

# COLLECTED WRITINGS OF J.N. DARBY CRITICAL 1

by J.N. Darby

---

*A collection of articles and writings by J.N. Darby from Collected Writings of J.N. Darby Critical 1, covering various biblical topics and Christian teaching.*

46 Chapters

## Table of Contents

0. Collected Writings of J.N. Darby Critical 1
1. Two Letters on the Greek Aorist in Translating the New Testament
2. The Greek Aorist
3. The Sinai MS and Tischendorf's English New Testament
4. Is It "Washing" or "Laver" in Ephesians 5:26?
5. Heads of Psalms
6. Psalm 68
7. Form of Prayer
8. Difference of Καὶνός and Νεός: "Young" or "New"
9. Difference of Greek Propositions
10. Additional Notes on the Greek Article
11. Likeness and Image
12. A Letter on the Sprinkling of Blood
13. Exodus 20
14. The Third and Seventh Days
15. The Basket of Firstfruits
16. Ananias and Sapphira
17. Preface to the Vevay New Testament, 1859
18. The Antichrist, Properly so Called
19. On Haggai 2:5-9
20. Scriptural Criticisms
21. The Sermon on the Mount
22. The Church of Christ
23. Washed, Sanctified
24. Mark 11:24
25. Preface to the German Testament
26. Suffering in the Flesh
27. Luke 21 Compared With Matthew 24
28. On the Greek Article
29. Sanctification and Justification
30. The Force of "the Last Day" in John 6
31. John 15:7, 16
32. Greek Particles and Prepositions
33. The Bearing of Romans 5:12-21
34. Breaking of Bread
35. The Allusion in "the Last Trump"
36. John 6:51 and 2 Corinthians 3:18
37. Ephesians 1:9
38. The Dispensation of the Fullness of Times

39. Brief Hints on the Greek Article
40. Angels and the Law
41. On Colossians 1:19
42. 2 Thessalonians 3
43. Rightly Dividing the Word
44. Obedience and Sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ
45. The Similarity of Jude and One Part of 2 Peter

## Collected Writings of J.N. Darby Critical 1

---

## Two Letters on the Greek Aorist in Translating the New Testament

---

My dear Brother,

Mere grammar will not do without the *usus loquendi*; nor do languages answer to one another in their habit of thought. I had purposely put "has," "have," etc., where aorists are, very often, and as yet I think I am right. I have seen ----'s book, not read it through; but it is grammar, not Greek. Take **■στα■ρωσαν**, (Gal. 5:24.) as an example: he spoils the whole matter by his principle. The aorist means very often the future, as no one can doubt. Again, in many cases the imperative aorist has a sense impossible to give in English. The present is Do, or Do not, something now; the aorist, Do not be in the state of one who has done it. Perhaps I express it imperfectly, but it is the idea. The aorist is of no time; but we have not properly a tense with no time. Hence we must put the aorist often into a time tense in English, future, historic, or what is called perfect; but the Greek perfect is much more defined than the English—more distinctly the subsistence of what has been done. A Christian "crucified the flesh" is not a present continuance, and indeed has no sense. It is about some Christian somewhere. It is more the French perfect. Je fus **■** Paris. They that are Christ's crucified the flesh. What does that mean? I repeat, there is no aorist in English. In the participle you must often say "having." It is in fact with undetermined time; which, where it is instant, may be translated present; when consequent on another, must be future in English, and when it is not simply a past historical fact, in the air, but, brought into present bearing and relationship, must be "has." **■υνεστα■ρωμαι** "was and am"; **■στα■ρωσαν**, "they have" done it. In John 15:6, the sense is future, but, as it is a constant fact, present would serve in English, a certain fact is looked at as a fact, so James 1:2; but there are cases where you must in English translate in the future. In Mark 10:3, 4, I prefer "has," because it is a present obligation; but in the two last you must make it present-habitual without time. In Matt. 10:4, **■ κα■ παραδο■ξ α■τ■ν** is mere description, and one can say, in English, who also betrayed Him; but we say it in English because it is past now or supposed so to be. Nor do I think that the aorist means simply a future as such; but there are cases where in English, we must put a future, because English cannot always abstract and put it in no time.

So it is of the present participle with an article, Matt. 2:20, **ο■ ζητο■ντες**, "the seekers": we must say, who sought. They were not seeking then, for they were dead.

In page 15 (2 Cor. 5:14) the Authorized Version gives the right sense but freely, the "five" no sense at all. All died because Christ died; and it is not all believers, for those who live are distinguished; but I question if he be not right as to the **τ■**, verse 15, applying to both. But I have not had time to examine it. Died, as to Christ, is an historical fact, one died: so rightly. **■π■θανον** is a consequence. Perhaps "had died" were better than "have." I cannot say, judging this is an historical fact in itself.

I think in result the making the aorist a mere historical fact, as "crucified," a great mistake in grammar and in intelligence.

I cannot at this moment give you an example where, in English, the aorist must be given as a future, but I met one the other day. I am glad, I trust, to learn anything and willing to learn from anybody. But my critics, amongst them, have not as yet convinced me. In looking over John and pan of Matt. 1 have put out " has " in one case and put it in in another.

As to James 4:5, I cannot see it now, but I have found it so difficult that I shall be glad of light from anyone; weigh it I did, but never was satisfied. Forgive haste.

Your affectionate brother in Christ.

Dear-----,

----- had proposed to me to do what you suggest. I have no objection. Since this question was raised, I have paid attention as I passed along preparing for the new edition of the New Testament; and it is clear to me it is wholly impossible to make an English aorist which has no time. It may be very often translated as an historical tense, and here I have often hesitated between the historical tense and the auxiliary verb. In the passive form it is often impossible to use either. Sometimes the perfect future, " will have," may serve. But see in Matt. 24:2 **■φεθ■**: still it is the aorist. But the English looks at it from the time of the speaker. It may be alleged that a prophecy looks at fulfillment as already there; but you must say " there shall not be left one stone upon another." When another event is named or supposed, it is imperfect in its sense, and so has to be expressed. Very often, as I have said, the historical sense is in the participle; in English, you must put the perfect form or present; " having called " (or " calling ") the disciples, he said to them. In the imperative I have no doubt there is a difference of sense; but how to be expressed in English? " If thy hand offend thee, cut it off," is an aorist; have it cut off, have it in that state, not properly do it. This is very common: so of the eye, " pluck it out and cast it from thee." In English, present and aorist are alike, **το■το ■λον γ■γονεν** " took place." There is a perfect which in English must be made what they call an aorist, because it is historical.

Take Matt. 1:24, 25; you have a row of tenses where the imperfect becomes historic: no doubt in Greek it is habitual in sense, but in English must be historic or aorist. In chapter 2: 2 " we have seen " is far better in English than the historic tense " saw." Then you get a whole string where it is historical, as to which English uses imperfect or aorist, " saw," " came," etc., in verse 2 **■λθομεν** is " have " or " are come." If I say " came," it is a history of what had happened before. In the passive, nothing at all answers in English to aorist. Chapter 2:16, " was mocked," " had been mocked "; so verse 17, **■πληρ■θη** " then was " is imperfect; so verse 18 **■κο■σθη**. What tense in English is verse 19, **τελευτ■σαντος**? But the grammarians say it is used. Thus Jelf. The aorist, in all the moods except the indicative and the participle, is usually expressed in Latin and English in the present, etc. And the consequences of aorist are often supposed to continue (that is, where it is not merely historic), and then we must say " has," or the like. So with participles of time, " when," etc., he says, as I have already said, it has the sense of futurum exactum. John 18:24 it is pluperfect, which is very common. In John 15:6 it is present or future. Luke 1:1: it is far better as " have." In Mark 3:21 **■ξ■στη**, it is perfect, or present; " he has gone out of his mind," or " is beside himself." So in infinitives (and imperfect) it has no past sense, as here **κρατ■σαι**. In Mark 3:26 **■ν■στη**, " have," or " be," or " rise up," **στ■ναι** in English present. I have no doubt to a Greek mind there is a difference, and, when I read Greek, I feel it. The mistake is in thinking that we have an aorist.

I repeat, habitually the historical tense answers to it. " He saw," " went," " came," but when? The rest of the sentence requires to an English mind a time: we English are obliged to give it. Nor do I see that it is in this sense less future than perfect or pluperfect. It is never any of them really; it is the rest of the sentence attaches its time force to the undefined fact of existence which the aorist expresses. In general in English we date grammatical time from our speaking, pluperfect, imperfect, future perfect (exactum), from some other noticed event. These always refer to, and compare the act as to time with some other stated or supposed fact. " He was doing it when," etc. He had done it already then. " He will have been at Rome three weeks to-morrow." This seems to me the secret of so-called tenses in Hebrew. They think from the first fact mentioned, " he went and ate," " ate " goes into so-called future, because it is after " went," and then a Vau conversive: only it goes out into details. All, save as excepted, apply time to present time of speaking.

Excuse such a long grammatical disquisition, but it is in reply to your suggestion as to the elements of the case. At any rate, you will see that, though more instinctively than from grammatical research, it has not been overlooked; and the researches made did not find me without a judgment, though of course I may have failed in applying it, and in some cases have much hesitated. But the sense is different. " We saw his star in the east and came," is historical of the past; we " have run " is a fact (and much more an aorist than " saw," though the fact of " having seen " cannot cease, and so far hence perfect). Then you must say " and have," or " are come," and it is really a present, even if I say " have "; and " have " and " are " are the same-both perfects in Greek. You will find, let me add, the tenses, aorist or future or perfect, interchanged in the same sentence. For this reason the mind may define more naturally or purposely.

Ever yours sincerely in the Lord,

J. N. D.

I should fear a little for use a perpetual marginal calling in question of text.

## The Greek Aorist

---

As many are very much occupied with the Greek aorist just now, allow me to suggest some thoughts as to it. As to Greek scholarship I should yield the palm to anyone, I may say, who has made it especially his study, though conversant with the language, as one may be who for years had laid it aside for other occupations, and has only resumed it for the study of the New Testament. But when the question is one of translation, the power of a second language has also to be settled, and its forms may not exactly answer to those of Greek. Still there are certain conditions of human thought which are the same in all languages, because all languages are the expression, as such, of the human mind. I do not speak of the effect of inspiration on them, but merely of the vehicle of thought in itself. But this shows that metaphysical analysis has its part as well as the empiricism of particular grammars. I shall confine myself to English, unless any particular suggestion may offer itself.

I shall begin by stating, what may seem very paradoxical, that tenses have nothing to do with time properly speaking. Verbs, and still more accurately participles, refer not to objects, that is, to nouns, but to acts (voices I do not speak of here).

There are only two tenses, as there are two participles: one is accomplishing an act; the other views the act as accomplished. " I dine," that is accomplishing; " I dined," here the act is viewed as accomplished. " I dine every day in the year at three o'clock," that is the accomplishing of the act, and in so far present, that is, viewed as present; the time is expressed by every day in the year, each viewed as present, but, in fact, many not yet come. But " I dine " is a real aorist, only an aorist of accomplishing, not of what is accomplished. When I say " I dined," the act is viewed as accomplished. But it relates the act as such, the mere act is accomplished; and if I can put my mind into the position of viewing it as accomplished in the mind's eye, a future act as to time will take this form. I take an example which Howell cites as to this question. " He told me he was sent by his principals to Paris, and returned next week." Now, " returned " is de facto at a future time, next week. But the mind views the arrangement as one whole in the mind, and so accomplished. The moment you get into the historical form, not in a mental view of a whole looked at as a plan, and so existing complete in the mind, you must put the present or future. " He was sent by his principals to Paris, and returns," if vividly presented, or " will return," if prosaically stated, " next week." But when I look at it as a whole in his plan, the act is looked at as in that accomplished, and I say " returned." The nature of the time remains the same.

Further, there is no real future tense, because there nothing is accomplishing or accomplished, or it could not be future. Hence I can affirm no act accomplishing or accomplished. What does the mind do? It takes the pure verb which represents the act simply as an act, " dine," and puts present purpose before it. " I will " (that is present will) " dine with you to-morrow "; the verb is present, a thing accomplishing, " I will." Philologists tell us that in other languages terminations were originally words, but I confine myself to English now. In Greek it seems evident that change of form is used for the tenses, auxiliary verbs being occasionally used, besides the case of the

pluperfect.

Participles give very definitively the accomplishing and the accomplished act; " dining," " dined." This, with the auxiliary verbs, gives great accuracy of expression-" I am dining," " I have dined." The former is an exact present; whereas " I dine," being merely the accomplishing, the act may apply to any time at which the mind realizes the act. It is an aorist present. But in the exact present the verb is not the act but the participle, " dining." The verb is simply the expression of the present existence of the act. Not that " am " by itself expresses time but existence; yet if the accomplishing is in existence, it is of course present. I say, " I am a man." That is not time, but " what "; only it must not have ceased to be, because existence is stated. And in the highest of all expressions it is in contrast with time-" I am." The other auxiliary verb, which must be the main object of inquiry, is " I have." This too has two tenses, " have," " had "; one possession now, the other possession past; the present, as usual, is the fact, not time: only it has not ceased to exist to the mind, as " I have a book." But I can use this too for all times, provided it be viewed in the mind as going on. " I have breakfast every day at nine o'clock." But it is used, though a present, with a past participle, which gives a very logical definite force to it in English. " I have written a letter." The participle views the thing as done, the letter is written. " I have " affirms present realization of the fact. Hence, in English, it has a moral force, not historical, not properly referring to time, though to a thing done, not doing or to be done. That man " has stolen." This is not historical. For that I should say " That man' stole' my watch." It is characteristic of the man. " You have beaten your brother." " I have not; I never touched him." " I have not" is denial of the fact morally; " I never touched " is historical.

Therefore we say, " I wrote it yesterday," not "I have written." We say simply " I have written a letter." Hence it may be used for the Greek perfect, where the participle can be applied mentally to a subsisting effect. " He has taken the city," historically as a fact. I say, " He took the city, but lost it again the next week." " Took " is merely the accomplished fact, " taken 'é is a past fact, " has " present possession of the fact. But it is by no means in English a Greek perfect always, that is, a past fact continuing. It is often a fact in itself wholly past, but realized morally as a present thing. " I have written to you in this article on the subject of the aorist "; in Greek, ■γραψα; in English, " have written "; because, though the writing be done once for all, an accomplished fact, it is treated morally as a present thing between my reader and me. " I have "; here the Greek aorist must be translated by what people are pleased to call a perfect. If I say " I wrote," present realization is gone. It is the revelation of the past fact, but present realization is not necessarily a Greek perfect. It may, and very often is, an aorist in Greek. When I read the New Testament, I may throw it back into historical fact naturally enough. But often we lose thus the power of it, because the writer is treating the matter as a morally present subject of consideration between him and those written to; yet the aorist may and very often is used.

Thus in " I have prayed for thee," ■δε■θην, " I prayed for thee " (which people want us to use for aorist) gives no right sense at all. " Prayed " is past, but the Lord is using it as a present matter between the apostle and himself. " I have transferred these things in a figure," μετεσχημ■τισα. (1 Cor. 4:6.) " I have espoused you," ■ρμωσ■μην. Where it is an actual continuing act, it is perfect. " I have used none of these things," κ■χρημαι, he still was not using them (1 Cor. 9:15); but in the same sentence, " neither have I written," ο■κ ■γραψα. " Neither wrote I " would falsify the sense. In some cases one may hesitate: thus, 2 Cor. 11:7, ■πο■ησα, ε■ηγγελισ■μην. It may be taken historically (aorist, so called), or as present realization in the mind, of an accomplished fact: "

Committed I sin?" announced the glad tidings "; or, as a present question as to a past fact: " Have I committed sin? " "I have announced freely." It is a matter of discernment as to what the writer means, not of Greek tenses. But in a multitude of cases the use of the historical tense in English for the aorist falsifies the sense. First, the application of rules for Greek tenses (often a matter of the writer's feeling at the moment) to English grammar (as if the tenses were the same) leads all wrong; and, secondly, the force of English tenses has not been clearly seen, (of which I am satisfied there are but two, but which from the use of auxiliaries with participles acquire a peculiar force) has not been really analyzed, when Greek aorists are pretended to be represented by them.

How far this is connected with so-called tenses in Hebrew, where it is known there are only two, I leave to further investigation. The rules for the use of Vau conversive seem to me strangely vague and unsatisfactory. Try it with Psa. 18, and see what you can make of it.

I have taken the Greek examples merely as they occurred. Hundreds of other examples, perhaps stronger ones, may be found. When it is a present moral question, " have " is better than the so-called aorist, though the fact be simply past fact. The question is, Is it treated morally or historically in the mind? " I have written to him twenty times " has not the same shade of meaning as " I wrote to him twenty times." The latter in strict use would require a note of time. " I wrote to him twenty times last year, and I never got an answer." " I have written to him twenty times, and he has never answered me, " is the moral fact. " Written " is past; but " have " makes it morally present. I may say ' 'I wrote to him twenty times, I have never got an answer." " Wrote " is the historical fact; " have never got " is a moral view of what he has done, present with me.

## The Sinai MS and Tischendorf's English New Testament

---

My dear Brother,

As many are now interested in such researches through the recovery of the God. Sin., I send you a word upon it. It has naturally been a pet child of Tischendorf's, as he found it, and no one can question its value as a witness of importance. But it seems to me, as far as I have examined it, that it is overrated. The Vatican MS is much more correctly written, and in every respect it seems to me superior. There is a considerable number of serious mistakes and omissions in God. Sin. I do not know whether I have been more observant from having remarked this somewhat in the synoptical Gospels; but it is particularly faulty in John, or at any rate I have observed the faults. It agrees in a good many readings with D, when D has been alone. The variations in ο■v, δ■, κα■ are innumerable, but it may be right here; so in the presence and absence of ■ before proper names. But there are many readings which are clearly wrong. Its family is the same as B, still B stands alone. Of all MSS, for beauty and correctness the Dublin one is the best: I found but one fault in it. It agrees with ■ and B in character, but is superior to both. Whether all its readings be correct is another question. But according to this family it is the first in correctness. ■ very often agrees with Vercel. among the Latins. I would mention another fact: Brixianus as a rule always agrees with the ordinary modern text, as A in the Gospels. I do not pretend to account for this and other facts connected with the history of the text as one learned in such matters; but I thought the facts I have observed might be interesting to some of your readers.

As many have been disposed to think they could judge of the text by Tischendorf's publication in English, let me add that, much as we are indebted, as everyone knows, to Tischendorf for his diligent and careful labors (which I should be the first to acknowledge), this publication seems to me an unhappy one. We have the text according to that ordinarily received (T. R.), and then three ancient MSS to throw doubt on all and decide nothing. Ordinary facts, such as A being not Alexandrian in the Gospels, are of course unknown to ordinary readers, who are then in uncertainty without resource. Now while the most ancient MSS will as a general rule have the most weight, and where A and B agree (in the Gospels) go far to decide a question, yet the simple fact of diplomatic or documentary evidence cannot decide everything. Some of the MSS which exist were made before so large a destruction of Bibles took place in the last persecution, and versions earlier than any come in as a check on MSS. There is nothing to make any serious person uneasy as to the text, but it is laborious care, not rapid decision, which secures what is right. When I find such facts as this—two leaves torn out of Veronensis—a translation made in the second century, and a MS as early perhaps as any we have, so that what precedes is lost too—in order to take away John 8:1-11; gaps left in others designedly, and Augustine telling us of copies of little credit leaving out for the sake of morality—these documentary evidences do not suffice to show it an interpolation. So in the end of Mark it will be found that Matthew takes the disciples to Galilee, and there is no ascension; Luke on the other hand gives the ascension, the Lord leading them out to Bethany—introducing two distinct and important characters of Christ's connection with His disciples. Now Mark up to the end of verse 8 gives us the view found in Matthew; from verse 9 to the end the

heavenly associations of Christ with His disciples. I am not prepared to say as to the history of the text how this was so arranged, nor do I (to say the truth) find that others can; nor do I blame them. But while MS authority must be our main resource, no one can deny that tendencies that vitiated the text were as early as any MS, and such we have to watch. God. Sin. is in one place evidently changed to avoid a question as to the Virgin Mary's having had other children. Let not the simple reader be dismayed at this: other MSS are a counter check; and while there is the imperfection of copyists, there is not the uncertainty which many would gladly say there is, and which the absence of research would lead persons to fancy.

J. N. D.

## Is It "Washing" or "Laver" in Ephesians 5:26?

The great general lexicographers, from H. Stephens to Liddell and Scott, give not only "laver" but "bath," and hence washing and even water for bathing or washing. See the amplest proof in classic Greek given by Passow, Rost, Palm, etc. So Schleusner, Wahl, and Rose's "Parkhurst," among those devoted to the Greek New Testament. Indeed the LXX use in general a different word (λουτρός) for a laver, and λουτρον for washing, as in Cant. 4:2; 6:5. So the Apocryphal Sirax or Ecclesiastic. 31:25. (Ed. Tisch., 1850, vol. 2, p. 195.) Further, λουτρον was used for the bath as a place for washing, λουτρον or λοτριον for the water rendered impure by bathing. See Scapula, Hederic, etc. Hence the English version is thoroughly justified, instead of its being "a meaning the word never has." It is generally, says Pape, cleansing, washing away of filth, abwaschen, abspülen. It may take, as a secondary meaning, the bath itself, as the word "bath" does in English. But it means applying the water, not the vessel. It is used often by the fathers for baptism, but even there in the same sense (κλυστρον, says Gregory Nazianzen). Indeed so far from being or alluding to a vessel, it is not likely a vessel was ever used in scriptural times. At any rate, Dean Alford's statement is quite unfounded. Titus 3 refers to baptism, but to washing, not to a font. A. says, See Lexx.; but the Lexx. give bath, water for washing or bathing, the act of washing, and even drink-offerings. It is not the bath properly as a place, but the bathing; and hence we have λουτρο θερμ and ψυχρο, λουτρο κεανο, and λουτρο φαινμενα π τς γς, etc. So the λουτροφορος used to bring the water, not the bath as a vessel.

Next, while it may be right to connect τρον with the verb or the participle, we must necessarily connect τρον λ. Το δατος too, and τρον becomes characteristic of the cleansing by the washing of the water. Thus this is the instrument of cleansing, and its true character is τρονμα. Neither of the constructions said to be required in this case is called for in the least degree. Τρον τρον would be utterly out of place; τρον τρον would be nonsense; but τρον τρον as it stands by itself is just what is wanted as a characteristic explanation (like τρον πνευματι, chap. 2: 22, and many such cases). But τρον τρον (if it be Greek, which is doubtful) would point to a specific agent that would make the bath. If the meaning were "purified by the bath of water by the word," the Greek would be δι τρον τρον or τρον τρον. But τρον τρον is unequivocally the character of the thing spoken of as a whole. Τρον λ. is the dative of the instrument; by the washing of the water they were purified: what was its character? It was τρονμα, or rather τρον τρον.

Again, this use of τρον τρον is quite common on all subjects. (Matt. 12:28; Luke 1:41, 77.). It characterizes. The reasoning on Eph. 5:26 would connect the last case with δονα, and turn the passage into folly. See Luke 4:32; 8:43; 21:23. It is simply to characterize the state. The article is no way needed, but rather its absence. So Rom. 8:3; 12:8 Cor. 15:43. In fact it would be endless to cite cases of the sort. It is the regular characteristic style. Prepositions are Middleton's weak point. He followed Hellenism ably, but not the mental bearing of words. Nouns answer to "what?" as τρον answers to "who" (or "which")? The article is indicative of an individual or individuals. Hence, prepositions or not, it makes no difference really. The absence of the article marks the nature or character of a thing; as here τρον τρονμα characterizes.

Compare John 15:3 for the doctrine. Both Ellicott and Alford are wrong in regarding sanctification as exclusively a progressive thing after initiation. It is so used, but even more frequently for the first setting apart to God. Here it appears to be used for the thing itself, and not distinctively either first or progressive. The apostle may allude to baptism (or, as is alleged, though very doubtful, to a sponsal bath); but he takes care to show that it is the word that purifies, καθαρ■σας ■v τ■ λουτρ■ το■ ■δατος ■v ■■ματι being one sentence, which explains how the sanctification is effected. Christ, having loved the Church and given Himself for it, made it His, and does the other two things; He sanctifies it, and then presents it to Himself, being God as well as Second man. Its sanctification is by the purifying power of the word applied by the Holy Ghost.

Hence the " washing of water by [the] word " is right; and ■v characterizes the whole statement, being no more connected with καθαρ■σας or ■γ. than with τ■ λ. or το■ ■δατος. It would not be ■v ■. if it were specifically connected with either.

## Heads of Psalms

---

Psa. 1; 2-The first is Christ under the law; the second is Christ in glory. The first two Psalms are as it were introductory: one, of the great general truths; the other, of the circumstances in which according to the ordained glory of Christ they are brought out to light; yet Christ as the head of the Jews, is in the first, the matter of it. The first is His character, the second is His power as set by Jehovah-king; and so the circumstances of the Psalms suitably. One is Christ in His perfectness under the law, the other is Christ set in glory in Zion, as king against, and in spite of, the rebellious Gentiles, as by the power of Jehovah.

The first is Jewish, the second is Jewish in power, but as He is made head over the heathen, it is therefore in extension of power-Gentile; and thus they are a key to the whole book. The latter both true in Christ, suffering in person, and so applied; and will have its fulfillment actually in the latter-day crisis alone, and thus it is a key to the whole book.

Psa. 3 is the voice of Christ in the Jewish remnant in their distresses (but the same is conventionally true of God's people everywhere and ever). Also note the testimony concerning the troubles of the Jews; and the remnant finds its place in the reception or treatment of our Lord in His appearance among them first.

Accordingly the Jews, as such, become identified with the ungodly enemy in the last days, with respect to their conduct towards the remnant. This is an interesting and important point: Absalom is typical. This the reading of Habakkuk and Joel (compare Ezek. 38, Luke 21, etc.) has largely, not to say fully, opened, though much of course to be seen yet. (See also Isa. 33)

I am inclined to think that the adverse external enemies are always designated by a distinct word, though not distinguished in the English, **enemies**: the enemies to Christ or the remnant, and oppressors within, by another word, often **adversaries**. Thus in Psa. 8 "because of thine enemies" is the latter word; "to still the enemy and avenger" is the former.

Psa. 4 is the supplicatory confidence of the beloved, that is, Christ and the remnant (in the face of the enemies, and in the midst of unfaithfulness) in God, and in the principles of righteousness: the reference to Deut. 33:19, in verse 5, is material.

Psa. 5 is the anxious inquiry of the beloved under the existing circumstances of trial; but whereas Psa. 4 adverts to proud Gentiles, who have no portion in the covenant, this Psalm adverts to the ungodly Jews rather.

Psa. 6, in this view, needs no comment, save that it marks the faith of the Spirit in the remnant, humbling itself under the sense of what is generally due: the expression therefore of Christ in the days of His humiliation. Compare the beginning-trial; and the end-judgment.

The pleading for deliverance from going down to the grave is fulfilled in "the flesh being saved" in that day; Christ secured this for them by taking their guilt, that is, on the cross, and going down.

Psa. 7, of which the title shows the occasion, exhibits the confidence of the beloved in His righteousness as against the reproaches of the enemy and the blasphemer, though there were none to declare His generation. (Compare John 18, latter part especially.) Compare the history of this Psalm and the latter part of 1 Peter 2, recollecting that Absalom, or that history, was the type of the latter-day trouble; the identification of the Lord with it, as exhibited in His bringing into judgment. He indeed entered into it that He might overcome, and so give to them " the sure mercies of David "-the Beloved. But as the Jews were then with Pilate, so the Gentiles with the ungodly Jews. The reproach associates itself with the attacks of the ungodly; so Rabshakeh.

Both characters of enemies are mentioned in this Psalm, but it is the plea of Christ's righteousness, saying, If He were like these antichristian enemies (Jews joined with Antichrist), then let the external enemies persecute and tread Him down. The plea is against Antichrist and the ungodly Jews, separating Himself from them. His defense was of God, not man: Jehovah should judge. Absalom and Saul, as types, are united; and so indeed Shimei's words connected them together.

Psa. 8 is the celebration by the Jews of the glory of their Head, in which of course we join. It is Jehovah-His name, excellent in all the earth, and His glory now set above the heavens (so recognized by them). Of the application of this there can be no question. I do not think the omission of the sun immaterial. This man, in His humiliation, and as the Son of man, is considered Enosh, Ben-Adam. I am at present disposed to think the translation of verse 5 right. Observe, the last verse expresses the sense of the Jews as to their portion of the glory. His name excellent in all the earth, etc., not the Church's-His glory set above the heavens. Also observe, this is the dominion of man properly, the Jewish portion, not the fullness which is the Church's. He, the man, is head over all things to the Church; observe also, as Christ is identified with the remnant of the believing Jews (through grace) in the latter-day trial, when this Psalm especially has its fulfillment; so Christ was the only faithful Jew in the day of His humiliation in the flesh, and held that character as a remnant, even alone, in the midst of the opposition and hatred of unbelieving Jews, and the kings of the earth rising up against the Lord and against His anointed. This mystery opens out much in the giving and sacrificing of Christ for the people, though, by the power of the resurrection, it also let in the Gentiles to the blessing of the same testimony. Hence see the application of verse 2.

Jehovah is addressed as One who has set His glory above the heavens, because it is consequent upon Christ's exaltation as man, and we can say the Church's with Him. Hence all the Church's portion in such passages is found in the person of Christ, the Church being united to Him, and actually takes place therefore when the Church is caught up to meet Him in the air, consequent on which the Jewish blessing begins.

In Psa. 1; 2, we have the two parts of the subject of the whole book of Psalms: a righteous remnant in the midst of sinners; and the counsels of Jehovah as regards His King in Zion, His Son on the earth.

In general this has been noticed; but I mark here that they are given as two distinct subjects. The word " righteous " in Psa. 1:6 is in the plural: there is a way that belongs to them in contrast with the resham.

Psa. 2 brings out the Messiah in the proper dignity of His person for the earth without any other connection with men- only that He is begotten of Jehovah on the earth. He is Adonai, the Son, the anointed King of Jehovah in Zion (the heathen His inheritance to be broken in pieces as a potter's vessel); to be trusted in (which is due only to Jehovah); associated with Jehovah when He is raged against. No doubt men will rage against Him, and that in the same time and spirit; and He as sitting in heaven laugh at them.

Thus we have the righteous in the midst of sinners in Israel; but these last will not stand in the judgment nor in the congregation of the righteous when gathered. Such is in Psa. 1 the character and position of the righteous; and in Psa. 2, Adonai Messiah.

But in fact He who should be King in Zion was to suffer, because the righteous were; and He entered into their sorrows, but as the righteous One, first it is into the sorrows of the righteous He entered. Hence after the great basis of the righteous in Israel and the Messiah, we have His entrance into the sorrow of the righteous and righteous sorrow. David naturally furnished the evident occasion for this in his history, though not alone.

Psa. 3-7 present this position of the righteous into the trials of which Christ entered. Psa. 3 is the confidence of faith. He looks to God in Zion, to Jehovah in the midst of the many that rise up against him: Jehovah is his help, and He will bless His people.

Psa. 4 is a call to the God of his righteousness to hear. Jehovah has chosen the godly; and His countenance suffices. This is righteousness, as the former is trust.

