aimed at in all the Levitical institutions under which they were placed. Take, for example, the laver, at which the *priests* (under pain of death: Exo. 30:20, 21) were always required to wash their hands and feet before either serving at the altar or entering the tabernacle. That was symbolical of *the inward purity* which God required. The Psalmist clearly intimates this, and shows he held it to be no less applicable to *himself*, when he says, “I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass Thine altar, O LORD” (26:6)—that he spoke of no bodily ablution, but of the state of his *heart* and conduct, is evident from the whole tenor of the Psalm.

By undeserved and sovereign goodness the Israelites were chosen to be the people of God, and their obedience to the Law was never intended *to purchase* immunities or advantages not already theirs. Such an idea is preposterous. No, their obedience simply *preserved* to them the possession of what God had *previously* bestowed. The moral Law made known the character and conduct which He required from His “children” (Deut. 14:1). That it revealed to them their shortcomings and convicted them of their depravity only served to make the spiritually-minded seek more earnestly fresh supplies of grace and be increasingly thankful for the provisionso of mercy supplied for the removal of their sins and maintenance of fellowship with the Lord.

In requiring the guilty Israelite to lay his hand on the head of the sacrificial victim (Lev. 4:24), it was plainly taught that the worshipper could never approach God in any other character than that of *a sinner*, and by no other way than through the shedding of blood. On the annual day of atonement the people were required to “afflict their souls” (Lev. 16:29). The *same* principle is equally applicable under the New Covenant era: the atonement of Christ becomes available to the sinner *only* as he approaches it with heartfelt convictions of sin, and with mingled sorrow and confidence disburdens himself of the whole accumulation of guilt at the foot of the Cross. Repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ must grow and work together in the experience of the soul.

What has been said in the last eight paragraphs is all fairly obvious and simple, for it finds its exact counterpart in the New Testament. Everything connected with the earthly and temporal inheritance of Israel was so ordered as to plainly exhibit those principles by

which God alone confers upon His people the tokens of His favour. God's ways with Israel on earth were designed to disclose the path to Heaven. True obedience is only possible as the effect of sovereign grace in redemption. But grace reigns "through righteousness" (Rom. 5:21), and never at the expense of it, and therefore are the redeemed placed under the Law as their rule of life. It is perfectly true that the Gospel contains far higher examples of the morality enjoined in the Law than any to be found in the Old Testament, and provides much more powerful motives for exercising the same; but that is a very different thing from maintaining that the morality itself is higher or essentially more perfect.

But the real problem confronts us when we consider the relation of the Law to the great masses of *the unregenerate* in Israel. Manifestly it sustained an entirely different relation to *them* than it did to the spiritual remnant. *They*, as the fallen descendants of Adam, were born under the Covenant of Works (i.e. bound by its inexorable requirements), which they, in the person of their federal head, had broken, and therefore they lay under its curse. And the giving of the moral Law at Sinai was well calculated to impress this solemn truth on them, showing that the only way of escape was by availing themselves of the provisions of mercy in the sacrifices—just as the only way for the sinner now to obtain deliverance from the Law's condemnation is for him to flee to Christ. But the spiritual remnant, though under the Law as a rule of life, participated in the mercy contained in the Abrahamic promises, for in all ages God has been *administering* the everlasting Covenant of Grace when dealing with His elect.

This *twofold* application of the Law, as it related to the mass of the unregenerate and the remnant of the regenerate, was significantly intimated in the *double giving* of the Law. The first time Moses received the tables of stone from the hands of the Lord (Exo. 32:15, 16), they were broken by him on the mount—symbolizing the fact that Israel lay under the condemnation of a broken Law. But the second time Moses received the tables (Exo. 34:1), they were deposited in the ark and covered with the mercy-seat (Exo. 40:20), which was sprinkled by the atoning blood (Lev. 16:14)—adumbrating the truth that saints are sheltered (in Christ) from its accusation and penalty. "The Law at Sinai was a covenant of works to all the carnal descendants of Abraham, but a rule of life to the spiritual. Thus, like the pillar of cloud, the law had both a bright and a dark side to it" (Thomas Bell, 1814, "The Covenants").

The predication made by Thomas Bell and others that the Covenant of Works was renewed at Sinai, requires to be carefully qualified. Certainly God *did not* promulgate the Law at Sinai with *the same* end and use as in Eden, so that it was strictly and solely a covenant of works, for the Law was most surely given to Israel with a *gracious* design. It was in order to impress them with a sense of the holiness and justice of Him with whom they had to do, with the spirituality and breadth of the obedience which they owed to Him, and this, for the purpose of convicting them of the multitude and heinousness of their sins, of the utter impossibility of becoming righteous by their own efforts, or escaping from the Divine wrath, except by availing themselves of the provisions of His mercy; thus shutting them up to Christ.

The *double bearing* of the Mosaic law upon the carnal in Israel, and then upon the spiritual seed, was mystically anticipated and adumbrated in the history of Abraham—the progenitor of the one and the spiritual "father" (pattern) of the other. Promise was made to Abraham that he should have a son, yet at first it was not so clearly revealed *by whom* the patriarch was to have issue. Sarah, ten years after the promise, counseled Abraham to

go in to Hagar, that by her she might have children (Gen. 16:3). Thus though by office only a servant, Hagar was (wrongfully) taken into her mistress' place. This prefigured the carnal Jew's perversion of the Siniatic Covenant, putting their trust in the subordinate precept instead of the original promise. Israel followed after righteousness, but did not obtain it, because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law (see Rom. 9:32, 33 and 10:2, 3). They called Abraham their father (John 8:39) yet trusted in Moses (John 5:45). After all his efforts, the legalist can only bring forth an Ishmael—one rejected of God—and not an Isaac!

When Thomas Bell insisted that the Siniatic Covenant *must be* a renewal of the Covenant of Works (though subservient to the Abrahamic) because it was not the Covenant of Grace, and "there is no other," he failed to take into account *the unique* character of the Jewish Theocracy—that it *was* "unique" is clear from this one fact alone, that *all* of Abraham's natural descendants were members of the Theocracy, whereas only the regenerate belong to the Body of Christ. The Siniatic Covenant formally and visibly manifested God's kingdom on earth, for His throne was so established over Israel that Jehovah became known as "*King* in Jeshurun" (Deut. 33:5), and in consequence thereof Israel became *in a political sense* "the people of God," and in *that* character He became "their God." We read of "the Commonwealth (literally 'polity') of Israel" (Eph. 2:12), by which we are to understand its whole civil, religious, and national fabric.

Now that "Commonwealth" was purely a temporal and external one, being an economy "after the law of a carnal commandment" (Heb. 7:16): there was *nothing spiritual*, strictly speaking, about it. It *had* a spiritual meaning when looked at in its *typical* character, but taken in itself, it was merely temporal and earthly. God did not, by the terms of the Siniatic constitution, undertake to write the law on their hearts, as He does now under the New Covenant. As a kingdom or commonwealth, Israel was *a Theocracy*, that is, God Himself *directly* ruled over them. He gave them a complete body of laws, by which they were to regulate all their affairs, law accompanied with promises and threatenings of a temporal kind. Under that constitution, Israel's continued occupation of Canaan, and the enjoyment of their other privileges depended on obedience to their King.

Returning to the questions raised in our first article (June 1936), "Was the Siniatic Covenant a simple or mixed one: did it have only a 'letter' significance pertaining to earthly things, or a 'spirit' as well, pertaining to heavenly things?" This has just been answered in the last two paragraphs; a "letter" only when viewed strictly in connection with Israel *as a Nation*; but a "spirit" also when considered typically of God's people in general. "What specific contribution did it make unto the progressive unfolding of the Divine plan and purpose?" In addition to all that has been said on this point in previous articles, we will now, in closing, answer by pointing out how that further details *of the Everlasting Covenant* which God made with Christ were therein strikingly adumbrated.

First, by making the Siniatic Covenant with the Nation of Israel, the Church of Christ was there prefigured in its *corporate* character. Second, by treating *through Moses* in all his dealings with Israel, God signified that we receive all His blessings through "*the Mediator* of the better covenant" (Heb. 8:6). Third, by first redeeming Israel from Egypt and then placing them under the Law, God intimated that His grace reigns "through righteousness" (Rom. 5:21). Fourth, by taking upon Himself the office of "King" (Deut. 33:5), God showed that He requires implicit submission (obedience) from His people. Fifth, by setting up the tabernacle in Israel's midst, God revealed that place of nearness to Himself

into which He has brought us. Sixth, by the various institutions of the ceremonial law, we learn that “without *holiness* no man shall see the Lord.” Seventh, by bringing Israel into the land of Canaan, God supplied an image of our Heavenly inheritance.—A.W.P.

Experimental Preaching

Our principle object in these articles is, under God, to open the eyes of preachers (to quite a number of whom this magazine is sent) to see the necessity and importance of taking up some of the soul-exercises which occasion so much concern to their most interested hearers, and to offer some suggestions along what lines this may be accomplished. Incidentally, we are endeavouring to make them of interest and profit to the general reader as well. Much skill and spiritual wisdom are required to speak on those subjects which more immediately affect the experience of Christians, and those are acquired only by the anointing of the Spirit and a careful analysis and diagnosis of our own inward life. It is just as requisite for the preacher to make a study of *the human heart*, as to be assiduous in the reading of books, otherwise he will not know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary.

To know what our spiritual state really is, and what our practical acquaintance with Christ actually amounts to is most desirable and profitable, for it arms us against our spiritual enemies, puts a stop to doubting, and causes us to glory in the Lord. But to describe clearly and declare fully the influences and operations of the Spirit within us, as they truly are, is a very difficult task. It is much easier to preach the *doctrine* of grace, than to describe *the effects* of it when applied to the heart of God. It is to those portions of the Word which treat most directly and largely with the exercises of the heart that the preacher should turn, both for guidance and material. Much in the Book of Job and in the Lamentations will afford help; but it is in *the Psalms* more particularly that the Spirit has recorded the varied breathings and traced out the diverse experiences of "the living in Jerusalem."