Psa. 5 is the assurance that if the godly love godliness, God surely does: Jehovah will abhor the bloody and deceitful; Jehovah will bless the righteous.

But Psa. 6 shows that the remnant had share (not in will: else they would not be the remnant) in this evil, and above all with Israel. Hence they must have to do with God as to it in the sense of His chastenings on His people. Still this makes them increasingly separate from the wicked, while mercy is looked to for deliverance. Compare Christ baptized of John: that is, the spirit of grace brought Him in the way of righteousness where it brought others in the sense of sin.

On the other hand, Psa. 7 looks at them in conscious integrity-Christ's actual place, not what He took, and the remnant's as renewed through grace. Hence not deliverance or mercy, saving and putting the enemies to shame in goodness, but righteousness is looked for: Jehovah shall judge the peoples, He will arise in His anger, whet His sword against the wicked, as He establishes the just. Compare the owning of Christ (though it goes farther) after being baptized.

Psa. 8 is the full result in Christ displayed as Son of man, to the glory of Jehovah, as the Adonai of Israel: yet I doubt not Christ is owned as such here. Thus the universal Adamic and the Jehovah government in Israel are united, while it reaches far wider still, because they are established in the person of the Son of God.

As Psa. 1 and 2 are introductory, setting up Messiah; so Psa. 3-8 are Messiah's condition as identified with the remnant pursued throughout, till, asserting His righteousness, the glory and vindication comes, true personally when He went to the Father from the world, effectually for the Jews when He returns taking the heavenly and earthly power. Psa. 9-15 are the discussion more particularly of the character and condition of these wicked ones, and of that wicked one, and their

prevalence, Jehovah being the only resource of the godly, the contrast in Psa. 15 being of acknowledged Jewish righteousness.

Psa. 9 The force and application of this beautiful Psalm are too obvious to need much explication; it is a learning, from the dealings of the Lord on behalf of the confiding remnant of the Jews, the faithfulness, and goodness, and full name of the Lord. He has in these actings manifested all the principles of His throne, so as to give the place and ground of confidence to all that seek the right. (See also Jer. 33:9.)

Psa. 10 is the extremity and helplessness of the poor remnant that put their trust in God, the occasion of God's arising so as to put out their (that is, the unbelievers') wickedness forever. It expresses the cry, which is not one of fear but dependence, at the manifestation of the enemy and his grievousness. But his confidence and wrongness of object which makes him forget God draws out (upon the cry of the remnant, as it were) God to arise against him and put his name out of remembrance, so that destructions come to a perpetual end. Verses 16-18 give the full development of the results and the manner of them. And notice the expression-" the man of the earth." The God of the earth, and of the whole earth, is a name with which we are familiar. Compare also the history of Nebuchadnezzar, and indeed the account of Babel, for the first development (that is, formally) of these principles of the man of the earth. But read the Psalm itself, with attention, for its consummation of wickedness of heart, the ἀνομία of the νόμος, as the last verses give us the acts by which it is brought into exhibition. You may compare Habakkuk, and more fully Joel, particularly chapters 2 and 3.

From Psa. 9; 10, which are prefatory we enter much more into the actual historical circumstances of the latter days, the condition of the remnant, and Jehovah's positive judgment which closes the age. The following Psalms discuss the state, feelings, and position of the poor in spirit in the midst of this, the character of the wicked being fully brought out.

Psa. 11 is the believer's trust in God. The principles of His dealings with the result as in man, all the foundations, are destroyed; and the righteous, though righteous, have in themselves no defense; but there is a God that sitteth above, where the workings of the ungodly do not touch the foundations of His throne; and He trieth thence the children of men, therefore trieth indeed the righteous; but it is judgment and destruction on the ungodly which floweth from His very character, in which the righteous trust.

This Psalm will have its special and intended accomplishment when, the saints being taken away to the Lord, the remnant of believing Jews will by their apparent desertion by God be tried, but also give occasion to the coming forth of the infidel boast, saying, " Where is now their God? " Also, observe, it is a confidence that God is in covenant, He is in His holy temple, His throne being in heaven, so that He is there in covenant though above in power.

Psa. 12, I think, applied to, or specially includes, the professors within the name, the nominal associates in the same hope, but who were really not of God's children. It is the complaint of the godly man as to the state of things around him in Zion itself-he would not have wondered at there being no godly ones among the enemies (nations) without. This is alike applicable to Jesus the Lord, the man of sorrows, and the remnant upon whom His eye is in the latter day in Zion at Jerusalem. Glory and praise be unto Him, the Savior, may we be with Him now and then.

The second " them " in verse 7, should be Him.-This generation forever, shows the forces of " this generation shall not pass away till " etc.

Psa. 13 is the expression of Isa. 8:17, that is, of Christ's Spirit in the temporary rejection of the Jewish remnant, but it is the supplication when it seems ultimately frustrated, bringing in the deliverance.

" How long " is the prayer of faith; " forever," because it appears as though there were no deliverance, and they are left even as the heathen and the ungodly. " But she shall be as a wife of youth when she was despised." " Thou hast known my soul in adversity."

Psa. 14 states the implication of the Jews as a body in the common principles of the ungodly (the Lord have mercy on them!). The fears of the godly drive them to God; of the hypocrite, to alliance with evil. We are warranted by the apostle in ascribing this Psalm to the Jews, and indeed it flows from the discovery that even they had corrupted their ways, so that there were none that understood. (Compare Isa. 33:14, 15.) Also consider Isa. 63, as we shall see also the association by comparing it with Isa. 53 The captivity is not reckoned to be brought back by Jehovah till the full blessing apparently.

Observe also the children of Lo-ruhamah, that is of the house of Israel, ought not, it would seem, to have part in the special trials of Jerusalem and Judah in the last day, nor the day of Jezreel to be till after that, when brought together.

Psa. 15 seems the character of those who remain really in communion morally with Him there in the holy hill of righteousness, when righteousness has been manifested, and what the characters are of relative righteousness from a pure heart, the righteousness of our relation to one another flowing from personal faithfulness to it and our higher relations, moral uprightness. For I observe that in the latter-day righteousness, it is not merely external, but because God makes them that from which the external righteousness should have flowed; as He says, " I said not in that day, etc., but obey my voice;" He putteth His laws in their hearts, and writeth them in their minds.

Psa. 16 is the Beloved's placing Himself in association (identity) with His people, and His hope as connected with them (as in that place). It is His word in His human nature, as Christ, as becomes a servant-His assurance when taking all the circumstances of the Beloved; and hence Peter says, " because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." We shall see the development of it in Psa. 17, and His supplication on this ground is fully exhibited in Psa. 22, as in verse 20. This is the answer of the human nature under the trial of His soul, that is, to the very truth contained in this. The results are there fully stated. I should from the Hebrew, translate, " Thou hast said unto the Lord (Jehovah), Thou art my Lord, (Adonai,) my goodness reacheth not up to thee; unto the saints that are in the earth, and the excellent, in them is all my delight." Compare Matt. 19:17, Luke 18:19, given in both as identified with Jew and Gentile, with the suitable differences and the just associate promises in direct connection with the matter of this Psalm. You may compare also John 17. I do not think **■**ΗΨΜΔΙΨΕΙ means, morally excellent. I am not yet satisfied as to its meaning or force: compare the Septuagint. It is applied to Christ as the manifest Jehovah of the Jews (Psa. 8:1).

Unless there be some mistake, I do not think it is my Lord, but " thou art in the place of Lord;" as a man, a servant, He owns Jehovah in the place of Lordship, identifying Himself with the saints on

earth.

Having gone through these general subjects, the direct testimony of Messiah's identification with the remnant is brought out in truth, and power of life, and resurrection; previously it was more properly His condition in consequence of identification with the nation, though of course the benefit resulted to the remnant; the wickedness of the great body being discovered by His coming to the nation (if another came in his own name, they would and will receive him); here what that value and benefit is to the remnant by virtue of Christ's resurrection. The association of the Church with Christ is on higher ground than even this Psalm. Here He associates Himself with them on earth, and knows coming into their circumstances He will still be raised; the Church is associated with Him as risen, the power of which is specially given in John 17.

Psa. 17 is the supplication of the Enosh, as having kept (that is, Christ as Enosh) the way of God (observe, the Church was formed of Enosh), by the words of His lips, as concerned in the works of men, and therein kept Himself from the paths of the destroyer, having leaned upon God so as to be kept in His paths. His full sense of the power of the enemy, the wicked compassing Him about, then the perfect identification with the position of the Jews in the latter day, in the view of the apparent success and temporary prosperity of the wicked (as in the hand of God), and at the same time His satisfaction at the resurrection portion, " who for the joy," etc. This Psalm is a very remarkable association of the personal state and hopes of Christ as such, and the circumstances of His people. It is one of the Psalms "of David," and also His identity with the resurrection-hope of the rest of His people, the residue. Also I think that we may note in the expression, " when I awake up after thy likeness," some allusion to what is contained in Rev. 19:16, as fulfilling 1 Tim. 6:15, 16. " For he shall come in the glory of his Father," etc., and compare Eph. 5:27 as to the one part, and Gen. 2:18, 19.

Psa. 18 most beautifully shows the connection of Jesus, in His suffering to death, with all Israel's sorrows and Israel's hopes. " In all their affliction, he was afflicted." It was His sympathy with Israel, the extent of which was shown when one man died for the people. " The sorrows of death compassed him, and the floods of ungodly men made him afraid,"-which made Him come down to deliver them, " when the channels of waters were seen, the foundations of the world were discovered at his rebuke." And this was morally true when they rose up against Him-bore up the pillars of it; when He said, " Let my people go, that they may serve me." Verse 16 is just Moses, and in power, Christ taking the place of Israel as in deep trouble. All the Lord's answers to Satan are from Deuteronomy, as taking Israel under the righteousness of faith, in ruin. The world was His, the promises were His. The power to satisfy the hungry with good things was His, and the poor with bread; but this was not faith in a servant recognizing ruin-as to the world; Satan knew that he morally had it, and that it was the Lord's title. But nothing swerved Him from His purpose, for He had a purpose. In verses 18,19, we have the power of the resurrection, accordingly, in terms also descriptive of the nation's deliverance-as is often made in the New Testament in a higher and a better sense; and hence in the Old, spoken of by those who were quasi in the grave; and sometimes as if they had been long there, yet preserved.

In verse 6 the cry of Christ accordingly is spoken of, as that cry which the Lord heard in Israel's first deliverance, to which the wonders in Egypt, the Red Sea, and Sinai were the answer.

All brought here together from verse 20; Christ's righteousness being made the ground of deliverance. It is now divine strength shown in His behalf, and He takes the arm of power; the risen man, the Gibbor, the head of Israel against all His enemies; and thus it issues in Christ's triumphs, and Israel's deliverances in the latter day, delivered from the strivings of the people, ζΘν; made head of the heathen, and a people who knew Him not serving Him-thanks to Jehovah, by Him great deliverances to Jehovah's King. It is then Christ's death and resurrection are made the witness and center of the Lord's sympathy and power in the rescue of Israel of old, and of Israel yet in the latter day; in all their history from beginning to end-in all their affliction He was afflicted; while it becomes true of the remnant in the latter day. Therefore deliverance from the striving of ζΘν is asserted. It is a beautiful and interesting Psalm in this way.

Psa. 19 seems to me to show the Lord in the two great parts of His glory, in the heavens far above all principality, while the present estate shows indeed the glory of the Son, though not the sun, and withal the wisdom of God the ordainer, and His actual righteousness as under the law (or judicial righteousness and glory). All the world were guilty of the great offense. Christ in the same act was not; He was born under the law, and fulfilled it, and did not come short of the glory of God in it. But He speaks of the testimony and statutes, etc., in His state of liability as excellent in themselves. His delight is in them j but also " thy servant is warned: " so Psa. 17:4. Observe further (for there is much depth in this Psalm) the heavens do not declare the glory of Jehovah (that is, His covenant name), but of God. The law of Jehovah converteth the soul, it is perfect: compare Psa. 1 and 40, so John 8:29. The Gentiles are His natural glory, for it is as risen to be the Sun of righteousness He is head of them, they being let in, receiving life through His rising; the Jews His legal glory, for it is only by fulfilling the law He became the head of the Jews, having the promises as the Seed; and as in and by them He reigneth in the world when righteousness has its sphere of fulfillment. But this is too large a subject to do more than notice in this heading of this bright shining Psalm.

Psa. 16-18 give us the association of Christ with the remnant on earth: Christ's righteous path upon earth and contrast with the world. Compare Psa. 17:14 with the end of John 17, " O righteous Father," and the results of this sympathy-ruin, to death on Israel of old, and yet more fully Israel in the latter day. Here in Psa. 19 we have a fuller scope, the wider glory of creation being taken in, and therefore in principle the Gentiles.

The workmanship of God and the law of Jehovah are manifestly (I will not say contrasted, but) distinguished. Thus the heavens and the firmament, day and night, are a tacit testimony by which we may say, " Have they not heard? "-the declaration of God's glory, not the law declaring His righteousness. The Spirit only may recognize, but they declare the glory without any reference to the character or condition of those to whom they are displayed. Thus they are referred to in Rom. 10, and become emblems of grace: see Matt. 5:45 to the end, being Christ the Sun of it, as set in the heavens, for grace is from the heavens. The law looks for righteousness from the earth, therefore ever in reference. He maketh His sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust, where grace is the subject, loving them who do not love us, as loving our enemies, the very character of God in grace. This (that is, the natural testimony of benevolent goodness to sinners) was among the Gentiles (He left not Himself without witness) as the law among the Jews, and so pleaded in Romans, that every mouth may be stopped; and so grace from heaven, from the Sun of righteousness, and the rain of His Spirit, was on Gentile as well as Jew. Here however it is only the sun, and not the rain, because of universality; the heavens

spread over all, and the sun going about from one end to the other. Now this symbolically shows the character of grace, its scope and working in light, and fulfilled when the Sun of righteousness arises indeed in person. The spiritual estimate of the law in godly acknowledgment is thus beautifully stated; but not, it appears to me, in connection with heavenly hopes or heavenly righteousness: grace has established that in the heavens. It is rather a godly Jew on the coming in of the millennium, the other symbolically stating what was to him in the heavens-Jehovah being owned as the rock and God of the Spirit-taught remnant.

Psa. 20 is the recognition by the Jews taught of Jehovah in the latter day, as in the time of their distress, of Jesus, even the crucified One, identified with them as their Savior; their thoughts towards Him, "now know I." The last verse singularly depicts its force-"Jehovah, save" (the word in Hebrew is the root of Jesus); "The king hear in the day of our calling." It is the recognition of Jesus, and in Jesus their own security, for God heareth them.

Psa. 21 is the Jewish remnants joy in the position of Christ with God; they perceive His acceptance and exaltation, and are now of one mind with it, and see how He did save Him, though they had "esteemed him stricken of God and afflicted" (though this is not adverted to, but the acceptance of the king). In a word they come to understand the resurrection and ascension of Christ the king, as verse 7, and therefore knowing their own security, that is, His power, as a believing people, and trusting in Him as the deliverer also of them in the latter day; for they see Him as a Jew, and in faith destroying His, that is, their enemies (so faith ever-unbelief its own difficulties, faith its sins -as the enemies of Christ); and triumph in His victory, not seeing them as associated with itself. So the Jews in the latter day, by faith in Him; they see Him all through as He is: it was "against thee." You may compare the last verse with Isa. 2:11, 17.

Psa. 20 gives us the remnant's thoughts of Christ in trouble for them, their comfort in His resurrection, and owning Jesus, the very name of Jesus, as their salvation, and the king; in Psa. 21, His exaltation, because they receive Him from His glory ascended, as with a name above every name, according to Phil. 2 In a word, it is all the glory and person of Christ in the person of their king (Psa. 20), tracing Him up, as it were, from the trouble through resurrection (Psa. 21), down from the glory to them, seeing Him in possession of better hopes than they had had; His own heart's desire, the joy that was set before Him, in which they see Him now; then the execution of judgments in the day of His wrath.

Psa. 22 The first verse of this Psalm declares the great burden of it-Messiah's great burden, even our sin. The assembly of the wicked would have been as nothing, but that He should feel Himself separated from God, His God, therein was the deep burden; insufferable to all save Him, yet worse, infinitely worse to Him as a trial than to any one else. Is He not therefore precious to His people? yea, even as to God? For it is God in them, who loves and delights in Him, for herein His people have a common interest with Christ to feel as God; yet about themselves as men, yea, as the very people interested and needing-He for their sakes, they as in themselves. See such language as verses 14, 15; and that this was the deep trial see verses 11, 19, in connection with the first verse.

The evidence of the Jewish personality of our Lord as suffering is remarkable in verses 4, 5, adding verse 6, and observe too the spirit of Christ pleading as to the position He stood in, as Himself the only remnant. As a man prays for himself, yet by virtue of the Spirit in him, so Christ

prays for yachidathi; (my only one.) That this is Christ we have absolute certainty, from verse 1, and also from 20-Christ praying that He might be saved from, etc., and heard in that He feared (it was the Spirit in Christ praying for the body, or the man, as the one faithful Jew, the accepted one amongst them, true to God, the faithful separated remnant). This term  $\eta\psi\iota\nu$  is expressly applied to the remnant restored or raised out of the formal nation in the latter day, " God setteth the yachidim in a house," (see Psa. 68:6) true of us also of necessity. Observe also, " O my strength," is the same word (inserting  $\iota$ ) as 'Aijeleth' given in the Hebrew as the tide of this Psalm; and the morning means dusk, when it is not light; it is therefore upon the dusk or dark ushering in of the morning on or concerning the Beloved. This whole Psalm is concerning Jews, and what relates to Jews, save verse 18, and that while He was amongst them, rejected by them.

Then further it is Christ as heard, Christ as man, who speaks, " For thou hast heard me." (Verse 21.) And as a Jew then, we have His first ministry in the congregation. That I apply to the saints gathered out among the Jews-the Gentile saints being added thereto, " ye that fear the Lord, praise Him: " we know from John 20:17 the Lord's application of this; then all the congregation as under Solomon compared with David. The  $\psi\theta\alpha\ \mu\chi\theta\delta\theta$  is His Solomon state. The rest of the Psalm follows this. I am not so ascertained of verses 30, 31, as to their application. This I see that it rests in the resurrection-glory of Christ, as delivered and delivering as man. I should incline to think it the elect remnant: if not, it would be the latter-day Jews (this would be still the elect remnant), witnesses of His acts-evincing who He was, and how He had delivered them; for He bore, as a Jew, their iniquities; and this was what was to be explained, for it was the strength of the dark morning which they wanted. (Compare Isa. 50:10.)

I am not sure verses 30 and 31 apply to the same thing (verse 30 seems clearly the remnant out of the Jewish congregation), to Adonai, not Jehovah. The Hebrew confirms the supposition. I am inclined to think verse 30, the congregation, and verse 31, the great congregation, or the first remnant of it, who are witnesses to Christ's righteousness all through: compare Rom. 3:25, 26. This last supposition shows the conformity and coincidence of the whole. " I will make of the remnant a strong nation." I apprehend that " they shall come " is the remnant of the latter day, which shall become a strong nation, and the great congregation. The character of the remnant and its results is strongly therefore brought out, and that too as forsaken; and from Jesus downward until the fulfillment of the great congregation: compare " Bless ye God in the congregations, even the Lord mimchor Israel." Psa. 68:26.

Observe, there were two parts in our Lord's sufferings. First, that in which He was faithful to God, and presented the perfect compliance with His will in the midst of an opposing world. In all this His strength was, as in Isa. 50, that His Father heard Him always: this He reckoned upon all through and looked to it in the hour of darkness. "All ye shall be offended because of me this night, and shall leave me alone; and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." But, next, it was the dereliction of this He felt and expresses, as in the opening language of this Psalm. It was here then a completely new kind of suffering, bearing, not the wrath and wickedness of man in faithfulness to God, but the wrath or alienation of God-the bruising of Jehovah in faithfulness to man, going through His uttermost responsibility for sin, especially, as we have seen, for the Jews, to whom therefore the language as spoken in the former part of the Psalm clearly applies primarily, though the Church by the Spirit of faith is enabled to join with them in it.

The perfectness of our Lord through this was seen in that recognition of God's perfectness-" But thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel." Two parts there are also of temporal trial: despite of such " a worm and no man; " and opposition, " the assembly of the wicked." In both He looked for God's help.

Psa. 20, 21 are what the spared remnant will do in the latter day. They are accounted distinctly by the Lord for a generation; they tell His acts to them that come after. So mystically did the elect remnant in His day.

[Psa. 19-22 are a complete subject in itself, the testimonies of God: the first, creation and the law; the two next, Messiah seen by the remnant in His human sufferings, and then seen glorified. He is great in the deliverance of Jacob's Jehovah; He has length of days forever and ever in reply to the life He asked, and He is made most blessed forever, exceeding glad with Jehovah's countenance. Psa. 22 gives Christ suffering (not from man, though that is there in full, but) from God, forsaken of God. Hence as Psa. 21 was judgment on His enemies, this is grace for all it speaks of.]

Psa. 23 seems to me to be the Lord Jesus Christ as man, expressing His faith as man. Verse 3 might seem difficult to some; but, besides His resurrection, the inquiry into the way in which He entered into the sufferings and sorrows of His people will, I suppose, show the force of this, and abundantly fill the hearts of them that know it. The comparison of verses 27 and 32 of John 12, and of the garden of Gethsemane (John 18), will illustrate this.

Psa. 24 seems the introduction of Jehovah into the great scene of Christ's sufferings, trial, and humiliation; it is a transition Psalm. The title of the Psalm, if correct, is remarkable; it would rather seem that something was left out, or that it was elliptical; it is not a Psalm of or on David, but on David a Psalm on or of Jehovah, though Jehovah seems also to join itself to the following words,-David mizmor le Yehovah hōporetz, etc. The Septuagint has the singular addition of τῆς μίσης σαββῆτου, which is indeed ἡ κυριακή ἡμέρα, the Lord's day. But this Psalm specially includes His dominion over the Gentiles, that is, Christ's supreme glory, the earth, etc., " for He hath founded it," etc.; but being the Lord, who shall ascend into His presence? He that walks in righteousness, that is, (but this first includes the man Jesus, qualified thus to sit down on this seat,) the introduction of the manhood of Christ into the throne of Jehovah's glory in Jerusalem, therefore Gentile saints as well as Jews; still, Jacob having the pre-eminence, they seek Jacob's face, or Him as the God of Jacob, for there His name is. The latter part is too plain to need comment; it notices the previous circumstances, from the results of which He thus takes the throne.

These two Psa. 23 and 24, manifest Christ as a man owning Jehovah as His shepherd, and Himself as Jehovah before an assembled world seeking Jacob. Compare John 10, where Christ comes in first by the door as the shepherd, and closes with His unity with His Father. Here He is Jehovah.

Psa. 25 We have here the voice of the remnant, according to the Spirit of Christ in the latter day; as Psa. 26 is the special portion of Christ in the remnant.

Psa. 25 Christ's Spirit pleads here in them, and therefore prays for no remembrance of the sins of youth (confessing them), and asserts their integrity too. It is intercessional. Israel returns on the plea of mercy on the part of the High Priest, who has the integrity. Psa. 26 gives us the assertion

of integrity -the ground of this plea. [Here the remnant is brought in under the double character of guilt before God and of integrity in the midst of evil.]

Psa. 27 is the word of Christ, as in the tried remnant of the latter day, as identifying Himself with their feelings, founded on His expressed experience of the Lord's faithfulness to Himself when He stood alone. Observe, the time of trouble is the time of God's deliverance (the place where God was met), whatever else was felt, though it seemed Satan: compare Psa. 32 Mercy acted on is the foundation of future prayer; it is, needless to say, the moral principle which gives confidence.

On the entreaty to hear the cry in verse 7, verse 8 seems to me to be Jehovah's expression of what had been in His heart as the foundation of it all. The Hebrew reads thus-To thee, that is, Messiah, my heart said, " Seek ye my face; " the answer is, " Thy face, Lord, will I seek." Then comes the confidence and pleading with the Lord thereon: Psa. 25 being confessional intercession for them in integrity; Psa. 26, the righteous integrity of Christ. Psa. 27 is the plea of what Jehovah is to them in the trouble, Christ having thus taken a place with them.

Psa. 28 is the voice of Christ in the remnant, in the latter-day trial; but I take the wicked properly to be the unrenewed and unyielding Jews led and associated with Antichrist. Wickedness is their definite character, which makes by degrees those that fear the Lord a remnant. Their portion is told in verse 5; but the Lord has heard Christ for the remnant, and the remnant see that Jehovah is the strength of their Messiah. The last verse is the intercessional blessing of Him that interveneth, opening the door into the millennial glory under Him as the Lord, for then the Lord properly lays aside His humiliation as mediator, that is, in His people. We have seen this celebrated in Psa. 24 This Psalm is peculiarly instructive, as to the progressive development of the remnant, and of their position as separate from the mass of those with whom they first returned as corporately one. In them all wickedness and deceit is included.

Psa. 29 is the answer of strength and power to the intercession of the last verse of the preceding Psalm. Jehovah appears in favor of these poor criers unto Him; and, though the sons of the mighty might despise them, they must bow to Him, and own His favor to them, and know that He has loved them. It is manifestly the coming forth in power of David the king. Compare Isa. 66:6.

Psa. 30 is an important one, and embraces a broad general truth, true in power in Christ either way, and in truth in the Church, and fulfilled consequently in each way in the whole portion brought under Christ in the day in which He comes whose right it is, and all things are gathered together in one in Him. The house was in one sense dedicated when the Lord rose again and ascended; but properly it was fully so when the fruits of His resurrection, even the Jews, and of His power of life as ascended, even the glorified saints are brought in-even the saints in either case. Now the portion of all was with Him -was to be brought into unity with Him in that which was manifested in Him on their part, which thing, as we have said, not in full power but in truth, is true in Him, and in us as He saith. It is the assurance then in all of triumph after death, the Jews as a body, as in Isa. 26:19: the necessity of passing through death, but death overcome;-that triumph, His holiness now secures them; their previous glory could not stand, however they may seem to have had it in God's strength. For it was not their glory, but the resurrection-glory is that which can properly stand. You may compare for the expressions, Isa. 65:14. The direct application of the Psalm is to the Jews standing as themselves raised out of the death of the former generation in the strength of Christ's resurrection. The virtue of Christ's resurrection being power, ascertained power over death, is

applied to save from it (see verse 3) Christ-the congregation-and the great congregation. The false confidence in verses 7 and 11 is contrasted with the real confidence of the Jewish remnant.

It is the song of Christ on resurrection, applied to the deliverance and saving of the Jews from death in the latter day.

Psa. 31 needs not much comment to those that are instructed in Christ. It is the confidence and supplication of the Lord Christ in His Enosh state, particularly with regard to the enmity in its various parts, which did not slack even to His life. You may compare according to forementioned principles Job 19. The reader of the Gospels, especially John, will trace some following of this Psalm in the language of faith and in the Lord's words, I think, too. It is a deeply interesting Psalm. [There are many expressions in the Psalms which are true of the writer or of anyone in like sorrow, but which yet have their accomplishment in the highest degree in the case of Christ. There Christ was applied without making the Psalm a prophecy of Himself.]

Verse 23 applies the value of the confidence due to Jehovah, as proved by Christ, to the saints in their trial.

Psa. 32, I think, applies to the Jews who receive the benefit of forgiveness in the latter day. That it is abstractedly true, as all these " blessings " are and must be, is certain, and, as Paul proves, comes otherwise also on the Gentiles. But these Psalms concern the manifestation of these things on the earth, as to which it is in the Jews as a body they are prophetically accomplished. Of course the energy of the Spirit (by whom they were spoken) is the witness of these things now even in the earth, as it is written, " that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth," etc. I add, this fully opens out the Psalm in its detail. Also this is the first testimony to the new character of blessing. Previously it was rather of Christ in person and the vicissitudes of circumstances of the righteous man-" Blessed is the man," etc. Now we come to find an acquisitive blessing, the blessing, not of a saint, but of a sinner whose transgressions are removed, the new blessing true of the Jews in that millennial day (compare Rom. 11:31, 32), and true, by virtue of the establishment in Christ's resurrection, of the dispensation on which that blessing is founded, to every one that believes in Him, in whom it is effectually set up, even sure mercy.

This sets the Jews distinctly on mercy, turning to which is the moral hinge of their condition, not in their own righteousness. Its special and beautiful application to the Jew in that day is, I think, very plain. From verse 6 onward is the practical consequence, and the Lord's dealings thereon.

Psa. 33 is not, in the Hebrew, "of David." It is an interesting new view of the millennial glory; the God of providence therein shown as the Lord, and identified in the same power and glory as the Creator, while the counsels of men come to naught, and His counsels stand in the blessings also of them who celebrate it, even His people. It takes it up also in His moral character, on which the security of His people depends.

Israel being the result of the earthly system, the God of creation and providence is here exhibited in the result of both, as to this present world, as the Lord; and towards them its connection with the providences by which it is brought about is plainly declared from verse 10 onwards. But it is not David identified with His people, but the broad general principles, the converse or other part of the truth from the special privileges, though true in them, to wit, as regards the God and His character from which they flowed. This Psalm should be considered with Psa. 24 There David the beloved is

shown to be the Lord; here he is viewed higher up as it were in the same truths, for the moral character of God is before His purposes as we view them, for these manifest those to us as 1 John 1. David is the beginning of His purposes, but the brightness and image of His glory and person.

Verse 12 involves the special place of the Jewish nation in the midst of this scene. It is beautiful to see this so consecutively brought in in the forgiveness and given uprightness of Israel.

Psa. 34 is the address of the beloved to the afflicted Jews of the latter day, from His own experience confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit, embracing prophetically the deliverance of these Jews themselves. It is a pressing upon the Jews of the latter day, who had ears to hear, to receive and to act upon the principles of which He had found the blessing, and in which also the faithfulness of God when He was the one remnant. The thesis is in the first two verses; it was as by David amongst the Philistines. The prophetic declaration is in verse 5; then the Spirit takes up from verse 6, I think, to verse 10. In verse 11 David resumes, as in person. I am not sure where I should close this, for the residue seems more of a sort of chorus-like testimony, but withal verse 20 leads us directly, it should seem, to its source. Verse 15 seems to take up the principles learned in David from verse 6, etc., and to apply them to the righteous remnant, at which verse therefore the form may alter. The general principle of the Psalm is evident.

I apprehend, though merging into more general truth, from 11 to the end is Christ's instruction of the children in this holy wisdom.

Psa. 35 is the appeal of Messiah in behalf of the remnant of the Jews oppressed in His own person. It is not the cry merely of the remnant, at the ungodliness which surrounded them amongst the Jews, nor for help against the Gentiles, but the critical intervention of Messiah in respect of the whole purpose of God concerning them; it regards specially the triumph of the ungodly Jews (let us weep over them) at the apparent oppression of them of whom they had been long weary-the saints amongst them; and their deliverance from them, they having joined the Gentiles. Verse 18 marks the result. Psa. 22 applies itself personally to Messiah, this to the remnant exclusively in the latter day, identifying Him with them, and spoken as on His behalf (He pleading in His righteousness). See 1 John 2:27, as showing the manner of the identification.

So the wicked of that day are identified with the wicked of Christ's day, "this generation." "Ye shall not see me till ye say "-" henceforth shall ye see the Son of man " j and so identified are these two scenes that the Lord says, "ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." The Gentile parenthesis is all left out, as not at all of the scene, for it is heavenly.

Psa. 36 is a very interesting Psalm, but there is not much I would comment on in it. It is explained in the expression, the servant of-Jehovah. It is Christ our blessed Master in that character, as proposing to meet the wickedness of ungodly men, as to whom He felt that there was no restraint upon them, because the fear of God was not before their eyes, and His conferring with Jehovah; and, to speak as to this case, unrestrained will as their character here, which is the greatest trial a man can be subject to; as the Lord said, "they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, likewise also shall the Son of man," etc., nor would He have suffered fully as He graciously did but for this. The security of God's people in such case then is not the restraint of the will of the enemies, but in our dependence on the divine care under their unrestrained will. This is a most important principle. Verse 1 is the thesis of this; the description is perfect and complete to our faith.

In the meanwhile one is ebed-Jehovah (compare John 12:26), and so to act, and therein the Lord's will is exercised continually. (Compare Psα. 91.)

Verse 7 is our joy meanwhile; in verse 12, deliverance.

The Lord teach His people, and keep them in His presence from the provoking of all men. The prophetic aspect of this Psalm, if the others have been sufficiently understood, is sufficiently plain.

Psa. 37 The application of this Psalm to the Jews, as of faith, that is, the remnant, but manifested by their acting on this Psalm, is obvious; and its direct application to the land as the inheritance of blessing (see verses 3, 9, 11, 22, 27, 34), but this in fact then of the earth, because it is the time of the restitution. The **■ZψZυ**, (**■ γ■**) now extends over the face of the earth, the land being the seat from which the blessing flows as **■ γ■**: that is, as Palestine shall be the special scene then of the conflict between light and darkness, so yet shall there be a congregation of the world's interests therein, and there and thence shall flow the results of the decision, when the El gibbor, "the mighty God" (Isa. 9:6), shall be manifested; and this Psalm is specifically addressed to the remnant in the time of the previous distress, as they might be tempted to give up the hope and fail in the crisis. The subject is plainly set forth in the first two or three verses, "Fret not thyself, trust in Jehovah," but there is more detail of promise as well as of direction directly. "Fret not thyself. Trust-delight thyself-commit thy way- rest in." Then again, "cease from anger," the reason in the general result to verse 20; then there is a contrast of the principles of their character also, that is, of the wicked and good. Psa. 34 resumes the thesis. The crisis of this Psalm particularly arises at the time that those that forsake the Lord, the unconverted Jews and the Gentiles associated with them as their friends, seem to have the world with them. Jehovah as a God of faith and hope is put in present contrast in verses 3, 4, 5, 7, then again in verse 34. The way in which this Psalm applies itself to the Lord also very plainly confirms and elucidates the principle we have above seen.

Psa. 38 is wonderful, but the comparison of it with Job (taking both as expressive of character) is full of interest and instruction. Every expression of Job's sufferings seems concentrated with less loquacity, with this remarkable difference- there seems the sense of sin with the confidence of help, and that all his desire was before God. Job's heart was pride, which he wished to bring before God. And it was to bring to remembrance (see title, and compare Isa. 43:26). Observe also the manner of Christ's bringing to remembrance under the burden of sin, opening out all His heart before God, recognizing the cause, not saying, "He hath set me a target to shoot his arrows at," but "because of my sin." All his desire and groaning therefore is before God, throwing himself on God in perfect affiance of heart, full sense of his sorrow, ample confession of his sins, which he truly bore, in very deed thus bore, that he had no strength to stand up under them. Verses 10-18 are the marvelous picture of the righteous One under sin, and all its burden; in weakness, yet bearing it all in perfectness of conduct, in the unflinchingness of the recognition of God-His God: righteous as a sin-bearer in the full confession of sin; righteous as a God-fearer in the full acknowledgment of what God was. (Compare Job 6; 7 in fine, 10: 5, 6; 13: 15; 14:17; 19:6; and other passages of Job, and Psa. 22) What Christ was bearing is manifest, but He bore it in Himself; we may wonder indeed, and be astonished indeed at Christ, when there was none to take pity on Him. The reproaches of them that reproached God fell upon Him, because He was to pour out His soul unto death for these very sinners, and at once; for when all men deserted Him, yea, even His lovers and kinsmen stood afar off, His enemies surrounding Him strong and mighty, then

it was also that as to suffering God also forsook Him (the effects of righteousness with men and devils-as representing God: the effects of sin with God as representing man), an astonishing spectacle! The wrath had its course: it is this we have seen indeed deprecated in Psa. 22 This was felt as in verse 3, though the very opposite to being charged as unrighteousness, as in Job. The comparison of this with Job is very full of instruction: see chapter 6: he thought to stand in his strength with God, but see the Spirit of Christ in us. Compare Job 9:2; 13:15; Psa. 23 The inconsistency of Job's mind is to be remarked; it is only in the cross that our consistency is to be found.

But the point which is much to be noticed here is, the Lord Jesus as the confessor of sin, or rather of the sins which He had taken upon Him. Here He was acting the truth before God, He did not hide His sin, nor excuse it, but so that we should know His owning them as His before God, confessed them, justified God, was guileless, and, having taken the sins, owned them all before Him in perfect integrity; and in His perfectness is our perfect comfort, for His confessing sins, and presenting all His desires before God, shows His sinlessness under these sins, and makes us know His perfect identification with our sins, His dealing with God about them, and our identification with Him. There cannot be a more important truth. It was paralleled by that part of the day of atonement sacrifice exhibited in the confession of the sins of the people on the head of the scape-goat; it was the people's lot. Christ was Jehovah's lot and the people's lot.

Psa. 39 is the turning of the soul inward on rebukes without, arresting ill service of God: it is the supreme God, whom no rebuke affects, turning to the profit of man in his Enosh state his helplessness as such before the wickedness of man. And though He give power, it is His power; and where He gives, and subdues not the adversary, man can do nothing in His service, but then under grace it turns to the profitable testimony of the true state of things. (It is most blessed to see the Lord in this, and teaching therein. Compare Isa. 50.)

Psa. 40 is the song of Enosh as heard and delivered in that he feared, but revealing withal the Son as entering into that state, as explaining and able now to speak of His humiliation according to its wisdom and the counsel of God in it, as being (having triumphed) in the glory which He had before. Yet is it so His voice remarkably and decidedly in the Jewish remnant. And, note, His resurrection belongs to the Jews, that is, as on earth actually as His state. It would be too large a field to follow this here. Suffice it to say, it includes His reign, not as sitting in heavenly places, but it is an assurance of this unto all men: if we seek argument, let us see not only our Lord's after the resurrection, but Peter's and Paul's in the Acts.

The great congregation is the Jewish people at large (it has a moral force here, for it is not merely those willing to hear, but to all, at all risk, that God might be justified). Christ had not failed in testifying to them. Verses 1-3 are a statement of the result, of which Christ is the witness as heretofore; the rest, the principles on which it went, and circumstances which thereon necessarily accompanied it. It is a sort of comment, so to speak, by Christ on the whole transaction. Observe, this Enosh state was in connection with the Jewish remnant, and includes His whole manifestation as to its actual associations and development; that is, His Enosh state was exhibited whilst a Jew, for it was also under the law, which was one of its grand trials according to the very state and subjection of man before God's holiness, or He would not be put to full trial, and Christ accordingly was so placed, " born under, the whole argument sub modo of Paul in the Romans (but without

sin), for I am speaking of responsibility.

Verses 10, 11, are a remarkable instance of looking for faithfulness from Jehovah, on the ground of faithfulness to Him.

The connection of verse 12 with this is very remarkable.

Verse 13, etc., are the resurrection, the answer to the patience of Christ; verse 5 is the comment on the many wondrous works which all merge in the incarnation and its circumstances. Then the pleading in the circumstances, crying to God, is no sign of impatience. His waiting for the answer, that is, the patience, not crying, would be in silence of heart: how much is there of it?

Psa. 41 is Christ in His humiliation estimating the real spirit a man is of, as holding a certain character, "Blessed is he," etc. (ver. 1), and therefore not exclusively (in fact) applicable to Him; so the Lord, "Blessed are ye poor, for," etc., and so in Matthew, "Blessed are the poor in spirit." It also describes the mind of the poor man under this humiliation, connected with the despite of the world, the proud, under it.

The character of His confidence is purely Jewish, and so the sorrow; Christ\* is the fulfiller of it.

## BOOK 2

In continuing to communicate to you the headings of the Psalms, which you desire, I must still leave them as they really subsist, as the passage of my own mind through the inquiries, whose results only can give the full satisfaction of more complete thoughts; and those who read them will not find this satisfaction, unless they study the Psalms, and not merely read the notices of them. I am however fully confirmed in the character and precision of the views they lead to, and the justness of the statements contained. Further study of the Psalms led me to divide them into five distinct books, having each distinct characters, the second of which you now have. This division arose from the subjects and the character of the relationship of Christ with Israel, and through Israel with the world, and both therein with God in each of the divisions; and I came to definite, and to my mind interesting, conclusions thereon. I was surprised to find (what want of attention or study had left me ignorant of before) that this division was one marked, precisely as I had marked it, in large editions of the Hebrew Bible. This naturally confirmed me in the idea (whatever the source of these ancient divisions) that my mind had been mercifully led by truth, and not by natural imagination.

As noticed heretofore, Psalms 1, 2 having given first the man of perfect legal righteousness and therefore flourishing in all his ways, and secondly the King exalted on Zion's throne of God, and judging and breaking to pieces hostile Gentiles, the Psalms which follow present the astonishing enigma (solved only by the deeper knowledge of the counsels of God) of Him (in whom alone these characters were true, and those united with Him in His ways, and by the working of His Spirit in them), instead of prospering (outwardly), being in misery, afflicted, despised, betrayed among God's people, and forsaken apparently of God (in one sense really), and the Gentiles domineering over them without hindrance. This enigma, in the pleadings of the Spirit of Christ in all the circumstances, the dealings of God in them, and the display of all His ways and depths thereby (for the real sources of it were all the depths of God's character) are brought out in these Psalms, as felt, understood, and expressed by Christ.

The first of these five divisions (Psa. 1-41) views Christ rather in His sufferings in the midst of them, in the discovery of the people He is among, and the responsible relationship to God He therein assumes, as identifying Himself with the saints; it lays the basis therefore of the whole matter.

In the second division (Psa. 42-72) we have Him, and therefore the remnant of the latter day, by the successful supremacy of the Gentiles in their antichristian power (consequent upon the rejection of Him by the Jews, and their dependence on and union with that power), cast out of Jerusalem, and speaking as so cast out by the Spirit of Christ. Thus from Psa. 42 to 49 we have the appeal of Christ's Spirit in them, under the loss of all Jehovah promises against the Gentiles; Psa. 42, against the Jews as an ungodly nation; Psa. 43, their desolation in a state of righteousness and cry; Psa. 44, Messiah the King; Psa. 45, the God of Jacob the refuge of the remnant; Psa. 46, their triumph for and in the presence of the world; Psa. 47, the great moral lesson, Psa. 49, of which resurrection is the real secret as regards all that is in the world. Psa. 50, 51 are a great judicial lesson on Israel, and their confession thereon, and thus righteousness in God vindicated, and grace meeting it restoratively: verses 1, 2, the whole state of things; then the declaration of the manner of it, " coming to judge," " the heavens called," the earth summoned that Israel may be judged but as "Ammi" the saints assembled below, the heavens however declaring His righteousness, but judgment beginning with the declaration now, " my people," " thy God." Psa. 51 is the full national confession. The other Psalms enter into the various exercises of heart and development of relationship with God, consequent upon the general position stated, of positive exclusion from the enjoyment of known blessings; but bringing in by grace much fuller enjoyment to them, and the truth of man's real state in all the world proved by it. The circumstances connected with these subjects are gone through, though imperfectly, in the notes on each respective Psalm. The character spoken of in this book of the Psalms, occasions that (except in two Psalms of which the study will explain the difference) it is God as such, and not Jehovah who primarily is addressed. Jehovah being the name of existing covenant relations, and not the moral condition of a justly cast out people, then standing in themselves, as even in their nakedness before Him; though the Spirit of Christ might take up their cause and be their strength-strength beginning in their confession of what they were.

Psa. 42 seems to be a complaint against the Gentiles, and therefore specially referable to the latter day; while Psa. 43 is against the Jews. That it is the complaint of the godly in the latter days I cannot doubt: compare Joel 2:17. But we must always remember that Christ fulfilled these sufferings in His own person (specially as far as the elect are concerned in them), and therefore was, on the one hand, witness in them of the faithfulness of God for others to act on, and, on the other, able to succor, etc. (Heb. 2:18), and therefore can speak them in His own person. This however is of the remnant more especially themselves. It is not, observe, " of David." We should also observe that, except in verse 8 where it is introduced as the name of faithfulness, it is " God " alone that is used in these two Psalms, not " Jehovah;" and this is a most important point. " God," as such, is the refuge of the soul. We know that Jehovah, He is the God, and God is Jehovah: still the idea is definite and important; I say now not merely prophetically, in which it is uniform and consistent, but in its force as the definite object of the soul. " My soul thirsteth for God; " and all is the " mystery of God; " and note therefore the spirit of these two Psalms much.

Psa. 43 I would add, though doubting it at first, that it appears to me verse 1 is characteristic, and its emphasis is on character and not person. Believing the interpretation right, it gives this verse remarkable force, for the Jews are called βσ; and note the word ██████████ ██████████ we have elsewhere observed, is the name of the Jewish saints, as in the latter Psalms.

It seems to me the time when the remnant will have lost the privileges of public worship (having been obliged to flee away), the nations in general rather than Gog being the oppressing enemy. It also shows that the remnant, as noticed latterly, will have till then gone with the multitude and counted them ██████████, but now ████, that is, but a ██████; and this explains much.

Psa. 44 is the voice of the remnant arguing from the faithfulness of faith, that it was the Lord and not their own arm which had delivered them, that the same arm could deliver them in any circumstances. It is spoken under the apparent utter dereliction of the latter day; that is, the time between their outward prosperity, in which the wickedness of the Jews had grown up in the land, and the full blessings of Immanuel's deliverance, when the latter-day enemies should then come up on the land, and the remnant should, between them and the ungodly Jews, seem to be deserted. Paul quotes it as evidence of the portion of the remnant (ver. 22 with Rom. 8:36), and as the Holy Ghost recognizes it as the portion of the accepted remnant, or the voice of the Spirit in their mouth, it was evidence of anything but their rejection. And thus the testimony of evil becomes the evidence of acceptance, to secure the faith of those on whom the evil falls when it comes: so our Lord, " these things I tell you before it come to pass." (John 14:29; 16:4.) This is a gracious arrangement of God (the Lord). The written sufferings are the evidence of the acceptance of those on whom they fall, when their faith might be shaken, so that " out of the eater comes forth sweetness: " " we are more than conquerors."

Psa. 45 is Messiah's triumph, reign, and union with the Jewish bride. It seems to me the Spirit as in the remnant. It is Christ as the Head of the Jewish people as King, the full spiritual recognition of Him. Verse 10 manifestly turns from the celebration of Christ the King, to address just admonition to the queen, Jerusalem, at His right hand. This is manifestly (to me) the Jewish bride in its perfect state; but it is as received in the way of grace, and therefore " a daughter," and to forget her father's house-the whole question once argued between Christ and the professors of that people. The people who are to praise her when thus restored are the Ammim," the gathered " Gentiles of the latter day, or new day rather. Having these points determined, the Psalm is manifest in its contents and full of the richest matter. It is the union of Christ with the Jewish bride in its proper character, with the glory of both celebrated by the Spirit. Righteousness is the character of Christ as a Jew, so " therefore God thy God," etc. It is prophetic; the voice of the remnant, who did not see His glory as a present thing, to Jerusalem, now called to Him in the latter day, and recognizing His glory in Spirit when so coming. Moreover it is consolation for Christ, the real mind of the Spirit in His humiliation; for this spake the " groanings which could not be uttered " in Simeon and Anna, and all those who looked for redemption; and they were so interpreted by God.

Psa. 46 is the song of the remnant in the turning-point of the circumstances of the latter day; that the God of Israel was, and had proved Himself to be " their God; " that He was true to them, as His chosen. The exercise of faith on the deliverance and interposition of the latter day, recognizing God, and so putting themselves into the position of His people.

Psa. 47 This triumph of the remnant is quite plain, as also the call unto all people. Verse 9 (ver. 10 in Hebrews) is the only one which calls for inquiry, and the expression is a very interesting one, though in the first instance the construction is difficult; " people " is Ammim, a word we have often noticed; Gentiles brought in, having the name of a people now, as on rejoining the Jews, and not in their national distinctiveness of power. " Or ever I was aware, my soul set me in the chariots of Amminadib, my willing people "; here the nadibi ammim (verse 9, translated the princes of the people) are gathering together; " for to him shall the gathering of the ammim be."

The difficulty is the apparent disconnection of Am, but it is, I suspect, as ever in Hebrew, the strength of the sense. They are gathered into unity with the people of the God of him who received as his name and title, " the father of many nations." It is in the exaltation of the Am of the God of Abraham-the people of the Jews, that they, the Gentiles, are brought in under the then presence of God's calling power, into blessing and gathering; so that He should be (Elohi col ha-aretz) " the God of the whole earth." (Isa. 54:5.) " Gathering " is one of the names of Christ, " gathering into one the (Bennai Elohim) sons of God that were scattered," and then all (as here) on earth in Israel; " for the shields of the earth belong to God," or are, in fact, now God's, " who is greatly exalted "; " for the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." God is the shield of Abraham also (Gen. 15:1), therefore He is gathering in heaven and earth all into one. It is a very interesting Psalm; Colossians ha-aretz, " all the earth," should be its title along with the circumstance, of being sung by them to Malchenu, " our king." (See verses 6, 7, 8, in Hebrews)

Psa. 48 also is manifest: It is the destruction or disappointment of the antichristian confederacy, and enjoyment by the believing remnant of their former but renewed mercies: " as we have heard, so have we seen." Nothing can be more touching than verse 9. Verse 10 is worthy of notice. His name is indeed what God is to His people, as revealed to their faith. It is, and has been, matter of their faith and reliance upon Him; but now more, He had accomplished that which His name declared.

Psa. 49 seems to me an address of the Spirit in the mouth of the remnant in the latter day, I think, flowing from the state of the Jews, who have taken unbelievably the promises in a merely earthly way, and therefore not of God; that is, who are living at ease in Palestine; but also referring to the ungodly Gentiles who think to have the world in possession. It marks, however, the false security of the world: chaled, the transitory character of time (Psa. 89:47), which passes away as a moth fretting a garment. It is the security of the people of God, being redeemed from the power of the grave, which would destroy and " gnaws " (ver. 14) the hope and security of those who are not God's. It is enabling faith to say what the Lord said of the remnant, " Blessed are ye poor." It is the instruction qualifying our faith to unite in the expression of the Son of man. The Maschil (the moral which consists in the contrast between the world's attempt to build itself selfishly and individually a house, and the redemption of the poor and rejected godly ones) is simple and manifest. The redemption from the power of the grave does not affirm resurrection, but just this much-deliverance from it. At the same time the principle of all this was fully verified in our Lord-the remnant all through; and as to this last point, His not seeing corruption was a literal fulfillment of it, though He saw death.

From Psa. 42 to 49 is one book of the remnant's songs. To the end of Psa. 44 are their sorrows. In Psa. 45 they are turned to the king; then the results, the God of Israel being found to be with them.

They are regarded as from the time of the separation of the fleeing remnant consequent upon the heathen getting into possession.

Psa. 50 is the actings and principles of God towards Israel at the time of God's showing Himself. The thesis is manifest; the application and force of the argument towards Israel, as to its condition intermediately, is very plain. It is the summons of the saints, witnesses of God's righteousness intermediately, and Israel thereon brought into question, with the assertion however, and founded on "I am God, even thy God," when God manifests Himself, when God is Judge Himself. It is the judicial act wherein the saints in covenant with God in Christ are assessors, and the Jewish people, His earthly people, called up to plead; where God, the God of the remnant of the Jews, speaks and comes, calling "the earth, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same." It is applied to the instruction and advice of them who recollect, as well as those who forget God among the Jews, in warning for that time. To verse 6 is the forming of the session. Then from verse 7 is the statement of the pleading on God's part (though there is a nicety of distinction in it, the tenor however, is unaffected by it, which I believe, is what is stated): the word for saints (ver. 5) is not Kodshim but Chasidim. I believe the former, not the latter, are the saints in glory (and these would be the Jewish remnant). The heavens declaring His righteousness (ver. 6) includes the others however; and the great result of blessing, then universal, comes in also unto them. Also note them coming in under the covenant of sacrifice, as indeed they and all saved must; but this is not merely the rescuing the remnant in Palestine, but a much more extensive and indeed universal work, when He shall gather (as the heavens also now declare His righteousness) His elect scattered Jewish remnant from the four quarters of the earth, after the appearance of the glory and the utterance of His voice in Jerusalem. The result is after the appearance of God in Zion: verses 1, 2, state the great result, "speaking" - "calling the earth" - "shined out of Zion." The manner of it, "God shall come" - "He calls to the heavens"; these are the saints whom He brings in-and "to the earth," for He judges His people. The result is, that the gathering, the righteous Jews and the heavens where the saints are already, declare His righteousness; the grounds of the judgment, to wit, on the Jews: against whom the saints coming in glory with Christ are witnesses that it was no unrighteousness on God's part; but it was their practical unrighteousness, and their supposition that, while this was so, the sacrifices were worth anything, as if God were like themselves. This last principle is very extensive. The scene is the session after the resurrection of the saints, bringing in the heavens on the Jews as a people, but, as we have said, with the witness, "I am God, thy God," calling them Ammi. It is an exceedingly interesting Psalm. We learn also that not till and in the judgment of the Jews does Jehovah thus effectually call the earth "from the rising of the sun," etc.; and then He "shines out of Zion the perfection of beauty," saying, "their God," and Ammi, my people.

Psa. 51 The application of this to the sin and restoration of the Jews has been observed by others, and the mere carrying the idea through the Psalm will give its application too obviously and forcibly to need comment. There are some points, however, of which I am not at present master; for example, Is there any type in the circumstances, and what is it? I will not enter now into the circumstances of the type, but we may note the wondrous identification of Christ with the Jewish people or with Jewish responsibility, and how the David of the Psalms is just this availing power in the deliverance of the remnant. He bore the very sin of them in His own death, and pleads as their representative for deliverance on this ground; so Isa. 53 "He was wounded for their

transgressions ": what was their great transgression? His death! It is the true David thus pleading, thus identified, that this Psalm introduces, saying, " mine iniquities," etc.; for David is not Christ in His glory, though it may include triumph.

In Psa. 52 we have the energy of the Spirit of Christ risen up after Israel's confession of sin to contrast the position and character of Antichrist and the righteous remnant, in fact of Antichrist and Christ in Spirit; violence, self-confidence, deceit, constitute the character of the man of the earth. The contrast is dependence. This is always the Spirit of Christ in the Psalms. It is the helpless but perfect assurance of the believer, the beloved in the remnant, contrasted with the enmity, presumption, and therefore destruction of the last enemy-the Edomite and its consequences; it is simple and pointed.

Psa. 53 I do not think Psa. 14 and 53 are the same thing. Psa. 14 is the blessing of the faithful Jews by Jehovah in spite of the ungodly. Psa. 53, the destruction of the ungodly Gentiles also by God: compare Psa. 14:5 and Isa. 53:5. The thesis is in verse 1, " The fool." The folly of saying there is no God is proved by God's being in the generation of the righteous. (Psa. 14:5.) This in His character of Jehovah, by His confounding and scattering the camp of their enemies (ver. 5), this proved there was a God, and proved it to them; and in blessing to Israel His chosen.

The election of God is the proof that He is God properly: " ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, that I am God." (Isa. 43:12.) It is a remarkable Psalm from the connection between the evil ones of Israel, and the enemies, and the position in which they find themselves. We know from the apostle (Rom. 3) that those under the law, Jews, are spoken of. But the principle averred of them, stating a general principle, is " no God "; God's judgment looking down, " none doeth good, no, not one." It is in effect the revelation that, when God looked down, He found no good, not even in the Jews, His people nominally. This, though always true, was then manifested. He views them as God, not in Jerusalem, but looking down from heaven at men; for Israel are but as men, thence and indeed Lo-ammi it is every one, man (Benai Adam). The workers of iniquity is the general character, the Jews are found in it. In Ezek. 34 the conduct even of Jews may be seen; it left them a prey to the beasts, the heathen. " My people," etc. (ver. 4), the remnant are called here in effect according to Psa. 46:2; consequently they, the unrighteous Jews, were in fear where there was no need for fear. " The sinners in Zion are afraid, though they have made a covenant with death, and are at agreement with hell." But there was no need to fear from this pride of men, for God scattered the bones of those who were encamped against Jerusalem. " God " (there is the question of righteousness; the others said, " no God ") despised them; then the desire of the Spirit of Christ in the remnant-when God does that; they wait for it (that is, brings back the captivity of His people). It is " out of Zion," first in a remnant (compare Psa. 126), Jacob and Israel, the whole people shall rejoice, and Israel be glad.

The existence and judgment (and afterward actings),of God are the great question of this Psalm, justly adduced by the apostle to determine all questions of righteousness for man as in man. Salvation is another thing. It is cited as said to them under the law.

This class of Psalms, from 42 to 72, takes up the condition not merely of what Christ found Himself among the Jews, but in, and as, a separated remnant, who were concerned in the union of the evil antichristian power, the apostasy, and the body of the Jews (this remnant being driven out, as we have seen in Psa. 42); but the character of God in question in the earth from heaven, when He is

what He is, not Jehovah in covenant in Jerusalem; the deliverance and interference of God in mercy to the Jews, properly guilty of blood-guiltiness. God in pure grace begins with the worst, through the Messiah whom they rejected, but united in His love with this separated remnant (thence Yachidim). Deliverance being given in Zion, God having scattered the bones of those who encamped against it, the desire for the deliverance and joy of Israel and Jacob bursts forth, and withal is accomplished, as noticed already in Psa. 126

Psa. 54 is Christ as the object of God's deliverance, or saving power, including the desire of it (verses 1, 2) and acknowledgment (ver. 7), both important as showing the position of Christ. It takes Him in His whole position as a Jew, from His first trial to the deliverance of the Jews in that day. The " name " is the manifestation of the internal and essential power and character, precisely what is obscured and injured in this world of confusion and evil. The " judging " is just the intervention of that name of power, so as to vindicate the consistency of Christ with it; which is the thread of order, of which Christ was the witness and which was attached to His name in the midst of evil, because He was it, and therefore the vindication of Him was the vindication of God's name. And so the " saving by His name " was peculiarly appropriate, for indeed it was the declaration of the identity of that name in God, with Christ as in the world; for He had that name in weakness. Therefore it is said, " Judge me by thy strength," that is, vindicate to me as in weakness, that very character and name which is Thine in strength, by the putting forth of Thy strength as vindicating itself. Now this is true as regards man by its suitableness, and as regards the object on account of its very weakness, because graciousness of love and faithfulness of kindness is part of the very name to be revealed, as may be seen in Num. 14:15-19. This cannot be pursued farther here. " Thou hast loved," etc. John 17 is part of it. " O righteous Father " is again another, and " my God, my God," etc., and " therefore doth my Father," etc., "not unto us," etc. (Psa. 115), and even "be merciful to my sin, for it is great" (Psa. 25) proceeds on the same principle.

This is a subject full of interest, because the Church can always go on this ground (and it is a ground of unfailling righteousness), and say, " not unto us." The Church is set to declare the character of God, and in its weakness; therefore it cries for the vindication of this character. So Christ was enabled to say, " I know that thou hearest me always," but therefore also judgment must begin at the house of God. Thus Christ put Himself under these things, and it " became him," etc., but if these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? For the judgment and character of God run on unchanged, and as He judges by, so will He judge in, His strength; but Christ is the vindication of the principles of God, because He is their personification in that very weakness in which the question arises. The application of God's power settles it. But we must not pursue this farther here.

It seems to me that this Psalm also would seem to make Christ speak in the language of mediatorial praise, as well as affliction, and observe the reason, (surely blessed be His name He does.) He is the mouth-piece, the efficient representative of our praise (as now), so especially in that day, and more especially as here, of the Jews. As to the application of the Psalm to the circumstances and person of Christ, I add, it is universally the name of God, and the strength of God, which is appealed to; but, as we have seen before, God is found (an only refuge actually for the position in which Christ sees things,) in contrast with all men. It puts the relationship in which the Spirit of Christ finds itself consequent upon the truth of Psa. 53 They are " strangers; " " God was not before them." God is his helper. It was not now a matter of covenant, for all this was

forsaken, but abstract faith in God; but this faith produces sense and application of covenant. Christ is alone; but" Jehovah is with them that uphold my soul." The sense of favor on God's principles towards others is the restoration of one's own soul in righteousness; He does not say " with me," for He was as an outcast for our sake; because perfect, His trust in God as the one only perfect man, but this induced, and became the object of all concentrating grace afterward. Therefore it is Jehovah, and all the trouble in result is passed.

Psa. 55 is Messiah's complaint of the Jews, from whom He had expected sympathy and concurrence. It is the departure (Matt. 16:13; Mark 7:24; John 11:54) as it were of Christ (in Spirit in the remnant) from the city in that day. He has discovered, they have discovered their true character. He retires, and His Spirit would retire ever so far from such a scene and state. But there is the energy of righteousness more marked in this (I speak not of its perfection), and the name of Jehovah is more speedily brought in. " How long shall I be with you? " saith the Lord; and even Moses, " accept not thou their offering." The treachery of those nominally associated with Him, the Jews with hostile power which gave it this character, as in Ahithophel. It is the consummation of the evil of Antichrist; the union of wickedness, there was none good; all gone together: thus their character is very remarkable all through here. There was nothing to be had but God, whose character changed not, if the prosperity changed not (ver. 19). A friend or religious associate was the worst because the nearest enemy. How this was personally verified in the blessed Savior, all know; but it is carried out to all that solemn scene of the latter day, when those that are faithful must follow that faithful One and Guide, led of Him without the camp, blessed be His name!

Psa. 56 is the complaint of the Beloved as trusting in God's word, the faithfulness of God to His trust in Him, when He had to wander, not having where to lay His head in that land of which He was born and anointed King. Compare Heb. 5:7, Psa. 69:13, 14, and Isa. 49:8, a chapter singularly indicative of the union, evidently in the mind of the Spirit (in the view here taken) of the Lord and Israel. Though it is quite evident verse 3 of that chapter is literal, in verse 5 this assumption of the remnant into His character is marked. In verse 10 of this Psalm " his " is put in; it is the testimony on which the truth rests; we may notice the expression God and Jehovah, both are the objects of (his) faith: God, is that He is to do it; Jehovah, the covenant relationship on which the accomplishment depends; nothing can be more affectingly interesting than the comparison of David, and the Lord in the days of His wanderings; it is in His Jewish connection He is properly David: though all the covenant is broken now, yet it is sure. We may add, Israel being now judged, Christ speaking as cast out, it is " man goeth about." They all stood on the common ground of contrast with the God of heaven, on the rejection of Him who came amongst them. Verse 13 is the principle so often found of the power of deliverance from death; the resurrection the center of this. Our portion is to " suffer with," theirs to be " delivered from."