True Christian experience may be defined as *the teaching of God in the soul*, an inward acquaintance with Divine things. It is a feeling sense of their reality, in contrast from a mere notional and theoretical knowledge of them, so that we know them not "in word only, but also *in power*, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance" (1 Thess. 1:5). It is the Spirit's application of the Truth to the soul, so that what is written in the Word is now inscribed on the heart. This supplies demonstration of what before was intangible and unreal, the Divine verities have become known realities. The soul can now say of God, "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth Thee" (Job 42:5). He knows that God is holy, for he has been made painfully conscious of the exceeding sinfulness of sin; he *knows* that "the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:18), for he has *felt* the same, scorching his own conscience. He knows that He is "the God of all grace," for he has "*tasted* that the Lord is gracious" (1 Peter 2:3).

Christian experience is the teaching of God in the soul and the effects this produces. Those effects may be, broadly, summed up in two words, *pain* and *pleasure*, sorrow and gladness, mourning and rejoicing. The natural world adumbrates the spiritual: as there is a continual alternation between spring and autumn, summer and winter, so there is in the history of the soul. He who gives rain and sunshine, also sends droughts and biting frosts; likewise does He grant fresh supplies of grace and then withhold the same, and also sends grievous afflictions and sore tribulations. Herein is His high sovereignty conspicuously displayed; as there are some lands which enjoy far more sunshine than others, so some of His elect experience more of joy than sorrow; and as there are parts of the earth where there is far more cold than heat, so there are some of God's children who are called on to

suffer more of adversity—both inward and outward—than of prosperity. Unless this be clearly recognized we shall be without the principle key which unlocks the profoundest mysteries of life.

But while there is great diversity in the lot of different Christians, there is an underlying unity. In incidentals there is infinite variety, but in fundamentals there is a real agreement. This may be illustrated by the analogy furnished from the members and groups of the human family. What differences of form, feature, and complexion, distinguishes individuals one from another! Where, out of all mankind, can we find two persons precisely alike? Nevertheless, how much greater is their resemblance than their dissimilarity. Take any man, black or white, red or yellow, and then place him by the side of a horse or cow, and it at once appears that an impassable gulf separates the lowest man from the highest animal. Yet of any two men, taken at random from the remotest nationalities, and their greatest contrast is but as nothing when compared to their general resemblance. The differences are but superficial and on the surface.

Let us now apply the above illustration to the spiritual family of God. Here too there are many variations, yet an underlying oneness; differences of specie, yet but a single genus. Each of the twelve tribes of Israel had its distinctive individuality, yet they formed a single nation. Peter was quite different from Nathanael, and Thomas from John, yet they were equally dear to Christ and equally gave proof they belonged to Him. The differences are patent because they lie on the surface, as freckles and wrinkles are seen on the face; whereas bones and muscles, arteries and nerves—the real stamina of the body—are unseen. Some believers have more faith than others, some more courage, some more gentleness. Some believers have a lighter burden to carry. Allowance must be made for temperament, heredity, environment, privileges, etc.; yet notwithstanding, all have the same cast of spiritual features, speak the same language, evidence the same stock, and stand out as distinct from the unregenerate as men differ from beasts.

“We must not make the experience of others, in *all* respects, a rule to ourselves, nor our own a rule to others; yet these are common mistakes. Though all are exercised at times, yet some pass through the voyage of life much more smoothly than others” (John Newton). Excellent counsel is contained in those words, and some of God’s dear children would be spared many an heartache if they would but heed it. There are some who know the very hour and place where they were first converted, but there are others who cannot even single out the year when their hearts were first really turned to the Lord, and because they cannot, they grieve, and doubt the reality of their conversion. This is very silly, for God does not deal with all of His people in the manner he dealt with the dying thief and Saul of Tarsus. Moreover, the genuineness of conversion is not to be determined by its suddenness or drastic character, but rather by *its lasting effects and fruits*.

“The wind bloweth where it listeth . . . so is every one that is born of the Spirit” (John 3:8). The figure which Christ there employed is very suggestive. Sometimes the wind blows so softly it is almost imperceptible; at other times it comes with hurricane velocity and power. It is so in connection with the new birth. In some cases there is long travail and much hard labour, in others the deliverance is speedy and easy. There is no uniformity in the natural realm; nor is there in the spiritual. If “order” be Heaven’s first law, endless variety and diversity is surely its second. As we have said above, considerable allowance must be made (in our calculation and consideration) of what is termed the “accidentals” of life, though of course there are no accidents in a world where everything

has; been ordained by God. Those reared in a godly home, and who have sat under sound preaching from earliest days, can hardly expect the Spirit's application of the Word to produce so drastic a *conscious* change as those who were comparative strangers of the Truth when God first meets with them.

The same thing is true of the experiences which *follow* conversion. Some long retain their newborn peace and joy, while others quickly come under a cloud and are shut up for years in "doubting castle." It is often due to the lopsided and deficient teaching they sit under, for there are some preachers who, if they do not plainly say so, at least convey the impression that it is sinful for any one to be joyful in this world. There is a class of spiritual dyspeptics who are never happy unless they are miserable, and the influence of such is very chilling upon those who are still enjoying their "first love." But more generally the blame for losing his assurance lies at the young convert's *own door*: failure to separate from worldly companions will grieve the Spirit and cause Him to withhold His witness; while neglect of private prayer and daily feeding on the Word will give the Enemy an advantage which he will be quick to seize.