Psa. 57 is at once the distress and the confidence of Messiah, when identified with the sorrows of the Jews (the remnant), when ready to be swallowed up (by the adversary). Its result, in full manifestation of the divine power in the heavens, and His glory over all the earth, is manifest. Verse 6, the reader of the Psalms must be familiar with, as the destruction of the enemies in the latter day. We may observe also verse 9 as connected with, and made illatively dependent on, verses 10,11. The remedy for trouble, that is, the saint's trouble, is the exaltation of God; and then He will be exalted above the heaven, and His glory be in all the earth; the heavens and the earth will be brought together in Him, in reconciliation of full blessing.

In the same troubles and increased, he looks higher; not only trusting in faithfulness on the word, but the day star is arisen in his heart, for the night if long and dark is therefore far spent, " until these calamities be overpast." To the eye of heaven the earth is full of wickedness, but God shall send from heaven; accordingly at the close the praise is not vowed, but from a fixed heart, and called to awake, and praise among the people (Ba-ammim) proposed. For verse 11 is the actual millennial glory viewed as in the glory of God and Messiah desiring it for His (God's) sake. Yet, in fact, He who sought it for God, in Himself only and really is it accomplished. It is then a beautiful Psalm, verse 3, which brings out the beautiful expression of his position: " these calamities " evidently are the situation of the full development of evil in that day: the principle is ever true, for the Spirit of Christ is then manifested.

Psa. 58 is the glory of the righteous judgment of God against the Gentile oppressors. It is the righteous, most righteous, appeal in judgment to the wicked, to men themselves; a sense of righteousness of situation, rising over the manifest character of the wicked-character distinctly manifested by that situation. Therein the righteous judgment manifests itself to His spirit. The Jews are the expression of righteousness on the earth, hence this appeal; and righteousness is a right thing-verse 11, so that a man shall say, " Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth." This position is one of great importance, the Jewish manifestation of righteousness. The earth is the place for the manifestation of righteousness, that is, judicially, though the heavens shall declare it. Heaven is the place for grace, as it is written, " that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace." But God judges in the earth, and the Jews are the people whom He hath known for His; and in the connection of Christ with the Jews this can be accomplished and fully brought out as seen here: righteous in His promises to Abraham and his seed, and Christ in grace associating (in righteousness) a remnant herein to Himself, but here describing the position as in Himself, as perfect in all ways in it, from God and in man; and wickedness being therefore fully manifested, and then after all the grace to them, judgment a righteous desire. It proves in the union with hostile Gentiles to be a deeper principle-man. " He knew what was in man." Compare verse 1. Long His patience and grace, wonderful the salvation of the Church, now it all came fully out-then judgment; but it is from a place of destitution and righteous faith that it is thus set forth. Till Christ took perfect humiliation, in perfect righteousness accomplished it then in the midst of them (rejected) and in perfect grace towards them, justice had not its way. " If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." God could simply in righteousness have punished iniquity, but He could not have displayed Himself; but how then? In Christ He could in uttermost grace, manifesting a head of righteousness. On this being despised and spitefully entreated even after all (and the enemies of God proved), the righteous will rejoice when they see the vengeance-such suitably, not being come in judgment, Christ would feel as to the Pharisees, " My soul abhorred them " (Zech. 11); but in the humiliation of Christ, with the remnant in the latter day, when wickedness is then accomplished, it is brought into much greater relief. He shall stand up yet for the people (all written in the book), " a time such as never was of trouble." This these Psalms describe by the Spirit of Christ entering actually, as He alone could, into all their estate.

Psa. 59 is a remarkable instance of the identification of Christ with the house of Jacob in their latter-day extremity. We learn also the mistake of looking for the full meaning of any Psalm in any of the circumstances merely of the writer, as verse 5 abundantly shows. The former point is

brought before us in comparing verses 1-3 (verses 1, 2, are the thesis), 5, 10, 11, 16: verse 12 gives the character of the enemies, compare Deut. 17 Verse 13 gives the end or object of all this-verse 6 shows also their character; verse 14 their disappointment. Though the subject of these psalms be the same, we must not suppose that they are tautological. Various are the characters in which sin now come to a head presents itself; pride, lust, tyranny, ignorance of, and enmity against, the Lord Christ taking part in the afflictions of His sin-afflicted and enemy-afflicted people; and many correspondently are the ways, in which the position of Christ is shown towards God, towards them, and towards their enemies. In these characters different psalms represent Him and them (and God as to the results), and the faithfulness of God drawn down towards them in Him, and due in Him. Therefore He says " O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee, but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me, and I have declared," etc., " that the love," etc. Consequent upon this intercessional identification of Christ with the remnant against the heathen, we return again to outer enemies, the heathen. It is now, " My God "- " O Jehovah God of hosts "- " the God of Israel," dealing with the heathen, that He has taken up Israel as His people. God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth. Verse 3 is the character of their evil, it is not now a matter of correction, but pride. Verse 11 exhibits Christ owning them as His people, in this intercessional Psalm.

Psa. 60 is the half-doubting (through sense of casting off) but returning confidence of the Spirit of truth in the house of Jacob, through the sense that their enemies are not overcome, but, that the promise goes to results, which include that. In a word, it is the sense of the Spirit in the house of Jacob, when their enemies' presence has brought them into the full sense of their casting off, which indeed was (though the reconciling of the world spiritually) the abrogation of judgment in the earth, and the leaving of it by God; but at the same time led them to that looking to God which at once brought them, through grace, to all the promises; and so " through God we shall do valiantly." We have here, in verse 5, the appropriation of the Davidical name to the remnant, and the identification with him in name. As to its direct prophetic application, it is the remnant, those who feared God, given a banner, and emerging from the consciousness of their casting off, by this mercy, which pushes them to seek, by God's title, their inheritance, casting themselves on the God who had cast them off, as their only strength.

It appears from this psalm that Israel is fully recognized with Judah (ver. 7), and Judah in his best character, before God begins to act with them on the enemies around within the territory, and the Jews possess themselves of Edom. After their recovery from positive oppression and trials, they call upon God for help in their weakness for action; and verse 4 shows the latter, as verse 3 the former. Verse 10 invokes the God who had cast them off, as the God of their help. " He had not let them stumble for their fall." They now " stay no more upon those who smote them, but upon the Lord, the Holy One in truth." God and man are again contrasted, verse 11, but in honest faith and sincerity, humble yet sincere truth-after the past act of the positive trouble, under the sense of it looking for the strength which shall order and establish them as against their enemies; going with their anxious acknowledging it was the casting off of God-" accepting the punishment of their iniquity," owning they were cast off, still as with a trembling heart to themselves, yet true, holding the banner of God given to them, and calling themselves His beloved. The truth is to come out in connection with them. God is to tread down their enemies: an old position, on much better ground, to a humbled renewed people in whose heart God has put His laws and revealed their Messiah as

Jehovah in righteousness, whom they once rejected. But here it is specially God and the people and the work in them, not the revelation to them. Here He stands at their head, receiving God on their return.

Psa. 61-66 I also find connected together. Instead of being Christ or the Spirit of Christ in the presence of His enemies or the people's (or remnant), it is in the presence of God in these circumstances-the calm appeal and judgment of circumstances in His presence. His Spirit conducts Him as man (and so the remnant) to a Rock higher than He, as man, or themselves. From the end of the earth or land, shut out from His holy presence in His temple, He, God is His tabernacle, God who has heard his vows. He has the heritage of them that fear God's name-his confidence is in Him; it is all through as associated with the Jews, I mean the Jews as distinct from Israel. Verses 6-8 are the expression of the character of this confidence: " generation and generation it shall be," yea forever; we hear of " mercy and truth " which then shall meet together-a time of praise. In the midst of all the circumstances Psa. 62 calls the soul to wait " only upon God "-calls the people (Am) to " pour out their heart before God, for he is a refuge for us." Men are all vanity-power belongs to God: mercy shown in justice (now to be manifested for the patient and oppressed). The expression of soul in this is found in Psa. 63 The application of this Psalm to spiritual joy, its character and confidence in this desert world, how often have they been the joy and instruction of the heart of the saint; but here I only follow the sense or explanation. It is most sweetly rich in joy. The King, verse 11, marks the place and consequence, as in Psa. 61 Psa. 64 is the depth of the secret counsel of the wicked, malice and encouragement of the enemies, verses 5,6; but God shoots at them, whose thoughts are deeper still-they shall be a sign of their own folly and God's judgment; men, all men shall fear, then afterward the Lord shall be the joy of the righteous upright. Psa. 65 presents Zion as the place accordingly where praise waits for God, as soon as ever the remnant, His people, are set there, praise will begin: and they have it ready there already in their hearts-their sins hindered, they are to be purged away- verse 4, the character and anticipation of this; verse 5, the manner of its accomplishment, its effect and consequences on the earth, as life from the dead. This is a joyful psalm, full of blessed hope, very beautiful in its spring of holy hope. The answer to the cherished hope and vow of the sorrowing righteous, long estranged but righteous, just ready to burst forth. Psa. 66 is a consequent summons to all the nations or lands. It is the song of the righteous, proved such, after their acceptance and so far restoration, but before the submission of the nations. The judgment which delivered them (the remnant) from their immediate oppressors (Antichrist, etc., of whom we have seen) is the occasion of this summons to the earth at large, having been in fullest trouble, they can now say our God in deliverance; Christ is the foundation of it in the close.

Psa. 61 seems to be the address of Messiah, Christ, to the Father, as rejected and expelled by the Jews (of whom He was anointed King), that from the end of the earth or land, driven (himself of old in Spirit, in this Enosh character) among the Gentiles, He could still look unto Him to be led to the Rock that was higher than He, as He said, " for my Father is greater than I." (See Psa. 16:2.) In this, as the persecuted Christ, He would abide forever, for " he put his trust in him." This was His mind in His humiliation. Then we have (with the exception of verse 7, which seems the interlocution of the Jewish remnant) His thoughts as under His deliverance: that is, having taken His people now upon Himself, He would act as became Him in consequence of the responsibilities so acquired, He would daily perform His vows; here then we have Messiah as the exalted man

occupied with rendering His vows (for the salvation of His Church, or rather here, more especially His earthly people felt in Himself, as Heb. 5) to Him who had been the power of its deliverance, hearing Him so crying; this with verse 7 is a subject of very deep interest. Compare here Psa. 56:12; 61:8, and 65: 1, where the form of the blessing is entered into. I do not here state the inquiry, whether the paying of vows by the Lord Christ is only as the head of His people in the millennial glory, or in the ages of eternity; of the former we have evidence as to the Jews here, for it is in this character, and as connected with them, He specially pays the vows; as with the saints, He is in the glory reigning. I have omitted to refer to Psa. 22, where the subject and result of Christ's vows are fully entered into. The latter part of verse 5 here is worthy of our attention. (Verse 7, compared with our Lord's words in John " and abide in his love," leads us into the force of this subject.)

Psa. 62 particularly describes the jealousy of Christ's enemies against Him, and their feebleness, because God was on His side. " His expectation was from him." Verse 8 is His comment upon this, and the statement of His experience in this, to His companions, " the people," and so " a refuge for us ": it also glances at the vengeance, as mercy of deliverance to the afflicted children of God; they are indeed bold and unhindered now, but God will recognize me, God will render to every man according to His work, therefore " trust in him," and always " trust not in oppression." See also verse 3 (where the soul is set morally right, the prevalence of all evil is but the evidence that the Lord alone shall be exalted, because there is a God). This is the Psalm of faith, and though I have but briefly touched on it, it is a most instructive and touching Psalm; just the meeting of the mind of faith with what is true in God, but hidden from faith save as it is realized in faith. The identity of Christ with the nation is strongly marked in verse 8; also observe God all through, except the last verse, where it is the covenant name of God-the Lord, the faithful One.

Psa. 63 seems to me to be the desire of Christ (now that He has come into a far country from God, in the midst of and under the sin and misery and desolations of man, wandering, yea, departed from God, as utterly estranged) for God, and looking at the full glory of God in the sanctuary (Judah externally was the sanctuary, and the Shechinah of glory was there). The desire of Christ after that glory which He had " with thee before the world was." It is the recollection, so to speak, of Christ applying itself to that which belonged to Him (I see much of this running through John, who is full of the glory); as He says in the very case, " and now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." It is then the thought of Christ in His time of need, of the glory as His delight which He knew in God, and delighted in in His presence; and we may say of another glory which He had with the Father before the world. The enemies that were against Him should be destroyed, who did not know, or they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. In which act, according to the principles of the Psalms, we see that " princes of this world " was a common designation for all.

Psa. 64 The malicious and calumniating enmity of the haters of the Lord (of Christ) shall draw out the wrath of God, and thus unexpectedly shall they be taken in their own wickedness: the character of their own enmity against Christ the perfect One exhibits the principles of their own state, and when drawn out to a head in the act of their own exaltation, draws down the vengeance of God. The very same perfection in power, as Christ was in humiliation (the full character of the enmity, and the result with God, are strongly developed).

That Psa. 65 is the restoration of the Jews, or, more properly speaking, the replacing of the remnant (now a nation) in their old place with God, in the mediation of Immanuel, as introducing millennial blessedness, is, I think, evident. The Jewish portion of this is stated in verse 1, as expected and appointed, and that in the most beautiful manner possible, in the union, if we may so speak, of God's interest and man's in it, according to the promises. In verse 2 is the Gentile portion of this blessedness. In order to this, Christ must take it up: accordingly that which has prevented is stated in verse 3, but in Christ's person as for the Jews, as in Isa. 53, the latter part being the expression of this by the Jewish remnant; this leads them to celebrate their acceptance in the beloved, the man whom God chose; then comes the manner of their deliverance, as in answer to their faith; the extent of this, "over all the earth," and the fruition of blessedness by the removal of the curse from the earth: such is the scope of this beautiful Psalm. The Psalms here open out more into the glorious results of the union of Immanuel with men rather than with the Jews.

Psa. 66 is the blessing of the nations in the deliverance of the Jews in the latter day: Christ at the head of the Jews, or rather as the head of the Jews, ready to pay the vows uttered in the time of their trouble. It is the voice of the upright remnant, He being so really, they in their acceptance having integrity, as spoken of in scripture, as Noah, etc., to God; but really true only in Him, and therefore all this is spoken in His person, and He has fulfilled all this (that is, what in His own person made Him capable of so taking the lead). To verse 4 is the blessing arising from the dealings of God to the nations called to praise Him. Verse 5, in reference to old doings, calls them to see present similar ones, putting down the rebellious. Verse 8 turns to the acknowledgment of for whom, and in what, all this is shown. "Bless our God." He hath tried, but hath also delivered us. In verse 13 Christ takes up the word, having His mouth opened, as it were, by the blessing of His people, all along in His heart. It is then progressively developative, from the general call to the nations to the special feelings of Christ.

In Psa. 67 there are two things, that the blessing of the Jews is the way of saving health being known to all nations; and next, that the praise of the peoples (brought in) is the object of their desire, and caused by the judgment and government of God, and that the bringing in of the people, their restoration to God, was needful to, and occasional of, the full blessing of the Jews in detail, that producing the fear of Him who blessed them. See Jer. 33:9 (as of the earth, for they were the earth's representatives and spokesmen).

Psa. 68 is a noble psalm and triumphs in the thought of the presence of God. The preface is longer than usual; and though the first verse is as a general heading, yet it extends itself to the end of verse 6-the celebration of blessing because of the assumption of this place in the heavens by Him of the ancient name, His character in association with this, especially as regards the Jews. Compare the desolation of Edom in Jer. 49 God arises, God that is all this. The solitary-I should translate, those separated into the unity of estrangement from the evil of those that were around them, the remnant and their estate-He maketh them a house, delivers the captives, and brings desolation on the rebellious, namely, the body of the Jews: it is the constant, I should say almost technical term for them. The Jews are the object of this arising; but it is the wicked, and the righteous, referring them to the presence of God in the wilderness, and the preparation of an inheritance, in which, refreshed with rain from heaven, the incorporation of the Jews (Yachidim) should dwell. In verse 11, then, comes the development, when "Adonai gave the word." Verses 15-17 are the Jewish people, a body; the establishment of God's throne not over, but in

Jerusalem, similarly as in Sinai too, and according to its power and enactments. Verse 18 is the recognition of those in whom these things were wrought, and how. "Thou," that is their Adonai, hast ascended on high and received gifts as man, even for "the rebellious" (the Jews), for the dwelling of Jah "Elohim." The apostle does not quote the latter part in referring to the gifts in Ephesians. The rest of the Psalm scarcely requires a note., taken as referable to the latter days. The congregations are not the same word; the Jah Elohim is in the heavens; the strength and salvation of Israel shines through the Psalm. It is a magnificent Psalm.

From Psa. 65 to this seem a sort of little book of themselves, a common subject. Indeed the whole from Psa. 51 to this is not merely great general truths (relative indeed to Christ and the remnant), but the actual question between Him humbled, and Him delivered, and His enemies. It is all personal, the personal trial of Messiah as identified with the remnant. Man would swallow Him up, as a man; but God was His strength; when God arises, that being so, the case will be different. "God" will be found to be specially brought before the mind accordingly here (that is, in these psalms). It is the whole course and relationship of God with Israel from beginning to end, as acting on the very same principles (His principles) throughout with and manifested in them, taking the name and word in which He went before them in their first deliverance in the wilderness, and identifying it with Christ in the heavens, Adonai ascended. Verse 18 shows the address to Christ as one who had effected all this. Solitary, are yachidim, it is a principle of action which we have seen all through; that is, we have seen the yachidim in their cry, compare Psa. 22:20. Lord in verse 11, is Adonai, that is, Christ recognized on high. Verse 16, Jehovah. Verse 17, Adonai. Verse 18, Jah. Verse 19, Adonai. Verse 20, Jehovah Adonai. Verse 22, Adonai. Verse 32, Adonai. It is recognizing Jah, the existing God-Elohim, God in covenant, that is, in Himself in consistency of character. Jehovah the accomplisher of all spoken in Israel, in a word, of promise properly-especially Adonai, who is celebrated as Christ risen in verse 18; but the same act, mercy, and protection or powerful deliverance as at first in the desert. "Let God arise." Num. 10:35. In a word, it is all God's glory and truth as centered and developed in Israel, accomplished and celebrated by Israel in Christ ascended, their Adonai:-God giving deliverances, God giving strength and power unto Israel His people. The triumph is complete and detailed, not only as their ancient God, their God of old, but as in the heavenly glory of Christ. With verses 33-35 compare Dan. 7:7, 9, 13, 22, 27; Deuteronomy 30: 26-29.

Psa. 69 The deep affectingness and object of this psalm is "he was heard in that he feared. Only we may notice the gracious use of these things in supplication by the Lord. This deliverance, as we have seen before, made the occasion of confidence to the humble: the "humble shall hear this, and be glad;" so they were the objects of His solicitude, verse 6. His identification with the Jews seen herein is manifest; it breaks forth in distinctness in verses 35, 36. See also verse 34.

Christ explains His part in going without the camp (as in effect the sin offering, bearing all reproach), but really that of a wicked world against God, verse 7. Jehovah the God of Israel (we have seen the circumstances of Israel), as obliged to go without, He explains His part towards men, and towards God. Here we see the circumstances of the great Sufferer, not in sympathy, but in fact, alone; and He explains this in His appeal to God first; then to Jehovah as to its effect on the poor, and scorned and low laid remnant around Him-for it was for Jehovah of Israel's sake-then He pleads the whose case in His own sorrow before God Jehovah. He had done all He could, ever to win them: what had He not suffered for them? His heart had been broken: what had He received?

There was none to pity. Then judgment-but He poor-set up on high, praising. The humble hear this, they rejoice and are glad; it is the sign of their confidence and deliverance. All will praise Him, for after all (the wicked having been judged) God will save Zion, and build the cities of Judah, and there will be a heritage for those that love His name, as seed of His servants.

Though the object of Psa. 70 is the same, yet its character is different; there is more confidence (I say not more faith), more appealing to God on the rectitude of His favor; its word also is (for it is brought now to a crisis), "make no long tarrying." Also the humiliation of Christ, the way of others' joy, is affectingly brought forward: "Let others," saith He, "rejoice;" as for me, I am content to be humbled, to do thy will for thy sake;" but I am poor and needy," content to be in humiliation, but my joy is in this, making others to enjoy. It is Christ and the poor, as the object of deliverance, not of suffering, a result in fact of His faithfulness in suffering; He poor, the occasion to secure by intercession, the gladness of them that trust in deliverance, but in His poverty He pleads, that they at least might be glad. It is in this spirit Paul says as to the Church, "so death worketh in us, but life in you:" only there in combat, here in intercession.

Psa. 71, though I believe the literal David to be the subject of it, applies, it appears to me, to the anomalous position of the Jews on the setting up of Antichrist, as David driven out by Absalom. This type will fully explain the psalm, looking to the Jews as similarly placed in the latter day, but finding a new place in resurrection, as Dan. 12:2; though that rather applies to another portion of the remnant yet scattered: this to a body of them, in, but now driven out of the land, though not permanently, the last time of Jacob's trouble, closing the typical David history, for then He takes His Solomon power or state. Psa. 70 was personal feeling, therefore, of David properly. The positive application of this psalm is to the Jews as apparently utterly cast off again in the close, the very close of their eventful history. Verse 20 is the confidence, but there is the faith of God's elect in the Lord now after the sufferings of Christ explained, clearly recognized in the outset. It was a Jewish faith of old; it was however to be as in a resurrection, not in what was of old. Solomon, not David, was to build the house-still not forsaken, till God's strength and salvation was to them, to that generation, and those that should come. They should not bear fruit so (that is, according to that generation), but they should introduce a better hope as a risen people.

The Jewish people shall be dealt with in the close upon their old principles, but they shall bear fruit upon new, under a new alliance. Therefore we have "old age" as in the trial, "bringing up again from the depths of the earth" as in the confidence. Psa. 42; 43, are probably when David was through Absalom driven across Jordan. So Christ is with the sufferers driven out, but His connection in spirit with the remnant is very different from His appearance in person to deliver, and give joy to the separated remnant, whom sorrow and evil around them have separated and driven cut. With the remnant we have seen Him in the foregoing Psalms, oppressed by those who oppressed them, even the great body of their own people estranged from them, because they were evil, and by them (because they are in power) driven from Zion, and the temple and worship in it.

The purport and application of Psa. 72 is obvious (closing, as it were, the previous David one) so as not to need comment. It is however one of the few which apply to our Lord in His manifestation of righteousness and glory, and it is the end of His desires as Christ. But we must notice only here, that, as of others, it is properly and exclusively Jewish, speaking of the bounds of His dominion,

and here describes succinctly but very clearly and fully the nature and extent of His dominion (which is important).

It is the work of Jehovah God, the God of Israel, and relates, as to blessings by Christ, so to the whole earth being filled with His glory, as the desire of David. Verse 15 also marks a character of millennial glory, properly, as I conceive, human (not angelic, that is, as to the desire), and Jewish.

### BOOK 3

The peculiar expression of the Spirit of Christ; His character, humiliation, identification with the Jewish people; the relationship in which it placed Him with the world; the repentance of the Jews, their thoughts concerning Him; the manifestation of principles to the world by it, resulting in His exaltation as Solomon, great to the ends of the earth, have been traced to Psa. 72

Psa. 73-Israel now is brought forward more generally and fully-Israel viewed as a nation, not the Jews and Christ merely-the circumstances in Zion, not the remnant driven out, though Antichrist may come in among the crowd of enemies and be noticed. But it is the Spirit in the remnant seeing and judging the position of, and pleading for, Israel among the nations, not as in the remnant fled in the evil day. This Psa. 73 explains the whole experience of the remnant in this respect. Israel therefore are looked at as a people, but those " of a clean heart" still alone are recognized as such by the Spirit. " He is a Jew who is one inwardly." For it is now recognized that " all are not Israel that are of Israel "; still Israel's importance is recognized. " God is good to Israel, even to such as are of a clean heart"; but he had well nigh slipped, and his feet gone, being envious at the foolish, seeing the prosperity of the wicked. Their consequent self-sufficiency and pride are then described. The effect of this is, that God's people, outward Israel, flock to them (those who might have begun apparently to run well). Their language then is stated 11-14. But there was a generation of God's children: the thought of this kept the tried believer (one of the remnant expressing their experience in this) from speaking thus, for he would have condemned them. Still it was not understood, and it perplexed his spirit till he went into the sanctuary of God, where the holiness of His purposes, His mind, is understood; there he saw their end-they are in slippery places, till Jehovah awakes, and there is an end of them. As to His people, the faithful remnant, the end of the Lord is to be very pitiful and full of tender mercy. But in verses 21-23, poor remnant, though so very foolish, who in darkness and trial wait for the revelation of the sanctuary, are kept and held up by God; very foolish, but with God in Spirit, and preserved. They are guided through this time of desolation and trial; and so I suppose it should be read " after the glory thou wilt receive me." It is the same as in Zech. 2:8. If  $\lambda\mu\alpha\epsilon\ \delta\alpha\zeta\theta$  may mean " according to," that may be; but simply it is " after the glory of God " has been manifested, Thou wilt receive me. Verses 25-28 are the great result of the true people. Trust in God in difficulty will enable us to declare God's works.

This psalm serves as a general thesis to this book, that is, up to Psa. 89, unfolded in many important themes, important to His glory and our learning. The enemies seem to be looked at generally as well as Israel.

In Psa. 74 we have the extent to which the desolations go after Israel is looked at in the land; for the remnant look at it according to God's fullness, however feeble or wicked they may turn out as men.

The remnant view Israel in God, looking at the heathen: verses 1 and 2 fully express this. The enemies roar now in the midst of it; their ensigns, their human and perhaps idolatrous witnesses of pride, are set up as the rallying-points of power and confidence. They set fire to and break down the sanctuary: this is also viewed by the remnant in its full character, the synagogues are burnt up.-" How long " (the prophetic word of faith and grace) shall the enemy without, and the oppressor within, blaspheme God's name? Though the enemy could boast theirs, God's people had none of their signs, no present testimony from God; yet the sense of this was at least among the remnant. They look for God's hand to come forth in power, their only resource; and this was faith; and they remembered His former deeds of old, their king. Jehovah's name had been blasphemed. This was the external enemy, " the foolish people " (that is, who in their folly knew and owned not God), had done it. Here from verses 10, 11, I judge, Israel externally comes in and takes a part, this in union with the world and therefore Antichrist; and " the turtle dove," contrasted with " the multitude," and " the congregation of the poor," are brought out into prominence. Then the covenant is appealed to, and the state of the earth or land brought into the remembrance of prayer before God. And God is called on to arise, and plead His own cause against the foolish man, the proud blasphemer, and the enemies around.

I suppose the foolish man, though of general import, to be definitely exhibited in Antichrist. But there is a general view of the state of Israel, both characters of enemies are noticed, those without who attack and prevail, and the oppressor. All these psalms to the end of 85 are psalms of Asaph and Korah (that is, not specially connected with the person of Christ, but with the remnant of Israel); and Israel therefore, not merely Judah, but Israel at large-the δωδεκαφυλον (Acts 26:7), though there may be answers of grace from Him in respect of His glory in the scene. The whole of this psalm is a beautiful putting in remembrance of God on their remembrance of Him.

In Psa. 75 we have a beautiful announcement of Christ's taking the congregation as its Adon, judging uprightnesses- blessed time! The question had been to faith, between weak oppressed Israel, and those that trusted in their own strength, despising God. Judgments had proclaimed now, and made a song to Israel of thanksgiving, that God's name (of whom the despisers had said, " Tush, God seeth not") was near, as the wondrous works of His hand had declared. Thus the Spirit led the spared remnant, the Israel of God. But then it replies in the person of Messiah, who has not as yet received the congregation, but announces Himself in His full character; He would judge uprightly. And, further, not only was Israel brought low, but the earth and all its inhabitants were dissolved; yet now sustained by His all-powerful arm, He bore up the pillars of it. Such had been the wickedness and ruin that otherwise all was lost; but now He reveals Himself bearing up the pillars. From verse 4 He declares how He had warned them. He had not judged these haughty despisers without warning them, that God and He only was the promoter and the Judge, and the wicked shall drink the dregs of Jehovah's cup, whose dealings are always on His own principles, and He does act on them; the ungodly will drink the bitter results of God's righteousness. But Messiah will declare forever, and lead the praises of the God of Jacob, " praising in the great congregation." Moreover (verse 10) He executes the righteous judgment of God on the earth-retributive justice here. The psalm is just this. God's power having been manifested, Messiah is put in the place of righteous Judge. He had given them the testimony that judgment was God's and verses 9, 10, give His place and service as announced in verse 2. It is entirely earthly and in Jacob, and is a beautiful installation of Messiah the Judge on the

manifestation of the power of God. This warning of the wicked ones in power we may see in another form in Psa. 2 Such a warning there will be, for God never executes these judgments without testimony. Thus we see the two witnesses stand before the God of the earth: I do not say that is all the testimony.

Psa. 76 is a beautiful psalm. The full celebration of praise on the deliverance and dealings of God. It is not merely that they are delivered, but that God is known; but then the objects of His deliverance and delight are brought out in their place; nor is it merely Jehovah faithful, that comes in merely occasionally in this class of Psalm, but God known in contrast with all else. Jehovah indeed is manifested as the God of Jacob; but this is their great glory, that God is manifested as the God of Jacob. Judah and Israel are both mentioned. His name is great there. Salem and Zion resume their place-blessed day-we, more blessed, are let into His counsels in Christ-but the nationalism of a Jew is divine. There it is he has met and broken man in his strength and pride. The mountains of prey are nothing-as a dream passed. When God arises, Zion takes her place in beauty, owned of Him. And the men of might come simply to nothing, and all their parade passes as impotent at the rebuke of the God of Jacob. Glorious and blessed word for that people! Verse 7 is the comment of the Spirit of Messiah in the remnant on all this. " Judgment was heard from heaven " -how magnificent and true the result! the earth trembled and was still when God came to judgment, and to help all the meek upon the earth-for in all His name and glory He forgets not in infinite and condescending grace, the poor. In all the astounding evil and indignation of Antichrist's time, He can think upon the very convenience of the poor remnant, and have His ear open to a prayer that their flight be not in the winter; and indeed whenever this decreed judgment of God come, it is with tabrets and harps for some. This is His name, His character, " the God that comforteth them that are cast down." All that the wrath of man will do, (what peace!) is to praise God, the rest is restrained. In verses 11, 12 is the summons thereon: I do not know that ■■■■ is more than absolute, " He cutteth off." It is a noble display of what happens in Zion, and God's manifestation of Himself in it. (Compare Zech. 10:6.) These Psalms being prophetic, while they declare the actual results of man's dealings and God's, serve as warning while those dealings are going on. It is still entirely the earthly judgments of the latter day. Psa. 75 takes a wider scope than this, because Messiah's exercise of judgment is brought in; indeed, though not exactly the same thesis, the judgments of Psa. 76 give occasion to Psa. 75 That was Messiah; this God. The whole is a triumphant song of the remnant, more peaceful and with more thoughtful exercise, but otherwise analogous to Ex. 15

Psa. 77 is the state of complaint in which the remnant find themselves. God seemed to have utterly forgotten to be gracious, still this was a God known. All these psalms are the celebration of God, as we have seen. There was grace and life in the cry: God was brought to mind in it, and they were enabled to say " this is my infirmity; " and the things which God had done to give Him this character are referred to, and come to mind. These two results are produced: " thy way is in the sanctuary; " " thy way is in the sea." Still, in all their troubles, He led His people like a flock by the hands of Moses and Aaron. Note the whole people: confidence is restored, and well grounded, though the present way of God is untraceable as a path in the sea; but thus brought in, in thought by the cry, God could be leant upon. Note, there is a difference between " crying with the voice to God," and " communing with one's own heart: " while the latter went on, his spirit was overwhelmed; the former was self-renunciation and owned dependence, and God gave ear to the

cry. All that passed previously within, though genuine, produced trouble, whether his previous song, or thinking of the Lord; but on the cry bringing in God, then His ways of old re-assured the heart. Before, the resources of our own heart were judged from; now, the manifested favor and resources of God. Remembrance of His doings is one of the marks of faith. " They soon forgot his works." (Compare Hos. 7:14.) The moment God is really appealed to, the soul feels that He is above all circumstances, blessed be His name! Their first thoughts were their own condition, and the remembrance of God brought the recollection of enjoyments under His hand, and made the sense of their condition yet worse while resting in the communings of his own heart, till, God filling his soul, all became power for present circumstances, and then came in the remembrance, not of their state, but of God's deliverance. The Spirit of Christ leads the remnant through all previous passages of their history, onward in exercise of soul, up to their present thoroughly desolate condition; and then, throwing them on God, His power of deliverance of old as the Most High shines in; and it is His guidance, so that His dealings in power of grace have their energy in their souls.

Psa. 78 exhibits the failure of all the dealings of God in deliverances and blessings on the people as such, and the transfer unto, or rather accomplishment of, blessings in the raising up of David the Prince in whom blessing and security was established for them. I notice the teaching of children as the order of blessing in it. Compare Gen. 18:19; Deut. 4:9, 10; 6:7; 11:19. It is a specific character of the dispensation, and of ordered blessing. It is not passed by even in Christianity: see Eph. 6:4. The remnant now set about doing this according to God's institution. The language of the Psalm is remarkable. It begins with the right of Jehovah-" Give ear, O my people; " but it is in the love of the same interests " which we have heard and known and our fathers have told us." Who makes this mighty link? The Spirit of Christ, who is Jehovah, speaking in the remnant who recognize His truth, in the midst of the people-the nation. Accordingly their history is gone through, yet not merely to characterize them but to characterize Him-to afford that in grace which was their only security-yea a record of grace, and its principle a parable, save to those that understood, established to faith which is of grace. For David was a king given in grace. Therefore there is no mention of Saul, but of perfect failure under all circumstances, and the favor of the Lord interfering in strength. The Lord awakes, and by His own gracious view of the desolations of His people His pity awoke, an encouragement of grace for the latter days in their trouble. This grace, and its judgment of things as here, was properly a parable to the flesh judging after the law, and drawing God's ways thence; it was truly a parable, because " the things revealed belonged to them," etc., " that they might keep the words of the law." (Deut. 29:29: " The secret things belonged to the Lord their God.") And now, on a retrospect of all to David, this secret is brought out; it was not of the dispensation, but sovereign. So when our Lord began speaking of a sower going forth to sow, it was a parable, it was grace to the Jew. He came properly seeking fruit, but in truth there was none, and He knew it, and He had been sowing fresh seed. " Thou leddest thy people: " there was the great principle of favor, but there was much more that God had to reveal for their thoughts in detail. Under this leading, in the midst of all favors, they had walked in rebellion and unbelief and lust (that is, in the wilderness with God, where He was teaching them Himself); then, as to all the judgment He had exercised in Egypt, and on the Canaanites in their favor, forgetfulness and giving themselves up to do the like, whereon God gives them up, as He had chastened them for their lust in the wilderness: He forsook Shiloh. To this Jeremiah refers also. He gave His people over-their latter-day trials were not the first time-it was an old history. But

their misery as ever (so in Egypt) awoke the Lord, and He smote their enemies, and raised up the Beloved for their deliverer. This was the lesson, a pregnant lesson for them. These parables and proverbs of old prove that it was not for David's time merely-that He who taught Asaph taught this Psalm. Their business, as in Psa. 22 was to teach their children. There are some other points in this history: first, the rejection of Ephraim, when strength and prosperity was amongst His own people, and therefore their early sin is mentioned (for though God is supreme, there is always consistency of character, if supremacy in grace, though He had endured with great long-suffering); further, the supreme choice of Zion and Judah which He loved, the exaltation of His house. Shiloh was, I believe, in Ephraim. The rejection of Ephraim and choice of Judah is strongly presented in the psalm. The psalm is a parable really.

Psa. 79 The way in which these psalms take up Israel is very remarkable. The remnant, in the full strong exercise of faith, take it up as God's place and people; and consequently we have still to remark that the question is between God, the exaltation of His character and truth, and man and his ways. Now, as between them and the nations, Israel is Israel as a whole, with which the faith of the remnant here identifies the name and character of God. To "how long," the prophetic word of faith on the earth, "Lord" is at once introduced-Jehovah-the faithful God of continuance and promise. The subject is the siege and taking of Jerusalem in the latter day after their return. It is not the enemy, but the heathen (a proper Jewish designation of those without); and destruction is consequent on the siege, not by Antichrist, but the heathen. I am led to think from Isa. 22 that Persia will be the leading agent here. Then the iniquity of that kingdom of the image, which never had persecuted but delivered the Jews, will be complete. It describes the utter desolation (as far as it goes) of the Jews in the midst of the last spoiling of the rivers. (See Isa. 18.) Jerusalem is laid on heaps, but Jacob also is devoured. The expression of the remnant under it, and their faith too, "Thine-thine inheritance," verse 1. Compare Joel 2:17. They regard therefore the slain, as God's saints ■■■■■■ not ■■■■■■. It is believed by many that there will be a special slaying of those who bear testimony in Israel, subsequent to the rapture of the Church, previous to the manifestation of the Son of man; but it does not appear to me, even if they be actually included, that this is what the Spirit expresses as the mind of the remnant here. That is for the Church to know, and beforehand, not the remnant's exercise of heart preserved for the earth; these are looking to Him who can preserve them that are appointed to die.

Psa. 80 is thoroughly and properly Jewish, more accurately of Israel; for it has no specific relation to any particular portion, save as Joseph more especially implied and involved the land. The "Shepherd of Israel" is addressed-He that leads Joseph like a flock "-He that sits between the cherubim," the place of His rest and power of old in Israel, of divine ordinance, attributes, and the throne. The Jews being first restored into the trials and exercises of the latter day, and concerned in all that related to Antichrist, the restoration of the others, and their presence in the land, more particularly involved the full coming of the nations. This psalm, as all in this book, recognizes Israel as such before God-"the vine that had been brought out of Egypt." Yet it is before the Son of man has taken His gathering power amongst them; but faith looks at the whole scene before God, without the judicial details being brought in. But it is their call of God as the Shepherd of His people to take His place amongst them-to stir up His strength and come and help them. It turns therefore to His presence among them in the wilderness, passing by all between as lost; and note here how judgment does the same thing by the Holy Ghost in Stephen-"Did ye serve me by the space of

forty years in the wilderness? yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, and I will carry you away beyond Babylon." The present desolation of Israel is referred to their sin in the wilderness-sin which the prophetic Spirit alone notices. Then consequently Solomon's house is passed by, and set aside as utterly worthless; so Anna withal waited for redemption as much as Daniel in Babylon. Here faith consequently goes back to God's part in it: "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt and planted it, and it is laid waste." But, the grace that brought them out and planted them being thus referred to, they can set themselves, even in the desolation (for grace and God's dealings are referred to), into His hand for deliverance, to be turned again and this vine visited. But it is as looking down from heaven, whither as it were God was retired; and they felt it. Still thence He could look down in grace, if they had driven away and forfeited His presence here. All through it is God's actings which are referred to. Hence, there is a branch brought in, which He had made strong for Himself, even the Son of man which He had strengthened, the man of His right hand. "So," they say, "will ye not go back from thee." "Turn us again" is their cry. We have not then the judicial distinctive details, but the exercise of faith in God to bring in the general blessing as of God to Israel; and here through the promised branch (or son) of the vine, even the Son of man, the man of God's right hand. There might have been a restoration, but all the beasts of the forest were wasting the vine, for there was no hedge. The apostles (though Jews were distinctively known to the flesh) yet speak of "our twelve tribes" ever, for grace and faith on utter ruin and rejection know the whole in God's mind in grace. The staff "Bands" indeed was broken; but then faith went up to God, viewed it there, and passed over all the history of failure and responsibility, and so back to God's original dealings from Himself; for man's total ruin is the time, the due time, of God's proper grace and His own counsels. Thus it exalts our thoughts of God. Jehovah God of hosts here shines forth to faith in power. The allusion of verse 2 is an exceedingly touching exercise and suggestion of faith; it was a time of love then, and if He made His poor people remember it, and the order of His beautiful flock, and their nearness to Him, He was not likely to forget it. Blessed God! how are His ways restoring ways of grace and tenderness!

Psa. 81 The new-moon trumpet soon sounds on this; and, grace and comfort restored, Jehovah goes on to explain all that had passed between. He had never departed from His love and the yearnings of His heart over them. It is the echo of the blessed Lord's word in His last effort of love, as acting on their responsibility, "How often would I have gathered!"-when He wept over her that killed the prophets and stoned those that were sent unto her. "Israel would none of me"-that was the affecting and true witness of a loving God-one who was a husband to them. Alas for Israel! Good would have been their portion. Yet they know their God better in grace; and it is remarkable how, in the testimony that it was no want of love on God's part that occasioned the desertion, their placing in grace is referred to. The reference (even where "if thou wilt hearken to me," that is, the ground of faithfulness is laid) is not to Sinai, but from the coming forth from Egypt up to Sinai, which was all the display of grace in contrast with law; so that even in murmurs they were blessed with the very same things they were chastened for afterward. And, now that the moon had been eclipsed, in, brighter rays she came forth again with rejoicing to receive her light afresh from the Sun of righteousness, and all was joy in Israel. We have again here Joseph specially as taking in the people and the birthright, as Judah did the royalty: verses 5-7 recall all these dealings. He was the God that brought them out of Egypt. Open their mouths wide, and they were filled. True affiance of heart, so as to receive the full blessing, was all that was wanting; but there was none

such. How was Israel silenced, yet in what certainty of grace!-grace always shown through their long history, so that they were infinitely humbled in what gave perfect and sure ground for them now to rest on.

This was a trumpet of gathering and of joy on the emergence of Israel into light again. The alarm trumpets had been sounded before, as in Joel. From His love God had never departed, nor changed in it; their heart was restored and returned to it. Joy was a statute for Israel then, and now in delivering grace. It is a most touching and lovely psalm. The law is clean passed over in it as naught; God is speaking in grace, as we have seen in judgment in Stephens speech.

Psa. 82 But there was another important question: what was to be done as to power on the earth, so that all things should be set right in Israel? God was arising to judge the earth. All might be wrong, but a great secret now broke forth on the world, joy to the longing remnant-" God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods." The thing is not yet executed, but His presence is discovered amongst them. They might be gratifying themselves, but here was One that judged them. " Whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." " None," says the apostle, " or the princes of this world knew, for had they known, they would not have crucified," etc. Now God was standing up to take the matter into His own hands. It might be true of the rest, but it was true of Israel too. Elohim was the name of their judges. To them the ληγοσ το Θεο came. They had the responsibility accordingly, but all was out of course, all the foundations of the earth. The transfer to Nebuchadnezzar or Saul or David did not alter this; the responsibility might be more abstract, but even the Gentile had Daniel's testimony, and was proved there: the Lord made known to him that it was so given. Still it speaks specially to those who had received the law by the disposition of angels, and had not kept it. God had given them the character of authority, and His name, and He could not leave it in their hands any longer. They must descend from the character of Elohim to Adam. Elohim, having stamped this name of Adam (all that they really were) on all that had borne His name, and arising in His own name, judges all nations. The remnant, the poor of the flock, can call for it, and be glad. This psalm changes the whole face and government of the earth. " Like one of the princes " means, I apprehend, like one of the mere Gentile princes, as of mere human consequence, not as Elohim, though I have sometimes thought princes might be used as in Dan. 10:13, 20.

Psa. 83 We have here another page of Israel's history as in the land: the confederacy of those nations within the limits of the land and borders, holpen by the Assyrian, who is joined with them to cut off Israel (now recognized as a nation there) from being a nation, that the name of Israel be no more in remembrance. It is not now the Jews or Antichrist, nor does the Spirit move in that sphere of thought; the beasts are not on the scene at all, but Israel in the land, and God is appealed to for His name and honor. They are His enemies, they will have " the houses of God in possession." Messiah, the Intercessor in Spirit, takes the question up in verse 13, and then Jehovah's name is brought in; and it is prayed that by the judgment He whose name alone is Jehovah, the same yesterday, to day, and forever, the God of Israel, may be known to be the Most High, and that over all the earth. This effort of the local enemies (only to their own displacing) gives, as we have said, a very definite page of Israel's history as in the land. Assyria, as to much of its territory, may be perhaps interested in this, the bounds being Euphrates. However, in seeking to cut off Israel, Israel (holpen of Messiah) can now bring in God, and thus He be known as the Most High over all the earth. We have nothing of the heavenly triumph here over the man of the earth associated with the

Jewish many, who have rejected Christ-" this generation," but the portion of Israel with the Most High over all the earth. The Spirit of Christ knew their doings and presents them before God. God had taken His place to judge among the gods; therefore He could be thus appealed to. For these Psalms are progressive. As to hidden ones, see Psa. 31:20, 21.

Psa. 84 is a most beautiful Psalm, beautiful in spirit for all saints. The land being cleared, the heart and thoughts of the saints in Israel find a rest again in the courts and dwelling-place of Jehovah of Hosts. The relation resumes its place. I do not think the Spirit speaks necessarily in those actually in Israel, but describes what their hearts found there. The ways of Zion were restored in their hearts; the track which led thither, long deserted and waste, was now printed with the footsteps of their hearts. Zion, as God's dwelling and the place of His altars, was the resort of these; and they knew in Spirit, and could say, " they that dwell in thine house will be still praising thee;" for the Spirit now revealed who He was to their souls. Zion is the center of the hopes and pleasures of the people happy in God. Jehovah of Hosts being most high over all the earth, the peculiar and familiar affections of Israel, the Spirit of Christ in each one, center around His dwelling-place proper to them. The soul of the true Israelite longs and faints (thoroughly restored in spirit) for the courts of Jehovah. It will be indeed joy! " yea, the sparrow has found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself where she may lay her young " (as has been suggested by a brother in a little published book on the Psalms) I am disposed to take in a parenthesis. If the sparrow has found a house, surely the soul of His longing people may find a rest in " thine altars, my King and my God."

Blessing first rests on those that dwell there, for this is the central point; next, for many were at a distance from these loved altars, on those whose strength is in Jehovah, and whose heart was in the way, long, rough, dreary perhaps, but the way to Zion, to Jehovah's courts. The valley of Baca they thus made a well of joy; and, if not rivers in the way, heaven's waters filled the pools. Their blessed security therefore in this longing journey is described in verse 7. The heart at once therefore turns thither for itself-the Spirit of Christ in this, who stands, I think, all through as an individual. In verse 9 Messiah is laid as the great basis and ground of Jehovah's favor to them. Note, we in the Son, enjoy the same favor even as He. This difference it is the Lord presses. (John 16:26, 27.) The blessedness of God as their portion is then entered into, and, identifying it with Jehovah of Hosts, the man that trusts in Him is pronounced blessed.

Psa. 85 relates to their full enjoyment of blessing, the blessing of God, they being by pardon and favor restored; and shows the frame of spirit produced in them by mercy-humbleness, yet outgoings of returning confidence. The captivity of Jacob is brought back, the iniquity of " thy people " forgiven, all their sins covered. This was blessing, but the full blessings of divine favor connected with this in the land are not yet brought in; and this produces these sighs to God. The restoration has awakened their sense of what God's favor really was, and what it produced; and hence becomes the occasion and plea to ask for more-for all. Their own conversion into the spirit of this blessing withal they seek; for conversion into the spirit of blessing is consequent on pardon and forgiveness. Israel is thrown fully on this now. The truth of God was counted naught by them in Jesus the minister of the circumcision, for they stood not, nor abode in the truth; unbelief barred the blessing then. Now they come in on sole mercy, " ■vα ■λεηθ■σι," and therein the truth of all the promises is fulfilled withal, not only for their blessing, but that " glory may dwell in their land." By these dealings truth as to the promises of old, and mercy towards the objects of them who deserved none, are met-these great elements of what God is. Righteousness, which would have

been against them, and peace (for He has made peace), the favor and prosperity of God, are fully united; and the effect, truth, a new thing (for guile was there: forgiveness and blessing, opening the heart, have taken it away) springs out of the earth. The return to blessing, peace-making blessing, and righteousness (before either hid or punishing) can now show the glory of its face unclouded; the full blessing of the Lord shall take its way through the land. These are the consequences, or what is desired to follow as the consummation of restoration. In verse 10 we have the truth realized in God's character; in verse 11, between heaven and earth, between men and God; in verses 12, 13, consequent blessing upon earth, Israel and the land being the special scene of this, according to promise: while founded purely on mercy, it develops the whole of God's truth. Rom. 11 is the comment on the principles of this Psalm from verse 26 onward, translating only verse 31 thus, " even so these have now not believed in your mercy, that they might be objects of mercy." Now righteousness-the consistency of God with His own character, or the truth of that character-finds its development in peace with His people, they having thrown themselves on mercy. Moreover truth springs out of the earth, not only in the conduct of the saints, but the power and witness of it in facts; so that " he that blesseth himself in the earth blesseth himself in the God of truth." Righteousness looks with unclouded aspect from heaven- naught to hinder the flow of the consistency of God's character, which now found its unhindered way upon earth; His righteousness could do so. It is exercised in Christ's reign; the Lord therefore, as ever when unhindered, flows forth in blessing, " gives that which is good " (every good and perfect gift), the land yields her increase, and righteousness goes before, leads the path of Christ-it is plain, goes before Him, and sets them in the way of its steps. It is not hid in God nor guides them in the revealings of the Spirit in conflict with evil, but a plain and present cloudless path. It is present righteousness. We have these things by faith hidden in Christ; this is the manifestation of them on earth.

Psa. 86 goes farther, for it also takes in the nations, but it looks at Israel in its misery and prostration: how can these things both be true? Just because it brings in Christ into the midst of the sorrow, and taking it; and therefore He, having thus identified Himself with it and suffered, can at once when they are in it (" the time of Jacob's trouble ") call to Jehovah Himself as to it. It is then the word of Israel in the latter day in her lowest troubles, but spoken by Christ to Jehovah for her, as one who has borne them atoningly, and can therefore look certainly for mercy in the disciplinarian and judicial visitation of them. This was needful (see John 12) for the gathering of the Gentiles. He could not take them with Israel then, for there was sin. (Compare Zech. 11) We have then Jehovah at once: the humble-mindedness of Israel, the gathering of the nations, and the principle of Almighty deliverance in resurrection; in verses 13,14, the gatherings of the violent against them. The deliverance is not in the yet manifested strength of the Son of man, but sought in Jehovah towards the dependent servant.

Psa. 87 The foundations of the earth had been out of course, and God had now judged among the gods; and now comes the question in the earth, Where is His foundation? This the Psalm expresses: it is clear-Israel the lot of His inheritance in the earth; Judah, His portion in the holy land. But He now proceeds to choose Jerusalem again. There will He dwell, for He has a delight therein. Then is it compared with the world's greatness and dwellings, and we are told who belongs to it. His foundation is in the holy mountains: certainly Jacob was His portion; the thoughts of those that knew Him centered there. But " Jehovah loveth the gates of Zion more than all the

dwelling of Jacob." It is the city of God of which glorious things are spoken. But amidst all her glories, one predominates with her: He, whose association with her was her glory-the birthplace of the man of glory. This is clearly all new Jerusalem.

Zion is on new ground, in a " world to come," after the foundations of the old are all cast down. Our Lord could not be said to be born at Jerusalem at His first coming, He was rejected there: that is the character of the former Jerusalem. But now He was creating Jerusalem a rejoicing; in new Jerusalem He is the first born, and alone in His place. " Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee " could be said there: she, this new Jerusalem in grace, could count that He was born there; what a change! and not only she, but Jehovah could count, when He wrote up the people, that this man was born, not rejected, there. Grace surely and purely it is; but what a change in the face and position of Zion! Many others might thereon be recounted, more children after she had lost the others, and the children of the desolate more than of the married wife, and the Highest established her-it was His foundation, but He established her. But this was the grand point of glory and association with Him; He was born there. Yet withal the external testimony and ministry of grace should be there, all God's fresh springs shall be in it, favor and delight within, as well as contrast of glory without; for, with them that knew her, she would not be ashamed of talking of Egypt, or Babylon, Tere, Ethiopia, or any else: the glory of the birth of her great One eclipsed it all. Then, and with this association-this glory of Christ's birthplace established of the Lord, a center of affections was provided for the people here below just because divine, a link with God. Not so all other patriotism, but that is-the native country of God's power.

Psa. 88 is the expression of the sympathy of Christ with the remnant as under the law in the latter day. Hence while it recognizes their condition under it even from Mount Sinai as in verse 15, it recognizes His subjection to death and all its penalty, discovers the identity of Christ (wondrous truth!) with them in this position of the bondage and curse of the broken law resting on the spirit-yet by His Spirit, their plea, in their perfect desolateness in this state. Christ seems to have entered into the spirit of this Psalm, to have drawn it forth rather, when He describes the elect, God's elect, as those who cry day and night unto God, Luke 18; and I suppose (connect with this the close of previous chapter, Luke 17) the Lord alludes in that passage to the circumstances to which this Psalm refers. His Spirit in the Psalm enters into the circumstances in full sympathy because in full affection, in which Israel the elect, and the elect heart widowed Israel, righteous in affection yet feeling all the effects of wickedness, and for others (Christ's true character and state), found themselves in protracted sorrow in that long yet, through mercy, shortened day. (Compare the confession in Daniel's prayer.) He enters into the long course of righteous judgment due to the people, terrible and awful thought! for the soul of Christ felt it the judgment of a law broken from the outset, the array of terror which it brought against the soul which understood its curse, and the weight of it in holiness-which understood the effect of the law, " the terrors of God," " wrath lying hard upon him." Outward mercies are nothing in such a case but mockeries, as the light air or what passes vainly through it. Though every trouble and sin has its darkness from it, still a call daily on Jehovah, for the law is the law of Jehovah; therefore its terror-a God with whom we are in relation, who has shut us up in this terror, forgotten seemingly of God, but only in the darkness of His anger, when we cannot find Him. The more we know what He is, the more terrible to find nothing but darkness-still the cry is maintained, yea day and night. It is a matter of the grave and destruction: enemies there were withal, lovers and friends none. Such is the estimate of the Spirit

of Christ, the just estimate it forms, and forms therefore in the people in the latter day under the law-shut up into terror, and alone there with Jehovah their Lord against whom they had transgressed-so much the more joyful and blessed their deliverance. Still, being the Spirit of Christ which alone can feel this, it cries day and night; what a picture, and how the truth!

This Psalm then gives us the condition of the righteous remnant, who know the law, understand the law is spiritual, see it broken from the outset, and the circumstances but the consequence of a vastly deeper state of things-a real return to God according to their circumstances. Death was what stared them in the face, and this under which they were was the ministration of death (the adversary had the power of it: God was but a judge in the law). Their history in this view did but add to their misery; but their condition in soul before the Lord blotted out their history. They could not get forth-death was before them; but they cried. What could they add to this engulfing in the terror of a righteous judgment, and a broken law, a law against a relationship and ministration of death? They could add nothing. Had there been hope, they would not have been where they were, nor thrown in the knowledge of righteousness on a God of grace. It ends then in perfect misery, but in a cry, the righteous cry of right affection in God's elect. There was One, who taking their sorrow and the curse of the law, being made a curse, understood their cry and heard it. When they understood it, so as to be brought with Him, He delivered. But death must be in some sort read here; Paul, I suppose, understood this much. All must know it in light (for we begin with resurrection), not necessarily in darkness. But for experience, knowledge even often of God, and action through the region of death, that is, the world, it is often (as neutralizing it and introducing us within the veil of it) very profitable and useful. For them Christ has at any rate gone through it, but He has gone through it; so we are really free. It is a very deep, and, when known through grace, a very blessed subject, because it introduces to God; and whatever introduces there is blessed. The Spirit of Christ alone can make us know it. It is known only by the Spirit of Christ, and He has known it.

It is remarkable too to observe, that as the remnant look back here, in their own thought of it, to this as the universal condition of Israel, all their history being blotted out morally (which was the trial merely, if fruit could be got, yea even to sending the Son, and there was none), so Stephen, or the Spirit in Stephen, just sets them in that closing scene of Israel's conditional history, exactly on this ground, where the remnant, in their own sense of it in their souls, take it up. " Did ye offer to me, O ye house of Israel, slain beasts by the space of forty years in the wilderness? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, images which ye made to worship them; and I will carry you away beyond Babylon." They sinned in the wilderness: hence their present condition. All else was rejection of reclaiming dealings, and just filling up the measure of their sins. Of Solomon's house it could be said, " Where is the house ye will build me and what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things? " In this Psalm then the law is discussed: Christ with them or for them, one with them now in sympathy under it.

Psa. 89 is a most admirable Psalm. As the former treated of the law and turned to Mount Sinai, this takes up grace and the covenant of unailing promise in David. It expresses the miseries of Israel, Christ taking them up as His in connection with promise, as before as the curse under the law; but here appealing to promise, the sure mercies of David, and not looking at the miseries as bowing under the righteous curse of the law. His blessed love was just needed for both together. It was the salvation and glory of Israel. But then it goes farther; for, as they had despised Him, they

must see Him in a brighter glory, not theirs, not only resurrection, though there the sure mercies were bound on a foundation which avoided for them the law (as having borne the curse of it), but ascension, and thereon (though they did not and could not of course see that Church glory) therefore He said to Mary, " Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended-but tell my brethren I ascend," etc. Thus it comes, this being noticed, though not in revealed church form, to be a very remarkable Psalm. Christ sings in Spirit for them, " I will sing of the mercies ■■■■ (chasede) of Jehovah forever." This was Jewish righteousness, to own utter failure under the law, their failure, and Jehovah's faithfulness, which if they had failed was mercy. See Rom. 11 before referred to. This was the divine wisdom of God about them, and so towards all, faithful but in mercy, they being sinners in unbelief, and so on their part having forfeited all: otherwise the gospel could not have treated all, treated men as sinners " together." Here then Christ takes up this, the great Jewish point of personal faith, " mercies forever "-their well-known chorus of faith- so signally shown in the Apostle Paul. (1 Tim. 1:16.) They were the mercies of Jehovah, " for I have said, mercy shall be built up forever." Christ here takes up, as He is able, the faithfulness of Jehovah's nature and promise for the people, faithfulness to mercy pledged and known by Him: so we say, " faithful and just to forgive." But He can say, not merely on earth (it had been rejected there, for though truth it was really mercy), but in the very heavens. As to the manner of it, He recounts (Jehovah, to wit) His own covenant promise with David His elect. This lays the foundation of the whole Psalm, Jehovah's faithfulness (to mercy), David its object and central channel. But rejected as they were, the heavens thereby came in, they would have to see His faithfulness there, and these would praise His wonders. Saints here are ■■■■■■■■, Kedoshim, not ■■■■■■■■■■, Chasedim. Thus though the covenant was with David, this is brought out as a brighter, higher, and better scene behind, recognized and owned then by them in spirit, while the heavens praise His wonders, and recognize His works below. Verses 5-7. These announce the heavenlies, not the mystery of the Church known, but blessing and faithfulness in the heavens when all had failed in man on the earth (save He of course who was therefore now in the heavens). Then come the dealings on earth, but all this is not yet David but Jehovah. Verses 8, 9. His faithfulness and almighty power controlling the angry elements-Rahab smitten -His enemies scattered with a strong arm-this will be accomplished in the destruction of Antichrist and the subsequent scattering of the earthly enemies of Jehovah; for faith looks at them as His, and His association with Israel in glory, has not at this point taken place though He may defend them and scatter the enemies. The same distinction I find in Zechariah, and elsewhere; that is, defense, before Christ is introduced Jewishly into the scene. Thus however the heavens and the earth become, that is, actually, the Lord's. He asserts and makes good His title-this soon centers in Israel, and Tabor and Hermon rejoice in His name. In verses 13, 14, He breaks out into praise of His might and strength; but the mercy and the power have now set up the throne, or introduced them into association with it. Verses 15-17, the exceeding blessedness of the people that know the joyful sound, that is, the Lord's throne established in righteousness (when mercy and faithfulness to covenant promise have done it), and these heralds of His presence go before Him, for this is true and abiding blessing. Verse 18 appropriates all this in blessed triumph, not in announcement, by Messiah; but He taking it all up in conscious joy as the head of the people, Jehovah our defense, the Kedesh of Israel our king. This is all the Jehovah part of it, the Kedesh of Israel-and the saints therefore are Kedoshim.

But now the object and center of it is introduced, the man chosen out of the people, Jehovah's Chesed (see verses 19, 20, Hebrew), the same word as mercies in the first verse, David the

anointed, to Him promises which could not be shaken; failure might bring chastisement, but never possibly induce failure on Jehovah's part j He would have ceased to be Jehovah then. These were mercies " forever;" yet all seemed now desolate as possible-the true David cut off in His youth, His days shortened, (see Psa. 102) and as the mercy was to be in Him, and He the Gibbor of help, all was laid waste, and the enemy had the upper hand. But here immediately the Spirit of Christ takes its true actual place on mercy, promise, and desolation, as the Spirit of intercessional prophecy which is certain of fidelity, and on mercy says, Lord, " how long? " If wrath continued, all would be set aside, no flesh would be saved (for the elect's sake the days will be shortened); next, appeal to faithfulness, but to loving-kindnesses sworn to David in truth, laying hold on the very ground of faith, and then thereby securing the blessing, identifying the servants of Jehovah (mercy had made and preserved such) with Himself, He (for He had made Himself one with them, afflicted in their affliction) had to bear the reproach, and His footsteps (Jehovah's delight and honor in the world) were reproached. That closed the psalm. The way of mercies was now made plain, and the answer of these sure mercies forever found their place, and " Blessed be Jehovah for evermore " filled the house.

The next book (for Psa. 89 closes this) takes up the sure blessing, millennial blessing, and Messiah that trusted in Israel's Jehovah while He was it, as its center and only and sure way. Amen. May we know the yet more secret and marvelous wonder of grace, even the heavenly glory with Him who is over all these things, while we praise Him for His wonders in them. Glory be to His name!