But even where there *is* a complete break from ungodly companions, and where the means of grace *are* diligently used, the joy of conversion is usually short-lived. Nor is this surprising: deeper discoveries of our depravity must sober those with the most exuberant spirits, and cause groans to mingle with their songs. At conversion sin is only stunned, and not killed, and sooner or later it revives and seeks to recover its lost ground, and gain complete mastery again over the heart. This presents a painful problem to the babe in Christ, for unless he has been previously instructed, he naturally thought he was completely done with sin when he gave himself to the Lord. It was his sincere and deep desire to henceforth live a holy life, and the sight he now obtains of his corruptions, his weakness in the face of temptations, the sad falls he encounters, awaken serious doubts in his heart, and Satan promptly assures him that he has been deceived, that his conversion was not a genuine one after all.

It is at this stage that the distressed and fearing young saint is in need of real help. Alas, only too often he is hindered and stumbles. Some will laugh at his fears and say "to the winds with your doubts." The absurdity of such a course may be exposed by drawing an analogy. What good would it do to jeer at one who has a splitting headache or a raging toothache? Would it afford him any relief to say, You are foolish to harbour the thought that all is not well with you? Or to tell the poor sufferer that he is simply heeding the Devil's suggestions? "Physicians of no value" are all such Job's comforters. They do not understand the malady, nor can they prescribe the remedy; and if we yield ourselves to *their* guidance, being blind themselves, they can but lead us into "the ditch." Beware, my reader, of those who mock at souls in despair.

"Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people" (Isa. 62:10). This word to God's servant is most pertinent to the case we are now considering. To "gather out the stones" from the path of experience of a tried saint is as much a part of the minister's work as it is for him to "lift up a standard." Now that which is stumbling our young convert is the discovery of his (unsuspected) inward corruptions, the power which sin still has over him, and the fact that earnest prayer seems to produce no change for the better. Only one who has himself known these stumbling stones in his own soul is qualified to take them out of the way of others; in fact the preacher knows nothing in reality of any

branch of the Truth, except as he has felt its necessity, suitableness and power in his own experience. We must ourselves be helped of God before we can be of service to His needy people.

It is the preacher's business to point out that corruptions are no evidence of grace, yet that grace manifests corruptions, causes its recipient to strive against them, and groan beneath them. The sighs of a wounded spirit, the cries for deliverance from the ragings of indwelling sin, the sinkings of soul amidst the turbulent waves of depravity, are evidences of spiritual life, and he who sneers at such is a Pharisee, despises a poor publican. Many of God's people are greatly harassed with temptations, frequently buffeted by Satan, and deeply exercised over the workings of sin in their hearts; and for them to learn that this is the common experience of the regenerate strengthens their hope and moves them to renew their struggles against their spiritual foes. It means much to a sorely tried and deeply perplexed Christian to learn that his minister is "*also his brother and companion in tribulation*" (Rev. 1:9).

Much wisdom and grace are needed here if the preacher is to be both faithful and helpful. On the one hand, he must not lower God's standard to his own poor attainments, nor must he give any countenance to failure. Sin in the believer is as vile in God's sight as sin in the unbeliever, and the allowance of it doubly reprehensible, for in the case of a believer it is against more light, fuller knowledge, greater privilege, deeper obligations. Unbelief is not to be pitied, doubtings are not to be condoned, falls are not to be excused. Sin must be frankly confessed to God, failures penitently acknowledged, all that is of the flesh condemned by us. On the other hand, the minister must be much on his guard lest by unnecessary roughness the bruised reed be broken and the smoking flax be quenched. Feeble knees are to be strengthened and not ignored, and the hands which hang down are to be lifted up. Patience, too, must be exercised, for as old heads do not grow on young shoulders, neither are raw recruits as well versed in spiritual warfare as the veterans of Christ's army.

There are some godly ministers who have failed to express themselves consistently with their own actual experience and with that of other holy persons, and thereby the faith and hope of gracious souls are weakened and dismayed, and occasion is given unto unbelief to more completely prevail over them. Perhaps some ministers are fearful that if they speak too plainly and freely about *their own* failures and falls, the impression will be conveyed that Divine grace is an empty expression, rather than a powerful deterrent to sin. But such a fear is quite needless: surely none should hesitate to be as frank as was the Apostle Paul in Romans 7—and none was more jealous of the glory of Divine grace than he! But we suspect that in some instances it is *pride* which dominates, causing the preacher to be ashamed of acknowledging his own vileness, fearful lest his people will cease to look up to him as a spiritual giant.

Here too these are two extremes to be guarded against; whilst we are far from advocating that the preacher should make it a practice of referring to his own spiritual ups and downs in every sermon, yet we are convinced that he has failed in discharging an important branch of his duty if he never makes reference to his own experiences. The servant of God is not only a herald, but *a witness* as well, and how can he feelingly *testify* to the longsuffering of God, unless he affirms that He has exercised infinite patience to such a wretch as *himself*? In like manner, he should bear personal witness to the ceaseless conflict between the two natures in the regenerate, the ragings of sin against grace, the surg-

ings of unbelief against faith, the eclipses of hope by doubtings. True, this should always be done in a spirit of humiliation and self-loathing, never minimizing the sinfulness of sin, and still less glorying in his “putrefying sores.”