#### BOOK 4

In this book we have God as the God of creation (so Sovereign of all things, and before all, wonderful truth!) in connection with Israel, and Israel placed as the special object in the midst of creation in blessing; because Jehovah was their God, the Creator of the ends of the earth; and He as Jehovah the Creator had made them the object of purpose in the midst of creation and providence.

The Church had a higher place, that is, union with the Creator in the person of Christ, so as to be thereby above the creation, though, as looked at in its own character, its members stand as first-fruits and heads of all created things.

The direct sufferings of Christ actually as man, in the midst of, and becoming head of, a creation belonging to, but indeed departed from, Jehovah His Elohim, are entered on, and Himself revealed as the eternal Creator in Psa. 102; and His association with the Jews in their covenant relationships with Jehovah, knowing and confessing Him as the Most High, according to His secret counsel towards Israel, is taught in the beautiful Psa. 91

In this book it is invariably Jehovah that is spoken of; for from its nature, even when speaking of creation, its object is the identification of Jehovah, Israel's God, with the power of creation and the celebration of His glory. In Psa. 103; 104, we have Messiah's praises for Jehovah in Israel, and Jehovah magnified in creation. Though Israel be blessed in creation, and its center here below in purpose, yet is there a covenant of Jehovah with the earth on which its blessings depend; so that it is just as in alliance with this name that Israel can thus appeal to the full blessing of this Jehovah the Creator.

In the midst of a blessing of Israel, flowing from the bounty of Jehovah the Creator and God of providence and government, the Gentiles (not the Church, that being above) necessarily come in. (See Psa. 96)

Let us take these Psalms in detail successively. Psa. 90 is the Spirit of Christ in Israel appealing to these great truths in the time of, and out of, their distress and humiliation. He who created all things has the power, and is their God. It is by His anger they are consumed, not by man's power or will. He could say "return," when He turned to destruction. It is the appeal of faith in the enlightening power of the Spirit of Christ, righteous in its reference to God, and going on the ground of His Almighty power, which indeed was the source of the whole blessing to come in. It was real humiliation for them. Nothing but divine power could restore them, ascribing all supreme glory to God, and righteous in owning His hand and their estate. The secret of God was with them, was in their cry; it was the cry of prophetic faith, consequently that which can draw all from God's power as above our evils supremely. "Return, O Jehovah, how long?" Faith always reckons also on the unchangeable fidelity of God to Himself, and therefore to the relationships He has by grace put Himself into with others; and therefore, whatever the failure of man in his responsibilities, looks up out of this to what God is: "Jehovah, thou hast been our dwelling-place to all generations."

Egypt, Babylon, or the wilderness, made no difference in this: and the Spirit, which could sing in the wilderness, "Thou hast guided them by thy strength to thy holy habitation," could recur to the blessed truth across all the circumstances of an exercised people, or the rebellions which were the occasions of them. The Psalm then takes up this character of the Lord.

"Adonai, thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations."

This Adonai is clearly Christ: we shall see the discussion of this point. (Psa. 102)

Verse 2, He was God from everlasting before creation.

Verse 3, He by His divine power turns man to destruction, and again says "return."

On these three heads they pray in the acknowledgment of His hand upon them, to satisfy them with His mercy, to let His work appear and His glory to their children. "The beauty of Jehovah their God be upon them," for faith rises in its hopes (see the intercession of Abraham), and lastly, "establish the work of their hands;" for it is a Jewish supplication properly. This is a full preface to the book. It takes up the highest or most abstract character of Adonai as eternal Creator, though applying it to covenant mercy.

I add a few words on the moral condition of Israel as using it. It addresses the Lord at once as the God who had always been the dwelling-place of the nation; He who was God before the world was, whose power could turn man to destruction, and whose word recalls him. Israel was before Him in ruin-his misery felt as caused by his iniquity-all before Him; his days passed away in His wrath-terrible yet now humbled condition -a true state of soul wrought of God, though not fully knowing God. He prays that, in the sense of their ruin, marked in the shortening of their days-their state of vanity, they may learn the wisdom of reference to God. Praying, "Return, O Jehovah," that He their Lord might repent Him, casts them entirely on mercy, desiring it early, owning (another point of truth) the affliction as of Him, that His work might appear to His servants, and the beauty of Jehovah their God be upon them. Such is the prayer of the Spirit in Israel looking for blessing;

humbled, but calling on the name of Jehovah, the name of covenant and perpetuity as their God, yet in mercy, but in benediction on the work of their hands. It is a prayer properly to Jehovah on His power, as known amongst them, revealed to them of old by that name, faith applying its covenant obligations to their present circumstances. This psalm then is more abstract and speaks from a higher ground, yet more especially Jewish, but Jewish in what Jehovah their God is rather than in relation to circumstances. Nothing to me can be more calm, confident, and beautiful—the confidence of righteous humility in faith: the Spirit of Christ—than this psalm.

Psa. 91 This beautiful psalm descends in one sense to a lower ground, taking the revealed names of God in connection with Messiah and Israel. We have first the two names by which God made Himself known to Abraham: one, the great title of millennial supremacy, used by Melchizedek; the other, the power given as a security to them that trust in Him.

But there is a knowledge of the secret place of the possessor of heaven and earth which is given only in grace. " He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty: " such is the announcement of Abraham's God, the God of promise and covenant. Messiah answers that He will say of Jehovah, He is His refuge, His fortress, His God. This is the secret place of the Most High. The promises of almighty security consequently are attached to it. In verse 9 Israel regard Messiah as having taken their God for His God, and declare with joy His exaltation and security. In verse 14 we have Jehovah's announcement of His mind as resting in Him who set His love upon Him. Thus this psalm has descended from the abstract and fundamental supremacy of Creator to the place of covenant relationship resting in promise to Abraham, in accomplishment of blessing in the millennium, when the Melchizedek blessing shall come upon him that through Jesus shall know the secret of the Lordless; and the security of the power of the God of promise shall keep them through, while Israel bless Messiah, because He, the heir indeed of the promise and center of the blessing, has taken their God as His God, showing that the secret of the Lord was theirs and for them. The psalm has tacitly assumed the existence of the evil and the judgment on it.

Psa. 92 is the joy and song of Messiah in the full result of blessing which hangs on, and is the answer to, these two names of the Lord, Jehovah in blessing and covenant faithfulness, and Helton, the Most High, as the source and securer of all blessing, possessor of heaven and earth.

It is spoken on the result of the true confidence in Him expressed in the last psalm, the great result explanatory of the allowance of the temporary exaltation of evil; and as it explains its temporary exaltation and the glory of Jehovah and triumph of Messiah, so it introduces Him declaring this triumph, and chanting the blessings flowing to the righteous, and their joy and gladness consequently in the Lord's house, witness of the uprightness and fidelity of the Lord. In a word, as the former psalm introduced all the personages in this great scene, and

Messiah's identification with Israel and dependent confidence in Jehovah, this chants the great result in blessing and the joy to Him and the righteous, and the glory to the name of Jehovah through it all. The exaltation of the wicked had only served as the occasion of the display.

These three psalms are a sort of preface; they enter into no details, and are founded on no detail of circumstances, but announce the eternal source, dispensation, and joy of the blessing.

Psa. 93 The Spirit now proceeds to treat the subject, not the principles, of the glory. Jehovah reigns, clothed with majesty, clothed with strength, whereby the world is stable.

This throne is not thought of merely now, nor a new acquisition of power, though its exercise may be new; it is of old, and He the Lord from everlasting.

The waves of creature force have lifted themselves up, but the Lord on high is mightier; next the people of God have had the testimonies of God always sure but now assured, and further declaring, as His judgments and law do, holiness becomes His house. There is the rule of the kingdom for rejecters, and for inmates: mighty power, which sets aside all their pretension; and holiness, the character and law of God's house forever.

This hangs on the great, now revealed, fact-Jehovah reigns.

It is the establishment of God's throne, and the full revelation and confirmation of His character. In scorn and rejection, their name cast out as evil, they had rested on His testimonies, the sure path of holiness; and now that power was brought in, and judgment returned to righteousness, they could with joy and triumph sing, " thy testimonies are very sure: holiness be-cometh thy house to length of days."

Psa. 95 The Spirit of Christ enters here into the circumstances to which the glory is an answer, and gives us the temporary exaltation of the wicked, and the appeal of the Spirit of Christ under the exaltation and prevalence of wickedness, and His righteousness vengeance is called for, not here exercised by Him, for He speaks as participating in the sufferings, as in sympathy by His Spirit in them a fellow-sufferer, appealing withal in His righteousness to God, giving sympathy in their sorrow, brought about by sin, and the efficacy of a portion in His righteousness, a claim upon God. This appeal brings in judgment.

Vengeance belongs to God (not to the sufferer). Thus it calls for divine glory, " lift up thyself." This is the great prophetic testimony, " Jehovah alone shall be exalted in that day."

Then the occasion, " how long, O Jehovah, shall the wicked triumph? "

Then the special triple character of the wickedness: " They break in pieces thy people, thine heritage," as Jesus says in His prayer, " for they are thine."

Their moral wickedness, " they oppress the weak."

Their despite of God Jehovah, " Jehovah shall not see, nor the God of Jacob regard it." It is not merely God generally, but God where He reveals Himself and claims submission.

Next we have to remark the actual prophetic circumstances. First we have the wicked among the people-infidels of the Jewish nation; next in verse 20 we have the question, if iniquity is to be settled on the throne associated with the divine authority? It reckons on the establishment of the divine throne already revealed to the intelligence of the Spirit. If vengeance then be not exercised, the throne of wickedness and the divine throne will be in fellowship. But in reply to the spirit of infidelity, the Spirit of Christ appeals to the creative glory of Israel's God. " He that chastiseth the heathen " is an appeal to what the pride of the Jewish infidel would admit; then he must see it in them (compare Rom. 3, the argument at the beginning); next as to the pride and purpose of man,

it is settled in a word -it is vanity. The meaning of the permission of the evil is given in verses 12 and 13 (compare Rev. 3:10). And it is rested on this, that though proved, the Lord will not cast off His people nor forsake His inheritance, but judgment shall return to righteousness, long in the place of trial and suffering.

In verses 16-19 we have the support of the Lord under, and in, the deep sense of the evil, and the appeal as to the impossibility of the Lord's tolerating a joint throne of iniquity; and consequently the judgment follows in a confidence first expressed by Messiah Himself, verse 22, and then associating all the people with Him, verse 23.

As to verse 13, it seems to me to imply preservation from, but during, the days of affliction (compare Isa. 26:20). The throne of Antichrist being established at Jerusalem, the appeal of verse 20 has wonderful strength.

In Psa. 95 we have the remnant fully convinced now, and assured of the deliverance of glory: so that in fact the Spirit of Christ summons the people finally to the joy of the revelation of Jehovah and His worship. This address of the Spirit of Christ is exquisitely beautiful. It summons the people finally, in the spirit of prophecy, to come and rejoice in the Lord, to enjoy His deliverances, to own Jehovah, by reason of His greatness, His relationship with them, His power, their ancient history; proposing to them this real sabbath of rest which now remained to them, even now to-day after so long rebellion-after all-if they would only believe. It is the last address of the Spirit in the remnant to the nation, " To-day if ye will hear his voice."

Psa. 96 This summons is addressed to the peoples and nations, not Jews, as Psa. 97 is the song so called for; Psa. 98 is the call for the Jews to sing, as Psa. 99 is again the song. Here the summons is to all the earth. But though the summons is to all the earth, yet Jerusalem is the center, and the Jews are called upon as instruments of the summons; Jehovah is the subject of the song. Earth and creation now revived, as from the dead, in the restoration of Israel and the reigning of Jehovah, are brought forward as the objects of benediction and scenes of joy. He is to be feared above the gods, for He made the heavens. All the kindreds of the peoples are called to come up and own this Jehovah the Creator, whose glory is in Israel, to worship in His courts there in the beauty of holiness. All the earth is to fear before Him; not only are they called to come up, but the great declaration " Jehovah reigneth " the Lord is King is to go through the nations, and the world itself will be established immovably by the reign of Jehovah, and He will judge the peoples righteously. Then the universe is called on to rejoice at this display of His righteous power. Thus, while Israel is placed centrally as the place of Jehovah's covenant, the whole creation is summoned into joy, for He is the Creator as well as Israel's God, and moreover in power judges the earth to maintain the blessing.

Peoples are in relationship, but not Israel. The "goim" are addressed, but the "ammim " judged. His coming is announced as the means and introduction of all this.

Psa. 97 is the most perfect answer to Psa. 96; the new song which never could be sung before-the glory of the Lord manifested-everything melting before it, confounding judgment pronounced on the gods of the heathen. The heavens whence He comes declare His righteousness; and therefore it is secured in power (there was none on earth to present to Him); and all the peoples see His glory. This is Zion's joy as the manifestation of her Lord; practically, as a prophetic

instruction in Zion, it is the righteous remnant who will enjoy it. Light is sown for the righteous, however dark the circumstances and adverse the power for the time. The manifestation of righteousness in the heavens at the coming of the Lord the Christian can fully explain. Jehovah is now high above all the earth." What shall the reception of them be but life from the dead? " The centralizing, extension, and introduction of righteousness declared in the heavens are remarkable points in these Psalms.

Psa. 98 As Psa. 96 was millennial joy introduced into the earth and among the Gentiles (these two things being united in the title and name of Jehovah's power-the possessor of heaven and earth, and whose union we have seen to be the great object of these Psalms, and the Jews the providential center), this psalm introduces the providential center, and calls on them to sing as those in whose behalf the Lord has recently appeared. Jehovah alone in power has gotten the victory. Jehovah's interference recalls what is properly Jewish, and we find it distinctly revealed, when the conflict is the subject of the prophecy as in Zech. 9 This interference is here celebrated. It is not judgment from heaven but on earth; so it is not now " the heavens declare his righteousness," but He has shown it in the sight of the heathen. It is not a call on the Jews to go forth and show the glory and greatness of Jehovah to the heathen, but to the celebration of Jehovah's deliverances and salvation in their behalf now manifested. " He hath remembered his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel." Grace, and faithfulness to promises founded in grace, are the celebrations or songs of Messiah, and the salvation of their (Israel's) God has been seen to all the ends of the earth. This salvation, it seems to me, is specially after the manifestation of Messiah from heaven; and, they being accepted, the exercise of Jehovah's power in their favor upon earth (as already noted from Zechariah) on till Gog is destroyed. Hence the Jews call on the heathen to celebrate, not Messiah or the Jews to go and summon them with the declaration of the subject of their joy, but Jehovah is styled the King. The character of the joy and its celebration is Jewish joy, as constantly seen in the Psalms, and in the temple worship. Hence also the heavens are not called on to rejoice, nor so much creation as the world, its inhabitants, and the symbols of mightiness and strength, though in terms of the creation. The coming of Jehovah to judge the earth is still the great theme, but here as before it is the settled throne, not the warlike judgment and destruction by Messiah in power.

As Psa. 97 is to Psa. 96, so Psa. 99 is an answer to, and in full correspondence with, Psa. 98

Jehovah is sitting between the cherubim, great in Zion, and high above the peoples. The king's strength is celebrated, and executes judgment in Jacob. So " exalt ye Jehovah our God, and worship at his footstool." The Spirit too in Israel recalls, with the understanding of grace, His ancient dealings with them in the distinctive acceptance of His saints, and dealings of judgment with them on account of their ways. Creation and universal joy and peace are not as much brought forward, as the covenant and habitual and well-known blessings of Israel in mercy and truth, made theirs by Jehovah's power in their deliverance. It seems to me also some that further on in point of time than 96 and 97, which are more widely prospective on the first manifestations of the incoming of Jehovah's power, which, be it noted, acts on apostate Gentiles when the Jews are in rebellious union with them.

Psa. 100 is Israel's introduction of the Gentiles into the temple, that they may rejoice with them, His people; a most lovely psalm: Israel blessed, at length recognizing grace. They are to know that

Jehovah, He is Elohim, the Creator of Israel, they His people and sheep of His pasture. Creative grace made them so, and appropriated them to be so, and thankful hearts (no longer undertaking in rebellious strength, or murmuring in proud weakness) can well own and declare the mercy which has now set them in well-known grace, that they, witnesses of grace, may, in the spirit of it, introduce others to their blessings. What a change in Israel, what a restoration of them indeed! And how is grace manifested in it, how lovely its character in them now, in contrast with them of old! Nothing can be more beautiful than the spirit and revelation given in this Psalm. Paul brought Greeks into the temple, and was sent far off to the Gentiles, but he was a pattern for those who hereafter should believe on Him: in him first, Jesus Christ showed forth all long-suffering, but these could, with him, also now tell the peoples that His mercy was everlasting, and that Jehovah was good. This closes this half or chapter of this book, what follows presents to us Messiah's part in it.

Psa. 101 gives Messiah's conduct of His royal house and land.

Psa. 102 A magnificent and most wondrous contrast of His humiliation among them, and divine creative glory.

In Psa. 103 He blesses Jehovah as the head, and in behalf of Israel.

In Psa. 104 it is as the glorious Lord of creation-characters we have seen so much united in this book.

Psa. 105 is a song of remembrance for Israel according to promise.

Psa. 106 is of intercession as guilty under the law, and protracted providential mercies of Jehovah their God, closing with the doxology of certain and unfailing reliance.

We will trace them a little more fully.

We have first in Psa. 101, the blessed voice of Him who alone knows how to reconcile mercy and judgment, to exercise judgment in mercy towards His people, and to make the fullest and most necessary judgment subserve to the purposes of mercy. Here Messiah owns these great principles in Jehovah, and sings to Jehovah in the consciousness of the fullness of these principles of government in Him-their efficacy and goodness before Jehovah-the maintenance of the light of truth and grace by them in Jehovah's house. He proposes, in the expression of conscious rectitude and perfection, His way before Jehovah, whose way it is. In effect it is the detail of the government of the house in the scene which the former Psalms disclose, as, by introducing Messiah, we are, as in every one of these books of Psalms, introduced to the fellowship of His sufferings. Here Messiah, identified with the Jews, proposes this righteousness as His way of government; and, always a servant, in that character looks for power-the manifested power of the presence of Jehovah. Jehovah need not be afraid to come nigh unto Him: He will walk within His house with a perfect heart (compare 2 Sam. 23:1-7, and compare ver. 5, and what follows specially); and besides, as His king in the land, purge it of all iniquity, and rid of evil doers the city of Jehovah. He is Jehovah's servant in the accomplishment of these things-such in peace and judgment within the land, Immanuel's land; and now waits only for Jehovah to be set up in it. For Christ is set king in Zion by Jehovah, and as His king; so that it is even Jehovah's kingdom when Christ's.

But for the introduction of these blessings, it needed other sufferings of Messiah. For the blessing of the earth and the redemption of Israel, He must suffer even to death. Messiah therefore is introduced in Psa. 102 as looking to the Lord, and crying to Him from all the consequences to Himself of the redemption of creation and the sin of His people (compare fully Heb. 2); and, nota bene, the sin of Israel forces Messiah into the position which sustains her (what marvels of grace and depths of wisdom!); and not only so, but into the place of far deeper counsels of grace and glory.

This deep and wonderful psalm takes up the suffering of Christ as the pivot of the whole Jewish blessing-the accomplishment of the divine counsels, and the glory and revelation of the divine perfection and excellency of Christ Himself. Messiah presents Himself in the midst of Israel before Jehovah, as utterly desolate, and under the reproach of His enemies all the day, but therein with a sentiment of its source far deeper-"Thine indignation and wrath." He had been exalted into the place of Messiah, for so He speaks here, as "one chosen out of the people"-Jehovah's elect, His servant whom He upholds; and now, cast down, He is under indignation and wrath, His days are as gone. But He has identified Himself, as we have seen in Psa. 91, with the name and promises of Jehovah; He, as a shadow, gone, for the reproach too, and fidelity of Jehovah, but with this word, Jehovah is forever; His support and faith perfect when there was nothing but Jehovah, and this is the essence and difficulty of faith in which Messiah was perfect, as in everything. On this ground of the stability abstractedly of Jehovah, and His remembrance, He turns to the promise and consequent necessity of the benediction of this, whereon His name was set before men.

The humiliation of Messiah, as the occasion of His necessity and cry of faith, is just the spring of hope for all the ruin into which He is entered (and out of which the cry comes), as to the redeemed people only when consequently united to Him in this cry, and faith understanding the ruin. Long time He had held His peace, but He would arise and have mercy upon Zion, for the time to favor her was come, for His servants take pleasure in her stones; they also think of the thoughts of Jehovah towards her, and their heart is identified with what Jehovah's heart and promise was identified with. This was a time of blessing. Thus by the manifestation of His faithfulness (for she was as in the dust, but that Jehovah had a title of His own and exercised it), the heathen would fear the name of Jehovah, and all the kings of the earth His glory, for it was manifested. Thus Messiah put forth, and His heart finds rest in, the faithfulness of Jehovah towards the object of Jehovah's especial regard-the place and the city He had chosen for Himself; and He rejoices over the glory and blessing, by that faithfulness, of the scene and subject of His tears, who would have so often gathered her children. But entering into the heart of Jehovah towards it, He must for its accomplishment enter into all its responsibility and ruin, and in this the Psalm presents Him. Further, when Jehovah builds up Zion, He will appear in His glory in behalf of the poor destitute, He hath looked down from heaven to loose those appointed to death, for such was the critical state of the people of Jehovah there at this time, and this that His name might be fully declared in Zion, and His praise in Jerusalem; so that the peoples and nations should be gathered there to serve Jehovah.

In verse 23 and the beginning of 24, the voice of Messiah again is heard reciting His own part in the sorrow, and presenting His case for Him. He had weakened His strength in His journey, and shortened His days. He, fearing, cries "O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days," submits to the power of death, as made liable to it and bowing under it but appealing to Jehovah

against it. But as, when the humiliation of Messiah was declared, the glory of Messiah and the faithfulness of the promises were announced; so when He bows His head before Jehovah in death in perfect submission (for entreaty to Jehovah against, is when real, perfect submission to), the answer of the divine glory of His person at once breaks forth. He was Eternal -He might die, but He was Eternal;-He was the Creator, however He had taken the responsibility of the creature. The creation would be folded up as a garment, and be changed by Him; but He was the existing One, and His years would have no end. Further, as the Messiah, the children of those that served Him would continue, and their seed would be established before Him.

I have gone very simply through the thread and connection of the Psalm, but if studied by the Spirit in faith, it is wonderful in presenting the humiliation, and that even to death-the glory and divinity of the Lord Jesus-the Creator in the ruin of His creature-as the power of redemption, and this, withal, in the accomplishment of His ordered promises on earth, of which Zion is the center, Jehovah the name of faithfulness, power, and truth.

I add some additional notes.

We have here the circumstances of Christ connected with all this Jehovah-blessing. He is Jehovah. It begins with the suffering of Christ (resuming all this position from the first two psalms), instead of blessing in the midst of Israel. He is a suppliant in the midst of creation (but note this is the salvation of the nation, for He has identified Himself with it), suppliant to Jehovah, for this psalm is all of Jehovah the God of the Jews (having title to the earth also, nothing could exceed His descension and κενωσις), still strange as all that might be, as He declares, for His faith and truth fail not, Jehovah endures forever. This faith is in the sufferings of Christ, the pillar of the nation; He holds them up, while they reject Him, the evidence of their evil, even though against Him, being the occasion of His intercession and effective sufferings. Then saith He to Jehovah, "Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion." The set time was come: utter desolation, no help but the memorial of it presented by the Spirit of Jesus. So (for Jehovah was interested in it) the heathen would fear Jehovah's name. Observe how He keeps up the thought of identifying Jerusalem and Jehovah, even in her dust. Then comes a revelation, "when Jehovah shall build up Zion, he shall appear," etc. In mercy to the destitute, He hath looked down from heaven for this-to declare the name of Jehovah in Zion (such was the manner of it): and the peoples and the kingdoms are gathered together to serve Jehovah. If this be all so; if He hears the destitute and delivers; if this be the name of Jehovah and His glory in Jerusalem, how concerning the Lord? His strength was weakened and His days shortened. He cried in this position to His God not to be cut off; then the glory of the Lord bursts forth in all its splendor, "Of old thou hast laid the foundation of the earth." Creation hangs on this smitten poor one. He made it. Creation shall change-shall be rolled up-renewed-but "Atta hu! " He exists ever the same. Such might have been His work, but His nature was eternal existence. His years in time shall have no end. Such is the rejected Messiah. Not only shall Jerusalem be the scene then of His praise, but all creation shall welcome the return- of the Lord in blessing, relieved by these very circumstances. In the midst of it, the children of His servants should have an abiding portion-those honored who honored Him-and their seed shall be established before Him. Thus is the power of this blessing of Jerusalem and creation, fully revealed in the person of Christ; His sufferings seen.

In Psa. 103 we have the answer to all this in praise, telling what Jehovah is. It is Messiah praising in the midst of the congregation, and praising on the ground of a universal blessing, co-extensive with the efficacy of His sufferings; and the scene, the fall and ruin into the center and depths of which His sufferings entered; and withal, with the competency to bless in return of the principles and glory of Jehovah which were dishonored by, and in question therefore in, the state of ruin into which Messiah had entered, that He Jehovah might be glorified. Of this the center is Jerusalem, though it is recognized (as we know more fully) that He has set His throne in the heavens. In this great transaction and its result man is manifested to be but grass: so in the same scene in Isa. 40 the same discovery is made. But in His dealings with Israel the faithfulness, patience, healing mercy, consideration of their feebleness and low estate, deep interest in His people, mercy and righteousness that failed not, are all brought out to light before the children of men. He had shown His ways in intimacy to Moses (see Ex. 34 and Deut. 32), and His public acts accordant with them to all Israel; and this is remembered in Messiah's song, thus showing the eternal character of Jehovah, " the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." But through Messiah's mediation and suffering for the necessary glory of Jehovah, the full tide of His righteousness and compassion can flow towards them in forgiveness, healing and blessing; and all their sins were put far away from them, and they were renewed in strength. This, to wit Israel, being the center of revealed display of these dealings and the whole character of Jehovah, creation is brought in as chorus of His praise. The throne in the heavens is seen and known. The great truths of the Church's place there remain unrevealed (that is, our portion), but creation and providence are brought forth in all their parts in the fullness, or summoned to the fullness of praise. Jehovah's throne is in the heavens, His kingdom rules over all; faith ever recognizes the title, but this celebrates its accomplishment and existence. The angels, all the hosts of Jehovah of hosts, His ministers that do His pleasure, all His works in all places of His dominion delivered and rescued from evil, are summoned to join in the praise of Jehovah now glorified in them—praise now easy, because they now enjoy the fullness of blessing of all that He is, and reflect that glory and the enjoyment it conveys. He has struck the chord note on which all the harmony hung, and whose soul was the center as the procuring cause of all the harmony, and, as feeling it all, in love and delight could best lead in, and resume in His own perfection all that had been displayed in it. The Jehovah that could delight to bless, and the sufferer that could obtain the blessing according to Jehovah's glory, again sounds that sweet and powerful and abiding note " Bless Jehovah, O my soul! " What exquisite music in the sound of that voice, which has thus knit the blessing of the heaven and the earth, and harmonized the glory of Jehovah with the ruined creature, and brought praise and joy out of the discord of banished sin!

The first five verses are the expression of Messiah's soul in the midst of, and representing, the people. Verses 6 and 7: His Spirit opens the door to Israel's praises in old remembrances, how Jehovah once began. In Israel it then answers in the consciousness of all the dealings which after long patience has established them in the latter days, and His glory in the midst of them. Verses 19-22: from this center all the blessing connected with it, and powers displayed in the result, are called on to praise and bless; and lastly, as we have seen, the Spirit of Messiah resumes the blessing, calling on His soul to bless. Further, in the comparison of verse 3 with Matt. 9:2-6, we learn who it was in all His humiliation that presented Himself in the day of their humiliation to His ruined people.

In Psa. 104 we have still Messiah, in spirit recognizing the glory and excellence of Jehovah in reference to creation; creation, moreover, not in its final renewal, but in its providential governance. As we have seen in the humiliation of Messiah, the mind of Jehovah passing through circumstances the most contradictory for the accomplishment of His glory (He " for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, making the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings "); so here we see, in the midst of the ruin which sin has introduced, Jehovah has never let go His hand, but controls and orders all providentially (for we must note that where there is no evil there is no occasion for providence, properly so called), and not in the unity and essence of God, but as Jehovah, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. The God of creation, government, and relationships of mercy and judgment with His creatures, He continues the display of His power in the midst of, and in spite of, the evil. In Him, (though man failed in it committed), this issues not in the putting away and non-existence of evil, but in majesty-supremacy over it, and the understood and necessary dependence of all things on His providence and government by which evil is restrained and repressed. This, as committed to man, found its place in Noah, but there was failure here as everywhere. But Messiah now celebrates this power and majesty in Jehovah in the scene of creation, and prays for the putting away of the wicked, consuming of sinners out of the earth, and the non-existence of the wicked, and that thus place be made for the unhindered enjoyment of creation and Jehovah's glory manifested and exercised. His soul therefore passes through all the details of creation, celebrating the power and providence of Jehovah, and prays that sinners may be consumed out of it, and thus completes the two parts of Psa. 102 As this owned Him as God, so in Psa. 103 and 104, Messiah owns Jehovah as to the two subjects of that psalm-creation and the Jews. If we compare Psa. 19 we see there the glory of God simply in creation, and the perfection of the law abstractedly shown; here, the glory of Jehovah governing and supreme, His glory very great in the midst of all things evil, existing perhaps in judgment if needed, but glorified in all, and ministering blessing to man. In this state of things Messiah recognizes Jehovah, " the young lions seek their meat from God; " in all this the spirit of Messiah praises Him. There is still a work remaining for Him who, in the midst even of disorder, sees that the earth is Jehovah's, and His glory in it, as a righteous Jew would; the destruction of sinners out of it. Such is the view of the righteous soul of Messiah, in spirit viewing the position of Jehovah in the midst of a world where effects witnessed indeed misery, but where faith saw Him in the midst of it. This desire of the destruction of the wicked belongs to the providential government of the world; not to the present position of the children-they are to grow together to the harvest: but by faith we can have meditations of Him in the providence which precedes it, which are sweet, and most sweet to the soul. It is of a glory which shall endure forever, despite the evil and the efforts of wicked men.

I think we learn plainly from this psalm, that, though the desire of Messiah (a desire accomplished by the righteous government put into His hands) be that the wicked should be consumed out of the earth, yet that the accomplishment of the glory of Messiah in the earth, leaves the principles of the result of the fall, in their existence the occasion of the display of Jehovah's ways and character-labor and toil and the like, until the evening; and that it is not the display of the Second Adam in simple blessing, when God shall be all in all.