There should be a balance preserved between describing how a Christian *ought* to live and how the Christian *does* live—how far short the falls of measuring up to the standard which God has set before him, that “in *many* things we offend *all*” (James 3:2). There should also be a balance preserved between the reproving of failure and a setting forth of the gracious provisions which God has made for the meeting of the same. There must be no hesitation in proclaiming *the sufficiency of Christ* to deal with the most desperate cases, His compassion for the most wretched sufferers, His readiness to hear the feeblest cry which goes up from a penitent heart. The groaning saint is to be exhorted unto cultivating the freest possible dealings with the Friend of publicans and sinners, and assured that He is as ready and willing to minister unto the needy now as when He tabernacled here on earth, for He is “the same yesterday and today and forever” and “His compassions fail not.”

As the young convert, distressed by the discovery of the deceitfulness and desperate wickedness of his heart, is to be informed that *that* is no proof he is still unregenerate, so he is to be told that the ragings of sin within him are no occasion why he should turn away from the Throne of Grace, but rather a reason why he should go boldly thereto, that he may “obtain *mercy*.” While he is to be frequently exhorted unto keeping his heart with all diligence, and the necessity, importance, and method thereof explained to him, he is also to be warned that his most diligent efforts therein will meet with very imperfect success. He is to be instructed that the spiritual warfare to which God has called him, the good fight of faith in which he is to be daily engaged, is a lifelong task, and that *sincerity and faithfulness* therein, rather than victory, is what God requires. The wounds which he receives in this warfare are so many reasons for him to constantly have recourse to the Great Physician.—A.W.P.

The Doctrine of Sanctification.

12. *Its Process.*

When the young believer first realizes the dying love of Christ for him and the amazing grace of God unto him, his heart cries out, What can I do for Him who has done so much for me? The answer is, live to Him and for Him: Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but *yield yourselves unto God*, as those that are alive from the dead” (Rom. 6:13). “The believer is to give himself up to God without any reservation. He is to employ both body and mind in every work that God, by His Word, requires of him. He must decline no labour that God sets before him, no trial to which He calls him, no cross which He lays upon him. He is not to count his life dear to himself, if God demands it of him” (Robert Haldane). We are not our own, but bought with a price. The faculties of our souls and the members of our bodies, which previously were used only for self and to serve sin, are now to be used only for Him.

“Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead” (Rom. 6:13). An adequate development of the truth of vivification and a proper exposition of Romans 6:13 really calls for a detailed consideration of the whole of Romans 6—one of the most important chapters in the New Testament. In the first part of the chapter (vv. 1-10) the Apostle dwells upon the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as God’s provision in grace for lost sinners—His way of meeting the dire need of His people and securing their salvation. The death of Christ exhausted the penalty of sin on the elect, and His resurrection secured their present title and future position of eternal glory. The Son of God incarnate was the Surety of God’s people, making Himself responsible for their debts, undertaking to fulfill all righteousness on their behalf, and putting away their sins by the sacrifice of Himself.

On the Cross Christ met all the demands of Divine justice in reference to the iniquities of His people. In rising again from the dead, “after the power of an endless life,” Christ secured their full discharge, and in that endless life He “liveth unto God” (v. 10)—fulfilling all of God’s will in reference to us, performing all God’s pleasure concerning us, securing all God’s purpose of grace toward us, becoming the Author of eternal salvation to all that obey Him. By revealing to us these wondrous and blessed facts the Holy Spirit has transferred from self all ground of confidence and hope, fixing them upon Christ, and on Him alone. And because of this we are exhorted, “Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 6:11)—account yourselves to be so identified with Christ, so legally one with Him, that *His* death was your death, His resurrection *your* resurrection.

“Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” This is a Divine command, equally binding on *all* believers, at *all* times—in every phase of their experience and under every circumstance. To “reckon” means to act faith on the same, to unquestioningly accept God’s testimony thereto. It is not to be a mere passing influence on the mind when we are undisturbed by active temptations, no mere happy frame of spirit when under a refreshing from the presence of the Lord, but an abiding conviction and assurance. But someone will at once object, Alas, I have the daily evidence that I am *not* dead unto sin, and to ask me to believe that I am, is an impossibility. Ah, God does not ask us to reckon or regard ourselves as being dead unto sin practically, but *judicially so*—dead to its guilt, dead to its condemnation, dead to its penalty, because Christ received the wages of sin on our behalf.

See how God has anticipated and met this very objection here in Romans 6:11. Observe well the word we place in italics: "*Likewise* reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." In verse 10 the Apostle had affirmed that Christ Himself "died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God"; and now the command is "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be," etc. *Like as* Christ died unto sin, so the Christian is (by faith in what God has declared) to reckon himself also "to be dead indeed unto sin"; and, *like as* Christ lives unto God, so is the Christian to consider himself as being alive to God. Now *how* did Christ die unto sin? You say that you cannot believe yourself *to be* dead unto sin while the presence and pollution of it plagues your daily experience. My reader, Christ did *not* die unto sin in *that* sense. No, He never had the coldness, hardness, inconsistency, and failures you complain of; for He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." Christ died as suffering the penalty of it; He died to expiate it, to blot it out of God's sight by His precious blood, and to so blot *you* out of God's sight as one against whom not a single sin can ever be charged.