In Psa. 105 and 106 we have, as closing this scene of creation and Israel's joy, the dealings of Jehovah with Israel: first, in the supremacy of grace and according to pure promise; and, secondly,

the government which acts in evil, consequently in grace, for God cannot govern where grace has not come in; and here specially it is His people as to, and notwithstanding, their multiplied offenses and faults. This is not the period of the final rest of the Jews, but it is the period of their restoration according to covenant and promise. Their final rest is when Messiah, present in glory, has gathered even all the scattered ones from the four winds to enjoy the fullness of His blessing and repose; when their eyes shall see the King in His beauty, and the inhabitant of Zion, unhindered in all the land, sees the land which is farthest from it in peace. This is the proper and full gathering of Israel according to Matt. 24; and it would seem, though more generally, Isa. 11 and 27. What precedes is partly judgment on them, partly destruction of the nations, and constitutes the great acts of royal session in order to bless them in peace, as found in Zech. 13 for example, and Ezek. 20; not simple restoration in blessing, but the dealings of God with them, purging them, and acting for that purpose.

Psa. 105 takes up the simple purpose of promise, and that God has remembered His covenant. His judgments are in all the earth now, and He is Jehovah their God. (Compare Isa. 26.) The Lord has acted in their favor, according to His promise, to give them the land of promise. Their history, accordingly, is pursued of old in judgment on Egypt, and pure fidelity of grace towards them, taking up the facts between the Red Sea and Sinai, which were pure grace, and the gift of the land which was pure grace according to promise also. The law is merely introduced as an honor and blessing at the end founded on the grace, and all from Sinai onward through the desert entirely omitted; for the praise and blessing are founded on Abraham, not on Sinai, and end in hallelujah.

In Psa. 106 we have the confession of the people's part and ways, and God's patience with them, resting on this word " he is good," and the technical term of Israel's hope in her misery and guilt-" his mercy endureth forever." It is still the Spirit of Christ-Messiah in the people. Hence note the need of Jesus being anointed as a man with the Holy Ghost, that by the Spirit He might speak, act, feel as a man placed in this place by God. Every Jew having His Spirit would, more or less, have the same feelings, desiring therefore this favor towards His people, viz., to be visited with His salvation, the good of His chosen, the gladness of His nation, that He may glory with His inheritance. All these desires for Israel He takes up, the confession of their sin, as then and from their fathers, for indeed as their fathers had done, so did they; and Messiah as He bore, so must He enter in confession into all their sin. " We have sinned with our fathers." He recites the wonders in Egypt (a proof of grace) only to show they were not understood-the Red Sea soon forgotten-the evil of the quails later-and all that passed in the desert, omitted in the former Psalm, in two great chapters (viz., their forgetfulness of the true God who had done so much, and their making and following false gods) introductive however of the revelation of the everlasting priesthood-this, of their own heart in Horeb, in their journey in the desert, through Moab, and after the great second act of grace bringing them into the land, the same thing with the heathen there. Therefore came in this great principle, not only had He chastised them when with Him in the desert, but when now before the world they followed it, He gave them up to it, He gave them into the hand of the heathen, and they that hated them ruled over them. But the Spirit goes on to notice, in His divine patience again and again, " the Lord delivered them," and they provoked Him afresh. Nevertheless when the cry of His people arose, He heard and regarded their affliction; He remembered His covenant, and repented according to the multitude of His mercies, and made them to be pitied of those that carried them captive. On this covenant, on this mercy shown, the Spirit of Messiah

pleads in the people; the spirit of grace and supplication confessing iniquity, but appealing to faithfulness and grace, to bring them from among the heathen now to give thanks to His holy name, and triumph in His praise; and, as the apostle speaks, making their requests known with thanksgivings. Faith adds, in blessing, its confidence in Him who is the ground of its confidence, "Blessed be Jehovah God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting," and calls on the people to respond, closing again with hallelujah. The connection and principle of these two Psalms is exceedingly beautiful and instructive in the ways of God; the faith of His people, and the distinction of supreme grace and faithfulness to it, and the song of righteousness and mercy, the dealings of the Lord reclaiming His righteousness in government which hangs all on grace, and that in the midst of evil-Amen. May we also triumph in His praise, in the name of Father to us given; who has loved us perfectly to present us in the glory of Christ, and who chastens, in patient faithful mercy, those He loves, that we may triumph in His praise- most blessed and highest of all positions for a creature, for it is above creation. (Compare Eph. 2:7.)

Grace leads them to the possession of the law, and their experience previously under the law as their covenant forces them to the experience and necessity and glory of grace to triumph in His praise. I think I see Messiah much more amongst the people in this book. Compare Psa. 78, where the fathers to the children declare the truth; but there it is all through "they"; here, "we." This is also because they are now actually in the midst of the circumstances.

## BOOK 5

We begin here with a new sphere. Israel restored is the occasion of the display of all the characters of God's dealings with the world as to His righteousness and judgment; and, by the introduction of the personal history of Christ in His rejection and exaltation, of deeper principles of His dealings relative to the person of Jesus, as the center of all economy. It is Jewish, but Jewish as to circumstances which concern all mankind.

Thanks to Jehovah characterize its introduction proclaimed by restored Israel, and witness His mercy their well-known song in the end. Verses 2, 3, especially call for this praise in the circumstance of Israel. The psalm itself speaks of the restoration and, though there was a similar deliverance from Egypt, that shall be nowise mentioned; for they shall not say, Jehovah liveth who brought them up out of the land of Egypt. "They wandered": therefore verse 4 I take to be on their return in the latter day; they had been (ver. 10) sitting in darkness; "for he hath broken the gates of brass." (Ver. 16.) So of their tossings on the sea. From verse 32 is what happens to them after they find their place in the land; and though they are then punished and brought low, yet all iniquity in result shall stop her mouth. Those who observe and understand these things will, in spite of and even through all the miseries of Israel, as ever, understand the lovingkindness of Jehovah. But His dealings are a pattern of instruction for the children of men in these days; and they are called (ver. 31, 32) to execute this praise in Israel, in the assembly joining with them.

In Psa. 108 we have the full political arrangements under the glory of Christ. God is to be exalted; Messiah, as man, addresses God; and Jehovah Himself with God making His glory as man the expression of what He is thereto subservient. Jehovah among the peoples as chief of Israel, for His mercy is above the heavens, and His truth above all seats and ways of authority or appearances which may pass through the heavens. He, even God, is to be exalted, that His beloved, the Messiah, Israel in Him, may be delivered; the right hand of God's power is to be

manifested. Verse 7: God answers (Elohim) in His holiness from which He cannot depart-thus generally. Verse 10: Edom is singled out, long and specially hostile (see Obad. 1:1, 3, 7); and Messiah in the name of Israel demands who will go out and bring him into Edom, the center of hostile power (so in many passages). Man's help is now vain; God will do it-God's immutable glory leaving all earthly appearances far behind, and producing its own upon the earth. Israel concludes, thus encouraged, " Through God we shall do valiantly."

Having in Psa. 107 the providence, and in Psa. 108 the determined glory of God, we have now (Psa. 109; 110) the part of Christ respectively in rejection and heavenly glory, until His manifestation. In Psa. 109, as the poor man entirely and self-emptyingly dependent upon God; but therefore the prey of the treachery and wanton, but proud hostility of the Jews and those who lead them, who were guide to them who took Jesus. The Jews are manifestly noticed, as verse 4, and Judas, but both headed up in the wicked man who shall be set over them -the representative of both the Jews and Judas; but after all, it was all the Lord's doing; and then let them curse, but " bless thou." Verses 29-31 are faith's estimate as from the Lord's truth of the result.

Psa. 110 We have on this rejection of Messiah the answer of Jehovah, and Christ recognized in the midst of all this suffering and rejection by His Spirit, even in the mouth of the most exalted of Israel, and of all Israel as Lord. David in Spirit calls Him Lord. Foes He had found plenty-the same as all; for His love they were His adversaries; but He was to sit at the right hand of Jehovah until His enemies were made His footstool. Hereafter Jehovah would send the rod of His power out of Zion: He should rule, instead of suffer, among His enemies. His people should be willing, not in the day of His humiliation, but of His power. " The dew of thy youth ■' is, I apprehend, the progeny given Him in Israel instead of fathers in that day. Moreover, Jehovah hath sworn He shall be a priest after the order of Melchizedek. He does not say He is on high-that was not Melchizedek's place, but a royal priesthood of the Most High, possessor of heaven and earth, though the title of His life is not on high. Further, there is a day of Adonai's wrath as well as power. " He shall smite through kings in the day of his wrath." He shall in that day judge also among the heathen which shall be His empire, powerful and decisive His judgment. He shall smite not only many, leaving there their carcasses, but the haughty head of a great country. I used to think this Antichrist; but it does not appear to me certain that this is not Gog, for he is exercising apparently his authority rather amongst the Jews than amongst the saints. We may inquire more of both, for both are true, but it is rather, I conceive, Assyrian. Verse 7: He shall be humbled, in dependence on the refreshings of God in the way: therefore shall He lift up the head. The other had exalted it, and he shall be brought low. Such is the proposed glory of Messiah as such, as Jehovah's answer to His adversaries' betrayal and humiliation.

The three psalms which follow are the joint Hallelujah upon these things.

In Psa. 111 Messiah leads the chorus, or instructs it rather, of the assembly of His people of the upright. The works of Jehovah in providential power for the accomplishment of all the promises of His covenant are the theme-redemption for them, truth for Him-power and judgment. His covenant proved and established also, as commanded forever. It is holy glory proved in it-the fear of Him-the way of understanding despite of all the rebellions of man.

In Psa. 112 the difference of the character and results (as God's part previously) of these fearers of Jehovah who delight (for the heart is active in these things) greatly in Jehovah's

commandments. Here now is the way even of earthly grandeur, but the desire of the wicked shall perish, the dealings of the

Lord, the result and character of uprightness, and His fear in man being shown.

The results break forth in praise in the chorus of those happy through it. Christ summons them in spirit, thus blessed at their head, to praise the name of Jehovah, the subject of the hallelujah in each; for none is like to Jehovah, the God of that people high above all the heathen and His glory above the heavens, all things in heaven and earth united under His possession, and specially blessing the poor and lowly Israel. This is Psa. 113 Note, His name is to be praised to the end of the earth.

Psa. 109 and 110 having brought in the rejection of Messiah by the Jews and His exaltation to the right hand of Jehovah, and so judgment on Antichrist, or at least the head over a great country, on account of His humiliation (it may possibly mean, and, more probably, Israel's after enemies, not Antichrist), then the relation of Jehovah and Israel and what is connected with it, Psa. 114 begins the application and effect of this to the earth -the effect of the presence of Israel's God. It recalls to the earth-to what happened when Israel was first delivered by Him. But Israel was now brought back to refer to God. Their souls were in communion with Him and their minds were so full of Jehovah Elohim that they say 'Him ' without mentioning Him. They know Him as their God and conceal His name as it were in a sort of secret triumph as belonging to themselves, and put forth only His works, until having stated them, the psalm calls upon them to triumph before Him, the God of Jacob. There is great beauty and natural power in the structure of this psalm. Of old time this was the case. Israel went out of Egypt; Judah was His sanctuary and Israel His dominion. What happened? How did nature quail before Him, before this power in Israel, before Israel coming forth! What ailed the sea and the mountains? Tremble they now at the presence of Jehovah, the God of Jacob. What joy for Israel! It was the earth, for in Jacob He is in the earth, and when Jacob says, Tremble, he still remembers that to him He was a God of grace. He turned the rock into a standing water.

Psa. 115 But though Israel may boast themselves triumphantly, turning to the earth when it looks on high, it can only say, He hath done what pleased Him. " Not unto us, not unto us, O Jehovah," the expression not merely of humble consciousness but of righteous desire. " Unto thy name give glory; " but His name is identified, for He has identified it, with them: " for thy mercy and for thy truth's sake," for thus His name was manifested towards Israel. If only truth, then must Israel have been rejected, for they had crucified their Messiah as well as broken their law, but the promises of Jehovah must not fail because man does; and therefore in His inscrutable wisdom He brings in by mercy the accomplishment of His truth, and when (instead of going about to establish their own righteousness, they stumble at the stumblingstone) they take mercy as their only and just hope, then the truth is re-established according to God's own promises and heart, and Jesus is owned as the way of it; for grace and truth came by Him, and, though rejected, will be established with greater additional splendor and glory by Him. This then was now different-a ground for Israel, not the law. The law was given by Moses-that was their righteousness. But they had failed, utterly failed. Such is the ground Israel rests on then, and the question can really be raised between God in Jacob and the heathen acting in scornful despite of their old sorrows and present abasement, saying, Where is He? The answer is of faith. Though Jesus may not yet be publicly manifested, yet

by the Spirit of Christ in the midst of them " our God is in the heavens," and as to all the prosperity of the Gentiles and their abasement, they say, as Jesus on the non-repentance of Israel, " He hath done whatsoever he hath pleased." The heathen idols are nothing (compare Isaiah from chapter 40, where the question is raised and the humiliation of Christ also brought in), and so they that trust in them. Then the Spirit of Christ thereon turns and addresses itself to Israel, " O Israel, trust in Jehovah," and asserts also the mercy-He is their helper; and then the promise of millennial blessing from verse 14; but Jewish and earthly then opened. Verses 17, 18, are full of blessing, but blessing for Israel on earth.

As in Psa. 115 the Spirit of Christ entered into the confidence of Israel on the footing to them of mercy, so in Psa. 116 into the sorrows in sympathy. Then, as mercy was to them merely, it begins " to us; " here, being their sorrows, it begins at once, " I love Jehovah," though in answer to a cry, for He cried for them (that is, in the world); and was just the One that did, taking their sorrows. Present salvation was the point, when only faith in the Lord could enable Him to speak-such was the persecution. Death so wrought in Him (not  $\theta\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  where this is quoted, as the portion of the remnant partaking of the sufferings of Christ; but  $\nu\kappa\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ), but here still referring to the Jews' portion. " I will walk before Jehovah in the land of the living," which the Lord as amongst the Jews sought, " if it had been possible; " but it was not, " for sin was in the world." The corn of wheat must fall into the ground and die-a man must be born again. But the apostle uses it in the energy of the Spirit, when the sufferings of Christ abounded in him, always bearing about, etc. And after all, if even bitter things were reserved for them, the hairs of their head were all numbered. Satan could do nothing unpermitted (and thus for glory and sowing precious seed of faith, showing them there was a better resurrection, so that with us men could be baptized for the dead), for precious in the sight of Jehovah was the death of His saints. He did not lightly permit it. O for faith to go straight on in this confidence, not fearing them which can kill the body! And if we have to say, "All men are liars," still speaking because we believe, because we trust in the living God, we shall soon say with Paul, " Thou hast loosed my bands." " I am thy servant " (not to their enemies). He hath delivered us from so great a death, and will (though life was despaired of,) for precious in the sight of Jehovah was the death of His chosen One. Specially will this be manifested in the latter day for the remnant; in the land of the living will they walk before Jehovah. The flesh of the elect will be saved; for their sakes the terrible days will be shortened, and the vows of the Lord will be paid in the presence of His people (that is, the Spirit of Christ in and as the Head of the people, whom when thus persecuted He call " me " in like manner). " In the courts of Jehovah's house, in the midst of thee " (it is addressed as a present thing') " O Jerusalem." The union between the Church and Christ, and that between the Jewish remnant and Christ, are different: we being His body, and therefore in a heavenly manner, being one spirit with Him; the other, as their Head and standing for them in present blessing and manifested, yet still completely taking their cause as His own, and in His Spirit entirely one with them; and " therefore" in this sense, the passage alluded to in Paul's quotation, I believe, has its force; the latter however was during life, and so with the remnant. Light is here also thrown on the going out of the remnant of Jacob as dew; the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom, a more general expression (John baptized could do that), and the outpouring of the Spirit. (See 2 Cor. 6:9 Psa. 44:22; Rom. 8:36; 1 Cor. 15:31.) The practical connection of the then Jewish remnant with those of the latter day, and those with Christ, may be farther searched out, for it clears up many things; in this also Matt. 24 is involved. We do not attach sufficient importance to the remnant in this character. The Lord looks at it especially.

We must remark that Psa. 116 is a psalm of thanksgiving, and on the principle recognized above. He does not love the Lord as under the law but as first loved-as for deliverance because heard when judgment and evil were upon his soul. Christ leads this thanksgiving or return of heart to Jehovah, saying, our God is merciful. (Ver. 5.) It is the thanksgiving cry for deliverance producing love: and love, a voice of praise and thanksgiving in remembrance of their estate. The vows are now to be paid, and they can be paid in the midst of Jerusalem, for the deliverance is wrought. (See Psa. 42:3, 4, and the position there.) Then they are under the sorrow. Here the Spirit of Christ puts Himself in the place of deliverance. Then it was the people we have heard, and Christ the object as King. Here He Himself leads, as a matter too of individual joy to His people. " I love Jehovah." This makes the position quite different, more near, and a matter of affection and intimacy because of what was wrought, and Christ intimate with Jehovah in union, but as helped, and the people having put Himself in their place, His hand laid on both. This makes this last Psalm (116) more blessed. It is His own Spirit rejoicing in the deliverance as one of the people, and so saying " our God."

Paul quotes both these passages in 2 Cor. 4 and Rom. 8 There is an analogous exercise of the Spirit in us. We may look at Christ taking us as united to Himself, and so presenting us before God, and thus in the highest perfection and place before Him; and also as in us looking up toward Him and saying, " our." The Spirit realizes our union, and then all is liberty and joy because for us accomplished. The Spirit realizes our position and looks up to Him alone there, saying " our; " and here is the difference of the remnant there. Now, or in the apostolic days, when we speak of union, we speak of glory, and perfection, and rest; whereas in the suffering we are substitutes for Christ in the world, though it be only by union we can go through; and we say, as it is written, " I believed," etc.-" we also," and therefore adds positive resurrection de facto as to the direct testimony; whereas He says," I will walk before Jehovah in the land of the living," and the bands are loosed-the power is shown. (2 Cor. 1.) Whereas the sufferings being before them as their portion before they find Christ, He comes down as it were, and enters into them, and says, " I;" and thus, while there is a strong connection, there is a real difference. The moment it was a mere fact, and Christ looked at as an object, it could be taken up directly, as it is written, " for thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are appointed "-this was common to both.

In Psa. 117 and 118 the results are fully brought out.

In Psa. 117 we have all the nations called into the blessing and praise of Israel's deliverance. It is still the mercy and truth of Jehovah. Jerusalem having now been made a center, they are called around; the possession of blessing in mercy begets the spirit of blessing. Though once forbidding to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, because they rejected mercy, filling up their sins, for wrath was come upon them ε■ς τ■λος. Now they had tasted mercy, and they can say to the nations, Praise Jehovah, for He is merciful to us. Here note, too, the greatness of the mercy is felt and first put; for so Israel comes in, brought in under mercy, and then the truth (they being morally restored) is proved to have endured and been forever. They could not find it under their lie, yet their lie had abounded to the enduring glory of His truth: under mercy they had come into this. How deep is the wisdom of God!

The next Psalm (118) takes up mercy as enduring forever- not merely the sense of the present greatness of it. But when they saw how God's truth had abided in spite of their sin, they see the

incomparable patience of God-His own character celebrated in them as of mercy forever. Israel, Aaron, and all may now say, His mercy endureth forever. As the Lord's going before or amongst the people had been announced to the earth in Psa. 115, so here we have the fellowship of Christ with the national special sorrows of Israel in that day, and thus bringing Jehovah to be with them. (Verses 4, 5, 7.) All the nations had gathered together against Jerusalem, but Christ was there with them in His heart in the trouble. With Him Jehovah could be, for He trusted in Him, and in His name He destroyed them. The adversary thrust sore to make Him fall, but Jehovah was with him. Lastly, Jehovah had chastened Him sore, but He had not given Him over unto death. There were the three points (and so known in an individual soul): the nations around compassing Him; the adversary thrusting sore; and lastly- the real secret deepest in sorrow, yet the key to all deliverance in it-Jehovah had chastened Him sore. Verses 14-17 are the triumph against the adversary, because the Lord must be exalted, trusting in Jehovah's name, of which this is still the celebration. Jehovah's name must be exalted above all these things. Verse 17 is Jewish confidence clearly. This psalm is a remarkable summary of the identification of Jesus and all the circumstances of the Jews in the latter day; and then, in verse 19, Christ's victory through trust in Jehovah in all circumstances opens to Him the gates of righteousness (now this more deeply true, even in the resurrection).

The division of this closing Psa. 118 (closing, that is, as to this subject) is this: first, the celebration of the truth for Israel. Compare 1 Chron. 16:34 and the structure of that Psalm very particularly; 2 Chron. 5:13; 7:3; Ezra 3:11; Psa. 106; 107; 136 The Psalm in 1 Chron. 16 is a summary of the heads of what Jews are interested in as the ground, exhibition, and resting-place of confidence in the latter-day, but there only the blessing and prayer; for it supposes the first step of blessings in accomplishment, and accordingly can rehearse together the statement, " Mercy endureth forever," and omit the intermediate miseries. Then the summons to each sort of persons to use the song, verse 5, Messiah for Israel and trust in Jehovah, and that answered to verse 9. Verse 10, the circumstance of Israel in the latter day as to the nations. Verse 13, the adversary's part, this Satan, and by Antichrist, but the adversary. Verse 18, Jehovah's hand in it-chastening, but preserving. Verses 10-13, therefore, are in a manner a common subject. Verse 19, Messiah takes the advance, being in this now living, accepted position, and then it is the Lord's relation with Israel in connection with Messiah, not Messiah's connection with Israel in respect of the evil-that was once true. Messiah's grace in subjecting Himself to their sorrows in this, though they esteemed Him stricken, is the way by which He can take them (now again at the last recognizing Him) with Him into the blessedness which (as their head, as the righteous Son) He is going into. The Lord's own use of it makes its force and application manifest.

I question whether it should not be (ver. 27) Jehovah is El (the mighty God).

Psa. 119 This exceedingly beautiful and well-known psalm appears to me to be this: other psalms testify of the circumstances surrounding the remnant as having the Spirit of Christ by that Spirit; this of their state, the Spirit of Christ in them expressing that state, the law written in their hearts, the judgments being executed. Thus there is what shows the Lord's interference, so that the sense of this is expressed, but not yet deliverance finally from the oppressor, their estimate of their whole condition, under and as connected with their circumstances, the mind of the Spirit of Christ in them. It is most interesting in this point of view:-all the holy yet humbled thoughts and feelings of this poor people expressed in the now returning righteous confidence of their delight in God,

breaking forth to God, who has put His law in their hearts when He is interfering for their deliverance. Its moral depth too is admirable and blessed in instruction and joy; and our delight in His holy will (the expression, and commandments, and holy roots of His will); for we know His law is spiritual and we carnal. The condition, however, prophetically in strict application is a Jew, a godly Jew, in that day.

From Psa. 120 to Psa. 134 is confessedly one series of psalms and ought to be viewed together; they are the songs of Zion, describing, if I may so speak, the process of their restoration. It supposes them to be already altogether in the latter-day times and that in a very definite character. Indeed generally they are retrospective of its earlier character, and, to say the least, commence with the certainty of the destruction of Antichrist, and this is entered into rather by a retrospective operation of the Spirit. It is on the whole of it rather the restoration of Israel-all Israel: that is the subject (the people leaning fully on Jehovah as one they knew and that distinctly, and He known and recognized, and they knowing Him and openly owning Him as their resource not in any uncertainty of position). It has more the character of a recital of what they had been enduring than the expression of those who had none that cared for their souls.

Psa. 120 " In my distress I called on Jehovah, and He heard." This first part tells the cry under Antichrist. The judgment on the false tongue for deceit was his, and characterized him; as Christ was the Truth. The next is the sorrow of sojourning among hostile powers, much connected with Gog. Kedar would come and Mesech before the last capture of Jerusalem, with whom they had no wish for war, but who were men of violence-were not godly men, still less had God for their habitation. They were weary of their spirit.

Psa. 121 They will look around them to the hills for help. Whence should it come? Ah there is the well-known truth for Israel! My help comes from Jehovah, who hath made everything man could trust in. He keeps Israel. He never slumbers or sleeps-a secure guardian: no power of evil shall smite them. The Lord shall preserve their going out and coming in from this time forth for evermore. The first of the two, the evil to which they were liable; the second, their sure, safe, and secure refuge, and that forever.

The happy results in worship (the third part of the sentiments of the delivered remnant, the happiness of Christ in them) is in Psa. 122 It is ever Israel in all this. These three psalms are rather prefatory, such as will be used; but retrospective, as I have said, not historical. From Psa. 123 we enter more into detail. They respect the full restoration, in one form or another, though it may not be viewed as accomplished in them all.

Psa. 122 then is the joy of Christ's Spirit in the fruits of it in others in actually going up; but all is restored joy of Israel, and verse 4 in assembled thanksgiving of worship in the temple; verse 5 is judgment-His delight in the place of judgment. The Lord's heart who once wept here goes out in yearnings over His beloved Jerusalem; and, calling to prayer for its peace, pronounces peace upon it. Two great motives too, animating to the brethren and glorifying to God, draw it out. Them He still is not ashamed to call brethren and companions, and having so blessedly named, He (at once introducing them into full connection with the glory and blessing) says," Because of the house of Jehovah our God, I will seek to do thee good." Nothing could be added to this.

Psa. 123 The intercourse is all here entirely with Jehovah and expresses their position and feelings towards Him. It is this rather than the circumstances that are entered into. They are occupied with themselves and Him, because with Him. Jehovah is looked at as dwelling out of the reach of circumstances where evil really was. Then out of the reach of circumstances the believer could direct his heart, and then there was the ground of patient faith. As Psa. 119 gave the position of the Jewish remnant as regards law in that day, so this as regards faith. It was their condition as to their heart that was in question or expression. They wait on Jehovah their God, who is in the heavens, as the eyes of a maiden or a servant to her master and mistress-helpless, and who have no business, till they get the word of their master, until He have mercy upon them. Patience, submission, the consciousness of no desert, yet the confidence of mercy-this characterized this waiting people. Then their sorrow and despisedness was an occasion for mercy-a plea; and so it is in their mouth, and so ever when one is in this disposition; so in the plea of this confidence of mercy they have to wait. They have nothing else to say but this is strong in the mercy and lovingkindness of Jehovah. There were others at ease and proved they were associated with, and dependent on, Jehovah. This was the blessed, holy, and submissive position of heart of the remnant. This was the perfection of faith in their position, the expression of the Spirit of Christ which enters into all our conditions. In all their afflictions He was afflicted.

Psa. 124 It was well they did trust in Jehovah. For if Jehovah Himself had not been on their side, in man all help was utterly lost. Men rose up against them, and the proud waters had gone over their soul, but it was the occasion of their being able surely to say, Jehovah Himself was for them, for there was none else, and to Him they had looked. Such is the effect of extreme and hopeless trouble-in Jehovah's deliverance, the clear certainty that Jehovah is for them. This Israel might now say-a long last word in the revolt of the sorrowing but still loved people, Jehovah is on our side. " Blessed be Jehovah " was now therefore their word. The snare is broken, they are delivered, and they could say now with experience, " our help is in the name of Jehovah who made heaven and earth." This great and hopeless trouble thus becomes the certainty of Jehovah's being with them.

Psa. 125 Here is the celebration of their distinctive confidence. They can now speak about it in the maturity of peace rather than the joyous excitement of deliverance, when they were just saved from being a prey to their teeth. They that trust in Jehovah shall be even as mount Zion which abideth, for the peace of mount Zion is now a witness of deliverance-the same mount Zion as of old, the seat of the gracious counsels of God uncovered. They trust in Jehovah-have the same portion as the mountains round Jerusalem. Verse 2, Jehovah is around His people, and that henceforth even forever; but then it was a distinctive blessing. It was judgment, the rod of the wicked, and then came against them: it should not rest on the lot of the righteous, there was no peace to the wicked; and this applied to the wicked among Israel. It was not a distinction merely between Israel and the nations, but a distinction in the deliverance of the righteous remnant; so the prayer is for them, the good and upright in heart. As for those that turn aside to crooked ways, Jehovah gives them a portion with the wicked; but there will not be now any more. Therefore, numbered with Israel, peace shall rest with Israel; now accepted and righteous before God, the righteous remnant becomes the nation.

Psa. 126 This restoration of the captivity of Zion is now specially noticed. The very heathen were astonished, and noticed the hand of Jehovah for them, and the echo of praise came from His

people: " He hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad." How simple and eloquent this word! Verse 4 takes the restoration of the captivity of Zion as the fullness of the restoration of the whole people. Verse 5 is the joyful experience of Israel, the humbled and sorrowful remnant grieved and laid low, but with godly sorrow now reaped with joy. But there was One above all who had sown precious seed in Israel, and in love as well as righteousness, and in both continued. He had been a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, their faces hid from Him; but now He filled His bosom with the sheaves, for though sown in tears, the seed was indeed precious seed, and the fruit sweet to His taste, and the joy of His labor of love- now He reaped it. The husbandman had had long patience for it, and waited the early and the latter rain; but now the precious blessed fruit came. First laboring, He now partook of the fruits; He came again rejoicing.

Psa. 127 This is for Solomon, in which character Jehovah builds the house; and we have the expression of the experience of the utter folly of all carnal Jewish expectations and efforts. They might have built the house, and great stones and buildings be there: it was in vain. The Lord did not own it. They might have watched the city, but they had awaked in vain: all had been in vain for Israel till Jehovah arose and had mercy. These Jewish blessings flow forth as upon earth in a gratuity given us-blessing in Jehovah's peace.

Psa. 128 It is the fearers of Jehovah that enjoy this blessing; yea, even to children's children. All the associations of their hearts would be satisfied. It was out of Zion Jehovah would bless them, and they would see the good of Jerusalem all the days of their life. How of Jehovah-and yet how truly earthly, and of man, of human nature, these blessings are!

Psa. 129 particularly takes up the enemies, these desolators. Many a time had they done it. And so indeed it was from the days of Chushan-rishathaim onward, till Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon broke the bones thereof; and after, in their yet worse and more terrible (because more real) desolation, their back had been plowed in and long furrows made. They had just to lie down and be treated at the very will of the enemy who had enslaved them. Yet, wonderful mystery, these had not prevailed against them. But there was One who said He was for them-One who in all their affliction was afflicted. His Spirit now taught them to speak in the recognition of the ways of God; and then comes the sum, for Israel, through mercy, now stood in righteousness. Jehovah is righteous; He hath cut asunder the cords of the wicked. Their character was now brought out: they hate Zion, with which Jehovah in grace was now identified. But there was not blessing from God or man upon them, when Israel should blossom and bud and fill the face of the world with fruit. No mower would fill his hand with them, nor any goer-by say, " The blessing of Jehovah be upon you."

In Psa. 130 we have Him who truly took this place; and though true of Israel, by Him and in His Spirit casting from the depths His soul on the Lord, and therein leading Israel into all the blessing of its forgiveness. This was the true hope of sinful Israel-the new ground, not under the law at all, and then looking for no other hope but waiting for Him; and so in verses 7, 8, His Spirit fully teaches them. The place-of the cry is the leading point here. The place acknowledged Christ's Spirit, who had been in it, taking His place with them in it, and putting loved yet poor Israel into the place of God's thoughts and its true comeliness in it-acknowledgment, faith-but that in mercy. His answer (that is, the answer of the Spirit of Christ) is in verses 7, 8.

His place of holy subjection and littleness is brought out in Psa. 131; and so was the place Christ had taught them and taken. He knew all things, but He had put Himself into the place of quiet

subjection to God's will, and therein was in the way of blessing. The things which were revealed He took up and taught to Israel; and there Israel found and would find its blessing. The Spirit is the spirit of all learning and instruction; but it is not the character of the Church's language, but of the quiet child-like subjection of Israel, entering as an obedient child into the place of its hope.