The general subject of the first half of Romans 6 is the believer's justification or deliverance from the *guilt* of sin; the subject of the second half is the believer's sanctification, or his deliverance from the *power* of sin. The dividing line is verse 11, where we are exhorted to set to our seal that God is true and acts faithfully in our federal union with Christ in His death and resurrection. On *that* foundation we are then bidden to "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof" (v. 12). You have been *judicially* freed from sin: see to it, then, that you are *practically* delivered from its domination. Watch unto prayer, lest ye enter into temptation, for though the spirit be willing, yet the flesh is weak. Settle it in your minds that unless sin be mortified daily in your hearts, it will assert itself and more or less obtain the mastery over your members. Sin is still in you, and if permitted, will reign over you. But remember also there are resources in Christ to help in every difficulty, strength enough to overcome in you, grace enough in Him to be sufficient for you.

"Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (Rom. 6:13). This is the practical response which the believer is required to make unto the amazing grace which God has exercised toward him through Christ. Having been judicially delivered from death when his Surety rose again, having been quickened by the Spirit, he is to act to conduct himself as one who is spiritually alive; he is to *yield himself unto God*. It is very striking to observe the variation of language in the two clauses: "neither yield ye your *members* . . . but yield *yourselves* . . . and your members." The Apostle does *not* say "neither yield ye *yourselves* as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin," for, thank God, *that* is no longer possible—Christ standing at God's right hand prevents the believer yielding *himself* to the service of that from which He has redeemed him. But he can "yield his *members* unto sin"—his thoughts, his impulses, his eyes, his hands, etc. to prevent that, he is to yield himself unto God, that is, unreservedly consecrate himself to His service.

"Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." The general dedication is the ground of the particular outworking of the same. I am God's, and then I use my time and strength for Him. We are to give up ourselves to Him not in part, but in whole; to serve Him with all

our hearts and might. We are to give up ourselves to Him in order to be governed and disposed by Him: to be what He would have us be, and to do what He would have us do; to subject ourselves to His disposing will, and submit ourselves to His commanding will. "Let Him (the Lord) do unto me as seemeth good unto Him" (2 Sam. 15:26) is to be the Christian's attitude; "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" (Acts. 9:6) is to be our readiness to obey. God has given Himself to us in the Person of His Son: the least we can do in return is to give ourselves up to Him, spirit and soul and body.

"But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life" (Rom. 6:22). This order is unchangeable: mortification, vivification, fruitfulness. There is a direct antithesis from what has been said in verses 20, 21: "For when ye were the servants of sin . . . what fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death." In the service of sin is nothing to be had but shame and death; but in the service of God the fruit is holiness, and the issue everlasting life. The more we serve God the more holy shall we be, and the larger will be our capacity for happiness in the life to come. Here, then, is the secret and essence of practical sanctification: the measure in which we really yield ourselves to God, is the measure in which we shall be fruitful and pleasing to Him. Obedience carries its own reward it itself, for holiness is the same in the soul as health is in the body.

Vivification, or living unto God, is a miraculous change of the heart by Divine grace, and then the acting out of that grace which was received at regeneration. They that have received grace are not to sit down in idle contentment, but see to it what remains of their earthly existence be entirely yielded up to God. As the first act of faith is a surrendering of ourselves unto God in Christ (2 Cor. 8:5), so a life of faith consists in a continued devotedness unto God. We began by receiving Christ as Lord (Col. 2:6), and we are to continue in the exercise of entire dependence on Him in all His offices: His prophetic to enlighten us, His priestly to intercede for us, His kingly to rule over us. God's Law is our rule; and we delight in it after the inward man. Experimental sanctification is a deliverance from the tyranny of sin into a life of righteousness: begun at regeneration, continued by mortification and vivification, completed at glorification.

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1). Under the Law those beasts which were offered to God were first separated from a common use—singled out from the flock or herd for this specific purpose; so the Christian has been called out from the world, and is no more to live unto himself—"For the time *past* of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles" (1 Peter 4:3). Then those animals were solemnly offered to God in sacrifice. In like manner, the Christian is to dedicate himself to the service of the Lord; to love, live unto, and glorify Him: "As ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness" (Rom. 6:19). The Christian is to walk in newness of life, delighting himself in God, seeking to please Him in all things, being completely submissive to His will.

Vivification or living unto God was, by many of the older writers, called "new obedience," in reference to that obedience which God requires from His people according to the tenor of the *new* covenant. The rule of our *performance* of this obedience is the revealed will of God, but the rule of its *acceptance* is its sincerity and impartiality. Because

God does *not* yet (in this life) renew us *perfectly* to His image—leaving in us a contrary principle—He accepts an imperfect obedience, namely, an obedience which is rendered to Him in all known instances of duty, and sincere in the manner of its performance. It is not that a lower and inferior righteousness answers the ends of God's glory under the new covenant than was the case under the old, but that our evangelical obedience does not hold the same *place* which obedience did under the (Adamic) Covenant of Works. Under the former our obedience would have been our righteousness, absolutely, before God, whereby we should have been justified in His sight; but *that* place is now filled by the obedience of Christ, our Mediator.

God has appointed this evangelical obedience (which is required by the new covenant), as the means whereby we show our subjection to Him, our dependence upon Him, our fruitfulness and thankfulness unto Him, and as the only way of converse and intercourse with Him. It is by our submission, service, and devotedness unto God, that we improve the effects of His love unto us, the benefits of Christ's mediation, and whereby we glorify Him in this world. Vivification, then, is the living of a holy life unto God, constrained by the love of Christ, regulated by the Divine commands. In the *outworking* of vivification, the Christian is no longer greedy to catch at every opportunity of pleasure and profit in worldly concerns, caring not *how* he obtains them; but is occupied with God's will for him, and is careful to follow it out, so that he may be "filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God" (Phil. 1:11).

The title which God has unto unreserved and hearty obedience from His people is an indubitable one, and it is one which He presses upon us in His Word again and again: "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price: *therefore* glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are *God's*" (1 Cor. 6:19, 20). We belong to God first of all by predestination: He chose us for Himself, as His portion and heritage, and therefore it should be our chief concern to give Him pleasure. Second, we belong to God by creation: we are the work of His hands, and therefore it should be our deepest desire to be vessels unto His honour. Third, we belong to God by redemption: we are His purchased property: the right of personal ownership is His, and our responsibility is to be used in His service. Fourth, we belong to Him by regeneration, whereby He has made us His children, and the Father has an unqualified right to demand loving obedience from His offspring. Finally, we belong to Him by consecration: this is a voluntary act whereby we have dedicated ourselves to Him.

There is nothing so pleasant, honourable, or profitable, as living unto God, having communion with Him in the path of obedience. Pleasant it certainly is to the renewed soul, for just so far as we are subject to God's will, are we in harmony with Him. Nothing so breeds serenity of mind, peace of conscience, assurance of God's favour, as when we are engaged in those things which are pleasing in His sight. All the unhappiness there is in the world is the outcome of sin, and therefore, the further we keep from sin, the more shall we discover the secret of true happiness. "The work (fruit) of righteous (right-doing) shall be peace" (Isa. 32:17). When our animal spirits keep their due proportion and temperature, cheerfulness and health of body ensues; and when the faculties of the soul are regulated by holiness, spiritual health is secured. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace" (Prov. 3:17).

Nothing is more *honourable* than to be a dutiful servant of God. "The righteous is more excellent than his neighbour" (Prov. 12:26). The judgment of the unregenerate is darkened by sin and blinded by Satan, and therefore they suppose it to be a weak and mean thing to be godly. And, on the contrary, imagine it is a sort of excellency to be free from the restraints of piety, and to live a life of pomp and ease, without any care of the life to come. The deluded worldling has no esteem for a pious man and prizes only that which is carnal and transient. But the things which are highly esteemed among men are abominations in the sight of God (Luke 16:15), whereas the things they despise He regards as of great price (1 Peter 3:4). Since God is the sum of all excellency, they are most excellent who approximate the closest to His likeness. If honour be derived from the real fount of honour, then those who are the most Godlike are the most honourable, the "excellent" of the earth (Psa. 16:3).

Nothing is more *profitable* than to live in subjection to God, for it gaineth His favour and fellowship for the present, and makes way for an everlasting fruition of Him in glory. What an unprofitable drudgery is the life of an unsanctified worldling in comparison with that of a holy man who waits upon God and has access of welcome unto Him. "It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in princes" (Psa. 118:9). The princes of earth are very uncertain and fickle, but God changes not. The poorest Christian is never denied an audience at the Throne of Grace, never upbraided for seeking mercy, never reproached for the frequency of his appeals. What can bring greater blessing to the soul than daily attendance upon the King of kings: the heart engaged in loving Him, the tongue in praising Him, the life in serving Him! This is to secure a foretaste of the pleasures and joys that await us on High: it is Heaven begun on earth: it is to enjoy the smiles and approbation of Him who delighteth in the righteous.

What considerations are these to stir us up unto vivification! How they should persuade us to make our devotedness to God more evident! First, by manifesting the change itself: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. 5:17), and then by our increase in the same: "Ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, so ye would *abound more and more*" (1 Thess. 4:1). It is not an indifferent thing whether we be eminent in obedience or no; God makes a great matter of it, as appears from His injunctions: "Thou hast commanded us to keep Thy precepts diligently" (Psa. 119:4); as also by His promises: "O that there were such a heart in them, that they would fear Me, and keep all My commandments always, that it might be *well with them*" (Deut. 5:29). By our obedience Christ is glorified, grace is magnified, and God is gratified. By our obedience we are preserved from the paths of the destroyer, kept from placing a stumbling-block before our fellows, and prevented from ruining our testimony.

Vivification or living unto God is the same thing as being conformed unto the image of His Son, or emulating the example which Christ has left us: "He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk, even as He walked" (1 John 2:6). Christ is a pattern unto us in His graces, His states, and in the special acts of His mediation. None so perfectly exemplified the graces of faith, patience, humility, self-denial, and obedience, and therefore did He say, "Take My yoke upon you, and *learn of Me*" (Matt. 11:29). The states through which Christ passed were those of humiliation and exaltation, and the members follow their Head, in first suffering and then entering into the glory (Rom. 8:17). The special acts of Christ's mediation were His death and resurrection, and to these also we are to be conformed (Phil. 3:10, 11). Experimental sanctification, then, consists

in *Christlikeness*. This, however, is of such importance that we ask the reader to turn, in this connection, to our article upon "Christ our Exemplar."—D.V. in the July or August issue.—A.W.P.

The Providence of God.

Rahab: Joshua 2

What a lucky chance! What an instance of providential direction! What brought the spies to the house of Rahab? They came not by invitation. They came not by previous acquaintance, or information, with respect to her faith and friendship towards Israel. Among all the houses of Jericho, why did they happen to lodge with Rahab? It has been uselessly, as well as foolishly, attempted to be proved that she had not been an harlot, but the keeper of a house of entertainment. There is no evidence that she kept a house of general entertainment at all. But were this even in evidence, why did the spies happen to lodge in *this* house, rather than in any other of the same kind? Rahab was the only believer in Jericho! Why was there one believer found in Jericho? The Lord in His Providence has need of Rahab's services. He took out of Jericho just what served His purpose. But could not Jehovah have performed His will without Rahab? Doubtless He could; but He chose to act by means, and by the means of His people, and in this case by a Gentile believer, as a figure of the calling of the Gentiles to the blessings of God's true Israel.

The king of Jericho is informed that Israelite spies were in the country—in the city—in the very house of Rahab. Could not the watchful Providence of God have prevented this? Could not the over-ruling power of Jehovah have kept it secret from the king of Jericho that spies were in the country—in the city—in the house of Rahab? Did Providence in this instance fight against itself? If we see the hand of Providence for Israel in the faith of Rahab, may not our enemies claim a similar Providence in manifesting the fact to the king of Jericho? Such manifestation was God's purpose, and for God's glory, as well as the eventual success of the spies. It tried the faith of Rahab. It proved her faith and her ignorance of duty. It showed an important truth: that God's people often glorify Him by their obedience, while in that very obedience there is sinful weakness. Rahab's faith and hiding of the spies are approved by God; her lying was the result of ignorance of duty or weakness of faith. There need not any singular defense be set up for Rahab. Every Christian needs a similar defense in many instances. Who is it that is perfect in the knowledge of the revealed will of God? Who is it, then, who commits not sins from ignorance of duty?

Rahab hides the spies and denies that they are in the house. But the danger is not over. Why does this lie succeed? Why did the king's messengers take her word? They should have died for their negligence. They should have searched every corner of the house. Would the police of any city, on such information, take the word of the most respectable house-holder? The thing was of God, and the cautious are negligent, or forgetful, when it is God's purpose to keep them from succeeding. The messengers are deceived by Rahab, and go in pursuit where the prey is not to be found. The stalks of flax would have been no cover, had it been God's purpose to reveal. Who can hide when God would make manifest? Who can discover what God would conceal? Who is it that may not see the work of Providence of the Lord in the history of this matter?

Adonibezek: Judges 1:6

“But Adonibezek fled; and they pursued after him, and caught him, and cut off his thumbs and his great toes” (Judg. 1:6) Cruel, cruel, cruel! It may be so; but it is of God. And in this point of view, it is right. The Ruler of the world in this affair executes an awful *retribution*. And He does it in the way of His *Providence*. There is no account of a

command to punish in this way on this occasion. There is no evidence that the Israelites knew that Adonibezek had punished in this manner the kings whom he had conquered. There is no evidence that they intended this punishment to be retributive. What, then, suggested the manner of punishment to them in this instance? Whatever it was, the Providence of the Lord secured its accomplishment. The tyrant himself confesses not only the justice of his punishment, but acknowledges that it was a retribution overruled by God.

“And Adonibezek said, Threescore and ten kings, having their thumbs and their great toes cut off, gathered their meat under my table: as I have done, so God hath requited me” (v. 7). Hear this, ye foolish wise men. Hear the testimony of one of the kings of ancient Canaan. Here are the heathen recognizing the Providence of God in the manner of his punishment, while ye see no Providence but as the effect of general laws. Your ignorance is below heathen ignorance. It is brutish. It would blaspheme the light of heathenism to say that it was heathenish. Of all men living there are no such enemies of the Divine character, as those who profess to fathom the nature of God, and determine a bound to His conduct. All the wisdom of philosophers could not discover how God could do this, while, at the same time, it was the uncommanded act of the Israelites. And that for which they cannot account, they will, in the presumption of their ignorance, boldly deny. As they cannot see the way in which God can do such things, they will solve the matter by explaining it as if it were merely permitted or foreseen by God. But neither permission nor foreknowledge can warrant a thing to be ascribed to God, as His doing. I might permit or foreknow with the utmost certainty, what I could in no sense be said to do. Here, then, I may be asked, can God be said to *do* such things? Were I to attempt an answer to such questions, I would be as presumptuous as the inquirer. God tells me in His Holy Writ that *He* doth such things. He tells me also that *men* do such things. I believe both assertions, though I cannot make the smallest approach to reconcile them. Does not God tell me in His Word that, “His ways are past finding out”? If we could fathom all the ways of God, the Scriptures could not be His Word.—(A. Carson)

A Prayer.

O my God and Father! my heart is naked and open to Thee. Thou knowest the secrets of it. Thou seest how fervently I pray for the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit. My prayer comes from a feeling sense of my want of Him, and from a dependence on Thy promise to give the Spirit to them that ask for Him. Lord! I ask. Grant me to be strengthened by Him with every needful gift and grace in the inner man. Send Him to manifest plainer and plainer my union with Christ, in order to my keeping up communion with Him, that, having Him dwelling in my heart by faith, I may be established in the experience of Thy love to me in Him. (W. Romaine)