Psa. 132 First of all David's (that is, Christ's) sufferings are the basis of all. Next it is sovereign grace; for responsibility, even under the mercy declared through Moses, was closed when the ark was taken captive by the Philistines. There could be no day of atonement, no blood on the mercy-seat. Ichabod was written on all. God had delivered His strength into captivity, His glory into the enemies' hands. Sovereign grace raised up Samuel the prophet, and then David who brought the ark not into the tabernacle at all, but to Mount Zion, which was thus the seat of sovereign grace in power as contrasted with Sinai. God is called on to arise into His rest; for He will rest in His love.

Into God's rest we are to enter, when His love will be satisfied and His nature perfectly met through the fruits of it, as in Heb. 4:4, 5. Christ will see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied. Hence it is God's rest and of the ark of His strength -a new thing. It is not, " Rise up, Jehovah, and let thine enemies be scattered," and " Return, O Jehovah, to the ten thousand thousands of Israel." But then man's (that is, the saint's) rest is only in this-" Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to mine eyelids, until I find out a place for Jehovah, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob." His rest, his heart's rest, could only be in the rest of God perfectly glorified. Here we find the rest of the saint's heart in its desires identified with God's, so that it can have no rest till He has rest and is perfectly glorified: a vital principle, the effect of being partakers of the divine nature. And this, we shall see, brings one in this blessed way into God's counsels; as it is written, " Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor that he should instruct him? " But we have the mind of Christ-the Holy Ghost by the word leading us into all truth. (Compare Ex. 15 and 29: 46.) Our rest is entering into God's rest-an infinite blessing.

But the desire is right according to man, the answer is according to God; the desire is right according to the divine nature and ways, but the blessing according to the riches of grace. The desire (ver. 8) is that Jehovah should arise into His rest, He and the ark of His strength. For the strength and faithful covenant-working of God enter into rest when all is accomplished. The answer (verses 13,14) is, " Jehovah hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it." It is more than asked, clearly more. The heart led of God has been brought to desire what is God's desire and the object of His election.

So the desire (ver. 9) is that Jehovah's priests be clothed with righteousness, as John the Baptist's father; and the answer (ver. 16) is, I will also clothe her priests with salvation-the full final deliverance of God. The desire is right: righteousness becomes them. The answer is from God, and becomes Him in the power of His grace. The desire again (ver. 9) is, that His saints may shout for joy. All right: the renewed heart must desire the prosperity and joy of God's chosen. And God will give it abundantly (ver. 16): " her saints shall shout aloud for joy."

Remark another thing. In the desire they are Jehovah's priests, and Jehovah's saints-" thy priests," " thy saints." It is so as to " the rest: " and as to the rest it is repeated (compare verses 8 and 14); but as to Zion, This is my rest. And this is what we want: nothing else will do or would be rest. But as to the priests and saints the answer does not say " thy," but " her," that is, Zion's. They are His;

but so perfectly does God own the complete association of His people with Him in rest and blessing, that the priests which are His He calls hers (for they do belong to Zion), and the priests which are His to be hers. This in the identity of the rest is of unequaled beauty.

I have omitted the desire (ver. 10) not to turn away the face of God's anointed. The answer (verses 17, 18) also is more: the horn of David is to bud; a lamp is there ordained for Him, and His crown shall flourish on Him. That is, He goes beyond the wish. But note it is " there "-in Zion. Christ literally is King there, as in Psa. 2 There too it was first sung-" His mercy endureth forever; " for it had blessed Israel after all and in spite of all, and found in the end of His responsibility the occasion and beginning of His perfect grace. We see the outgoings of His goodness in that which He will do for Zion.

Psa. 133 The person of the high priest represented the whole people. But the power and anointing of the Holy Ghost in the fragrance of grace was that which united the whole people; so exactly in Christ-one Spirit and one body. They shall in that day appoint themselves one Head; they shall not be two peoples any more in the land, and this not only in form but in Spirit and unity of blessing. Hermon caught in its lofty head the dew or produced it; but it fell in the central place of divine blessing, thus ministering the power of unity. Hermon was called Zion, but it was with S, not Z. This seems to be Zion as we ordinarily understand it, where Jehovah commanded His blessing and life for evermore. It was the place of grace, the hill of grace. Though Hermon, whose head was in heaven as it were, was the attractive place of dew. it was the dew of Hermon, but it fell on Zion. The Spirit will be poured on them from on high, and Ephraim will no more envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim.

Psa. 134 Zion thus established, praises rise. Men by night in the sanctuary at peace there, His servants, stand in His courts; and as once the day only brought clearer light on their sorrow, now the night itself is awake with the praises of Jehovah who has restored them and given them cause for praise day and night; and He who has been the center and power of this blessing-David-is now in Zion which Jehovah has chosen. They bless out of this seat of grace and royalty. The sanctuary owns the royalty-the seat and place of blessing. He who has made heaven and earth, the Jehovah of His people, the Creator of all things is in this power called to bless Him out of Zion, the place of grace and desire to Jehovah. It is not Sinai now; Psa. 132-134 all center in Zion. Jehovah has chosen Zion-commanded blessing there-blesses Messiah out of Zion. Surely the people is restored now. The priest blesses Jehovah and calls for benediction from Jehovah on Him from this seat of royal grace. Thus is Christ placed, as the remembrance of David and his afflictions, who had no rest till a place was found out for Jehovah: heaven and earth the compass of heaven, but Zion the seat of peculiar blessing; Psa. 133, especially priestly blessing, as Psa. 132, the king. Psa. 134 brings both in, pronouncing and ministering praise and the blessing.

Psa. 135 This and the following psalm seem to me to be the praise to which the songs of degrees have led. Jehovah is celebrated, the name of Jehovah, and is called to be by the servants of Jehovah. They stood now in the house of Jehovah, in the courts of the house of their (Israel's) God. Jehovah had chosen Jacob for Himself. Israel was His peculiar treasure. He was great, and Israel's Adon above all gods. Whatever Jehovah pleased, He did with universal power, as in creation and providence, and that power in delivering Israel, judging their enemies, exercising divine and righteous authority over them in favor of His people, and using that righteous

sovereignty in preparing a place for a heritage to them. Verses 13,14, remarkably take in the record of the name of promise to the fathers given to Moses, as in Ex. 3; and of sovereign mercy in their utter destitution, Deut. 32 The heathen are therein shown their vanity. Verses 19-21 take up the full Israelitish located blessing according to the ordinance of God in Israel, not His in them, but their return to Him as blessed. At least they are so called in, and in spirit summon their companies, and close with the utterance of the praise itself with a final hallelujah as it began.

Psa. 136 takes up the well-known hallelujah, Israel's chorus, " for His mercy endureth forever." The present occasion of their praises proved that mercy endureth forever, and that that mercy had really gone on unceasingly, and had preserved them (through their rebellions), and remembered them, as Deuteronomy had said, in their low estate, redeeming them from the hand of their enemies. It still takes up the almighty sovereignty of God, Jehovah, and takes up the same elements of power, but adds Israel's sense of mercy, and that, its having endured forever, enabling it to take up this very praise now. " He remembered us in our low estate." Then indeed it is that praise really comes out from a humble spirit, and mercy known now, and known in unchanging favor in personal blessing, yet more glorious and lovely, because a love which flowed from itself, not caused by the object, is added to the praises as the sinner's only basis for them all. It is a beautiful expression of this; and the mind, thus taught, recounts them with happy particularity- power, wisdom, skill, grandeur of governance in the objects formed in their proper order, judicial and mighty power in deliverance to the people, for the Creator looks at them, and they are immediately associated with creation in its blessing. He did everything in controlling power over creation for them. Distinctive in judgment, Israel passed through, Pharaoh overthrown. He led them with unceasing care when there was no way, and smote their enemies when they would have checked their entrance into their inheritance, giving their possessions to them His people, and after all redeemed them from their low estate, for indeed His mercy endured forever; and then blessed in providence all the race of man and the animal creation too, for to this His mercy reached-the God of heaven whose mercy endured forever. It is not here " of earth " merely; for it is for them as much to look up as the Gentiles who had the earth, and the Church, apt to think God did not mind the earth, to look down and own Him the God of the earth. Messiah's reign in that day shall prove Him gathering both their dislocated elements-failing Israel on earth, and a failing Church for heaven-into perfection and stability.

This closes, I think, the rising up by degrees to Jehovah's house, where this or these are sung. What follows takes a wider scope and yet looks back to the interval which has been entirely omitted in these two psalms-discipline and sorrow and humiliation for sin by the way the people visited.

The former two took up merely the land in their introduction into it, and looked at them then in their low estate, and this, whatever its cause, was looked at as an object of compassion. Mercy forever was the word, and they could truly sing it then. Circumstances are entered into here, connected with visitations and sorrows in strange lands and deliverances there, and all that was associated with Israel's state when far from Jehovah, and Lo-ammi indeed really written upon it-quite another and different aspect of things.

Psa. 137 This therefore gives an important character to this psalm-the period of Israel's rejection, and the impossibility of praising the Lord in such circumstances. It is the Spirit thus in the remnant.

Faith put to the associations of God's glory with Israel, but for that reason incapable of uttering the Lord's songs. They might (with a sort of holy boldness in God's own principles and holiness, yet with bowing of heart) say, as elsewhere-" Praise waiteth for thee in Zion." Jehovah had His own law, His own place. This He had made Israel's: were they to forget this? It would have been slighting His favor, renouncing the specialty of His mercy. Babylon they might get-they had got into: their sins had brought them there; but there they must at least hang up their harps, weeping because for them the place of this world's careless and apostate glory. For indeed, if in sorrow, they were identified with the place of God's glory in the earth. Their portion, if the Spirit of righteousness was in them at all, was sorrow then. Well, Jehovah too was very sore displeased with the heathen that were at ease. He was but a little angry, and they had helped forward the affliction. For good He suffered His people to be afflicted, for righteousness too now, but still they were beloved. Now the testimony to their righteousness in sorrow is rendered to them by the Spirit there. And this is the blessed point of this psalm; even if carried away captive, there were those of whom Zion's sorrows were the sorrows, and, in spirit, Jerusalem, the Urim of God's peace, preferred above their chief joy. They, when free, could say this in the truth of the spirit of their state then. So shall it be in the latter day. All the intervening sorrow of a separate people in judgment is witnessed and owned of the Spirit of God. Then we have the three great powers of the world or cities that concerned Zion; but they were Zion's songs, not to be sung but there. " Babylon " (if it could be said for judgment, full judgment, was not yet come about) " who art to be destroyed "-haughty evil. He who would be blessed is he who executed the judgment on it. Then there was a third party, haters of Jehovah, who would be found liars; implacable enemies of Jerusalem, hating it just because it was Jehovah's, and they were miners of it; but as they dealt thus in the day of Jerusalem, Jehovah would remember them. We see thus that deliverance from Babylon (and so we may add its fall) precedes its destruction; and before they can triumph in the setting-up of Zion, they can, as delivered, and with the remnant's feelings, speak of their previous position as one that had been. Though Babylon was not destroyed, and Edom yet to come up in remembrance of judgment before God, Jerusalem was still to be spoken of as one remembered, not forgotten-not as one which they possessed and dwelt in peace as their glory. But Babylon is spoken of as one remembered too, and yet in existence. There they had done so and so; and he would be happy that destroyed her; and Edom, still viewed as in power, to be visited of the Lord. It is thus a very instructive and pointed psalm, as well as exceedingly beautiful in its spirit and strength of association with Jehovah in the sense of the appointed place of His favor, blessing, honor, and glory. Jehovah would remember Edom; but Babylon was to have, it seems, some instrumental rewarder of her ways. The judgment on these two closes the psalm.

Psa. 138 than takes up the praise before the whole earth- Jehovah's word. His faithfulness in truth was magnified above all His name. Mercy might have done it and be sung; but faithfulness to His promise in spite of all man's unfaithfulness (see verses 1-3) now shone out in all its glory; and they that blessed themselves in earth would bless themselves in the God of truth. This is a glorious position-the position of the strength of the Spirit, while its tender mercy is true too to the needy and in our infirmities. But this was risen above in His strength now. The holy temple was then to be worshipped toward. Every promise had come out in its own glory in spite of the utter unfaithfulness and utter failure of man. It was true the kings of the earth had not yet come to bow to the glory of the Lord, or yet sing consequently in the ways of Jehovah, and Israel had therefore to praise before the gods. Still this in one sense exalted Jehovah's strength. All was not as yet brought into

the peaceful blessedness of acknowledged rule; but Jehovah had appeared on Israel's side, so that they had that glory before all the princes of the earth. Israel had cried in the day of his trouble and Jehovah had strengthened him, and now all the kings of the earth would have to hear the words of Jehovah's mouth and would sing, for indeed it would be and was blessing in the ways of Jehovah; for great (the delivered one now can say) is the glory of Jehovah. Such is the substance of the psalm as regards the remnant, as it is in the period after the destruction of Antichrist in the time of Jacob's trouble, the first great act of judgment in the person of the associated oppressor of the remnant, before the earth is subjected or its kings have learned to bow before Jehovah, the faithful God of His people in blessing. Still the resurrection of the Lord Jesus is the great hinge of this psalm, and when the mighty one of death was against Him in His entering into the time of Jacob's trouble, yet (with Israel against Him, associated with him; so that it could be said, This is your hour and the power of darkness) He was strengthened in His soul with strength and met in His own blessed peaceful dignity their apostate rulers that stood up against Him-was heard in that He feared, and could take the ground of resurrection against all that was against Him; and so in the strength of divine favor could in blessed perfect obedience take the cup and thus seal the certainty of this submission of all to Him in the strength of the Lord over all evil, even in the power of death. We have then in the last three verses the three great aspects of Jehovah's ways-high but having respect to the lowly; reviving His true, loved, faithful servant, though such may be in trouble; stretching forth His hand against the wrath of His enemies, perfecting that which concerns His faithful servant. " For his mercy endureth forever "; and this it is has made way for the glory and manifestation of His truth according to the depth of His wisdom and unsearchable judgments. In Christ indeed, and so of all promises in Him, His word is magnified above all His name-His promises, " Yea and Amen " in Him. Blessed be He who is both Lord and servant, David's son and David's Lord, Israel's sufferer and Israel's Savior (the same love making Him one that He might be the other in divine perfectness).

Psa. 139 The day of Christ's trouble having been thus introduced, the mystery of the Church according to divine righteousness, and searching all things even according to death, is brought in. But the Church being brought out of it stands of course above and beyond the reach of it in judgment, for it stands in the power of it according to the favor due to the person of Christ, and which in Him has raised the Church out of the full result of the judicial fullness of divine righteousness against all that divine righteousness could search; and if it reached heaven or the power of death, the two extremes of that righteousness, it found it in one in perfection, in the other in suffering its full exaction in Him who thus, in it for the Church, and the Church in Him, fills all things. (Verses 17, 18.) The purpose of these thoughts concerning Christ and His glory is referred to, and then, consequent on this, the judgment of the wicked in vindication of His honor (who opposed and rejected Him) and that righteousness may prevail (for in truth His soul was perfect, though He went into the dust of death in its hatred of evil); and so the Church in Him. And thus the searching eye of divine righteousness, desired for it, is disciplinarian and directive-not judicial as to the acceptance of the person. This rests the whole question on higher ground-the highest and fullest ground yet taken in this book as to the manner of its communication to us, and our portion in it. It is the mystery of the Church, but hidden here. It is not, I will praise thee, for I am searched; but, " I will praise thee; for I am... made." The whole Epistle of Ephesians is the Spirit's unfolding and applying according to the full light of an ascended Savior; the force of this psalm is a commentary on it according to the light of the gospel, and its actual accomplishment. Verse 18 is

restoration -His place in spite of death.

Psa. 140 The sacred people being righteous and searched, and the wicked to be judged and slain, these in their relative condition are brought in. And, passing on to the condition of the Jewish people, to speak the words of Christ among the remnant as taking up their cause in that day, it looks for deliverance from them on the earth, possibly in the evil man noticing the last enemy rising from within them, especially the Antichrist; and in the violent, those who seek their own will from without against the men of peace and righteousness. Verses 12, 13, show the sure confidence of faith in their circumstances. The psalm, however, is one of character in these He sought to be delivered from-the evil ones and enemies (not designation).

Psa. 141 makes a scene deserving of investigation, and enters into the position of the righteous one amongst the people--his being thrown entirely on the Lord for keeping righteousness, so that he may have no part with the wicked, willing that the righteous should smite him. He will pray for them in their trials, though they rebuke and reprove him. All he wants is righteousness; but he desires to be preserved from the vanities of the wicked. Snares they had laid around, but he was securing himself to God, and desiring this only practical acceptance with Him, Jehovah, and to Him only therefore he looks-instructive lesson. Though willing to be smitten by the righteous, verse 6 implies still an owning of them, but their liability to heavy chastisements; but as he prayed in their calamities (for a blessing is in it, in the cluster), so when chastened and overthrown, they would hear his words, for indeed they were sweet. He knew it before the Lord in the day of visitation: there would be hearers. Thus the Spirit of Christ took up the people of Israel found in Jerusalem; as for the enemies, it was deliverance from and judgment. In verse 7 He looks at the relentless evil and violence-murder committed against the nations. He calls them in that-in spirit He loves them still; still the individual believers-for it was now on earth a question-on earth would escape, while the wicked would fall into their own nets. Look at David in the time of Saul, and there is much to guide in the understanding of the psalm. Prayer is the position in which he puts himself, praying the Lord to put a watch over him.

Psa. 142 Here we find the loneliness of Christ and consequently of His Spirit in the remnant; but Jehovah was the refuge in loneliness; and where all failed of man, He did not; and the voice of groaning was the glory of the Lord's only faithfulness. The Spirit of the Righteous and Holy One was overwhelmed. So of His yechidim in the latter day. But Jehovah knew His path, terrible, troubled, and trying as it was; and no man would know Him: not only of the peoples none were with Him, but none of His people. And so shall iniquity abound in that day: so are the saints ever tried. Look at Paul-" no man stood by me; but the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me." See the account of these very latter days in Matt. 24 But when His faithfulness was proved, the righteous would compass Him about. This then is desertion, while His persecutors stronger than He pressed on Him, that is, as to the land of the living.

Then, in Psa. 143, it is not solitariness as to trial, but judgment, that is the question, that Jehovah might be with him- this between his soul and God. Trials existed-his life was smitten down to the ground-his spirit was overwhelmed within him, and his heart desolate; but judgment could not be met by man. No flesh living should be justified. This is, indeed, just what we have learned by the Holy One entering into it. He showed this very necessity of all, and the Spirit in Jehovah's remnant expresses just their sense of this; and He, bearing it as their representative, was heard in that He

feared. Still it drew His Spirit for Israel (for Israel here it is that is in question, and that in the truth of their latter-day position, oppressed and having enemies, ver. 5) to the Lord as His resource, for the communion with Him was uninterrupted and unbroken. On the cross vicariously the Lord did enter into judgment, but that is just what makes all the rest true for Israel, and this only as purging. Thence direction is sought-teaching, deliverance, guidance, and the cutting off of enemies, for He was Jehovah's servant. This, then, is the psalm of judgment, and Messiah's and the people's part in it is very plain, and how He could plead this for them, and they by His Spirit in them. The cry is founded on God's faithfulness and righteousness-not on theirs as regards the servant's condition. There was no entering into condition. This, I repeat, was just what Christ proved in the atonement. Righteousness is pleaded in all His relationship with the Lord; and then cutting off His enemies is mercy, and only mentioned as to this which puts mercy clearly ■η a new place-riddance of the earth, that there may be a land of uprightness and an earth of peace, through the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and they that troubled gone in mercy.

Psa. 140 then enters into the position of the righteous generally in the latter day, in presence of the enemy of the Spirit of Christ; Psa. 141, His thoughts before the Lord in the midst of the people in that case; Psa. 142, He finds there are none-He is left alone; Psa. 143, the question of the Lord with His servant, through the available intercession of Christ-the presence of the Spirit of Christ in the remnant thus brought before the Lord alone, with the consequent direct supplication from verse 7 to end.

Psa. 144 Jehovah is celebrated by Messiah as in the war and conflict for the people. First (ver. 2), what He is to Him; then subduing His people under Him. Then comes the righteous inquiry for judgment: What is man, that the Lord so long lingers and pauses before He gets rid of the wicked and the evil? (Compare Psa. 8) For here man is seen the proud adversary on earth of the Man of God's right hand, after lengthened and infinite mercy, bounded first by this state of adversity, which was patience, not with abstractedly possible return, but manifested opposition to good, and therefore would-be feeble acquiescence in evil. Now God's patience had been the patience of perfect power not of feebleness with evil. Man's worthless-ness is here thus presented to Him. It was now the hand of strange children, and Messiah (pleading withal for those put for, and then with, whom He was afflicted) must be delivered. Man is like to vanity. " Bow thy heavens, O Jehovah "; and the righteous Messiah claims the intervention of power, and this brings judgment and new songs-judgment in order that righteousness may bear its unhindered and natural fruits of blessing. It is here with intercession for judgment, because of the position of things. Happy the people in this case of blessing of righteousness-Messiah's blessing; yea, the people that have Jehovah for their God. Thus the vanity of man, the judgment and blessing of righteousness, are all identified through Messiah with His people, even the remnant of Israel.

Psa. 145 Messiah extols Jehovah in the millennial blessings of peace (vs 18-20) showing its introduction by the hearing of the cry of the sorrowful, oppressed, then yechidim ('solitary')-mercy and judgment. That first statement gives the force of the psalm, and it is most lovely in unfolding His intercourse: the anthem between Him and His saints and all creation, His works and all flesh-the chorus extolling Jehovah, the blessed in that day. It is a most beautiful psalm in this respect, and carries us far into blessing; and it shall be continuous (we, however, in our own, abiding-in special eternal blessing); this with Messiah below.

Psa. 146 to the end is the great chorus of praise to Jah the Lord, the Jehovah, or Eternal One of creation, and of Israel, of which Israel was made dispensatorily the tried and blessed head; Messiah, as of the earth and of the flesh, coming of them and coming to them, and withal Jehovah's earthly sanctuary being in the midst of them, the center of the blessing and the peculiar place of nearness.

Psa. 147 The deliverer and executor of judgment, Zion's God Jehovah. Messiah announces Him thus-He only could. They were the objects of it. Then He is to Israel, the remnant, "our God;" and praise (and they at peace) is pleasant and comely. How lovely is this peace, and Jehovah's prosperity in them! Yea, He takes pleasure in them that fear Him, in those that hope in His mercy-not their own righteousness. Also they have His word, the oracles of God. He had not dealt so with any nation (the Church is high up above in these blessings). There are two points then: His mercy to Jerusalem, building it up and gathering the outcasts of Israel; and His power in creation (His own strength being the thing displayed and delighting in none else). The connection of Israel with creation-blessing is very strong, and a very cardinal point in the order of God's economies. Christ, as originally coming, would have been (had men not been all sinful) the head over them in this blessing. He shall be (but taking in the heavens on a larger scale, and) elevated on a higher principle of grace, and that in purification and redemption, risen as He shall be (as in Hos. 2:21, 23). Creation shall be restored in their restoration; but these higher things are brought in, and a more glorious source of it; but all linked together by the exaltation of the rejected but returned Man. The Second man is the Lord from heaven; but it is grace and government at this time, and not simple order of beauty with God all in all. He sends His word into the world, and shows it to Jacob. His power in this nearness to Israel, brought low, is the great theme, however, of this psalm. His power-Jehovah is the theme however, not the Father, as in that character; and the heavens shall praise Him; though we in our own special church-position rejoice there in the Father-our Father-"the kingdom," it is written, "of their Father."

Psa. 148 Israel's relation with this general or universal praise is then taken up. This is the great earthly millennial result, but connected, as we have seen, with a sphere beyond it -all creation. "Praise Jah" is still the key-note. First, Praise Jehovah from the heavens; verse 7, praise from the earth. In the heavens are we; but this is not the subject of the Old Testament word. This mystery is hidden from ages and generations; yet we know our place in it; but all the creatures in it are to praise Jehovah, for He created them. Then from the earth; and here the kings of the earth come in, and all people, princes, and judges of the earth. They are to praise the name of Jehovah; for His name alone is exalted-His glory above earth and heaven; but He had elevated the horn of His people. He is the praise of all His chasidim, even of the children of Israel -a people near unto Him. As power was shown in the former psalm in act, so the place of praise; Israel and creation are shown here, as alluded to at the close of it in the millennial hallelujah.

Psa. 149 rises up to the proper praise of Israel for themselves, as between themselves and God in this nearness. The saints here are always chasidim, that is, Israel so accepted and beloved in mercy-the meek and God-honoring ones-the remnant.

Psa. 150 is the great and comprehensive chorus: God-El -the mighty and strong and only One, who judges and swears in Himself alone, is celebrated-not Jehovah. It looks in the sanctuary: now indeed specially the heavenly Jerusalem is this in the day of glory for the Lamb, but intrinsically in

the light which no man can approach unto, His own secret place of holiness and separatedness from all. He is praised in their thought. Spiritual thought by the Holy Ghost on earth at least, alone reaches Him; then not only in His separation above all, but in the firmament of His power, the strength and stability of this place of steadfast testimony of immovable greatness and power; then His acts and greatness; then with man's (still on earth) best praise; and then everything that has breath is to celebrate Jah, the existing One-Him indeed in whom they live and move and have their being and breath to praise. It is out privilege now, but it is anticipative of the time when we shall actually be called on to do so. This shall be the full tide of unhindered praise to God Himself where He is for what He has done, goes with all given energies, and by all that has breath in formal character. It is indeed Jewish and earthly; but, as before, it reached to the heavens-the created heavens-where we may be, here to the sanctuary of El where He is in His own glory. And this must close, as indeed it is the source of praise. For the soul rises up from Ashre Ha-Ish (Blessed is the man) to Hallelu-Jah, Halleloo-el Bekodsho (Praise God in His sanctuary.) Then the soul necessarily stops, at least, finds itself at the infinite close of all. Before it is known only by the Holy Ghost.

## Psalm 68

---

THIS Psalm is God manifested as before the ark, that is, among the Jews; the clouds, the seat of celestial authority, the place where the Lord rides when He exercises power, the visible seat of authority, the **■πλοῦρ■νια**. (Compare Deut. 33:26, Psa. 89:6, and Dan. 7:13, 14.) The whole Psalm is the effect of " Let God arise."

" Let Elohim arise, let his enemies be scattered, and they which hate him flee before him. As smoke is driven away, thou wilt drive them away; as wax melteth in the presence of fire, so let the wicked perish in the presence of Elohim. And let the righteous be glad, let them rejoice in the presence of Elohim, let them be glad with joy."

This is the contrast thereupon of the wicked and the righteous, the great Jewish principle.

" Sing to Elohim, praise his name, make your triumph in him that rideth in the deserts, in Jah his name, exult in his presence."

This recognizes Elohim as the Jah that was with them in the wilderness. " I AM hath sent me unto you."

"A father of orphans and judge of widows [is] Elohim in his holy habitation."

This is the character of God as preserver of the desolate, in which he stands towards the real Jews in that day. (See Jer. 49:11.)

" Elohim settling or establishing the separated ones in a house, causing the bound in chains to go forth in prosperity. But [on the contrary] the rebellious shall dwell in a dry land," that is, in desolation.

The manner in which this is exhibited in result, distinguishing the poor isolated remnant, and the captivity, and settling them in a house, and the body of the Jews being brought (as rebellious) into desolation: thus much is the full title and subject-the Elohim as manifested. This is the character of God as arisen in respect of the remnant, and the rebellious body of the Jews: while evil prevails there is no unity but in separation; when He comes whose right it is, then He will gather together into one all things in heaven and earth, and it will not be so; the " yachidim " **ι■ηΔιγΔιυ** are then the united ones; those driven into separated union with Messiah in hope, but by His Spirit separated from the mass and thereby made essentially one, then shall be settled in a house. That is one fruit of God's arising; next He brings the bound out of captivity, loosing the bonds; and as to the rebellious, the revolters exercising proud will against Him and the poor, them He puts in desolation.

" O Elohim, in thy going before thy people, in thy marching through the wilderness; the earth shook, the heavens also dropped before the presence of Elohim: this Sinai before the presence of Elohim, the Elohim of Israel."

Here he refers to Elohim's presence amongst them before: " marching " is a bad word, it is a word of solemnity rather, often used of God's going.

"A rain of plentifulness [liberalities] thou didst pour, O Elohim, of thine inheritance, when weary thou didst establish it."

His inheritance is not left as a dry land: God is interested in it. (Deut. 2 II, 12.)

" Thine incorporated people [thy body] shall dwell in it, thou hast prepared in thy goodness for the poor, O Elohim."

Elohim having prepared the inheritance therein to place the remnant, now made into an incorporated people, the poor whom He had prepared for in His goodness, Adonai (Jesus as we shall see farther) gives the word, and a multitude carries the message of His goodness abroad. (Isa. 66:19, 20.)

"Adonai gives the word: great the host of the publishers."

" Kings of armies [hosts] flee, flee, and the housewife divides [distributes] spoil."

" Though ye lie amongst the grates, as the wings of a dove overlaid with silver, and her feathers with yellowness of gold shall ye be."

" In Shaddai dispersing [or, when Shaddai disperses] kings in her, she is covered as with snow in Salmon, " snow," that is, white and glittering with beauty.

" The mountain of Elohim [is as] the mountain of Bashan; a mountain of summits [as] the mountain of Bashan."

Perhaps Bashan had its name from ωΘΡο a tooth or cliff.

" Why are ye jealous, ye mountains of summits, [at] the mountain of desire of Elohim for his resting place? yea, Jehovah shall dwell forever [in it]."

" They shall be ashamed for their envy at the people." (Isa. 26:11.)

" The array of cavalry [or chariots] of Elohim are multitudes of thousands multiplied. Adonai is in them-Sinai in the holy place."

" Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive. Thou hast received gifts in man, and even for the rebellious, for the dwelling [there] of Jah Elohim."

" Blessed be Adonai [that] day after day heapeth upon us [blessings], the El who saveth us."

Here we have Adonai recognized: it was thus that gifts were received for man, and the rebellious became a dwelling-place of Jah Elohim. " In man." The Hebrew preposition Beth gives a very simple force, not exactly answered by any English preposition; as before " dispersing kings in her," it is not merely as being in her, nor merely for her or her sake, but in her case, as putting Himself as the agent of power in her; it is the sphere or place of God's action or blessing, etc., as the case may be.

" Our El is the El of salvations; and to Jehovah Adonai are [belong] deliverances [goings forth], even from death."

" Even from death," even as to this, which they as a nation had been obliged to go through. Deliverances belonged to Jehovah Adonai, and He was their El too.

" But Elohim shall smite [or break] the head of his enemies, and the scalp of him that walketh [or goeth about] in his wickedness."

"Adonai spake from Bashan. I will cause to return-I will cause to return from the depths of the sea "-return to blessing or from captivity.

So that thou mayest plunge thy foot in blood. The tongue of thy dogs [has] its portion from enemies."

The Hebrew word  $\eta\mu\chi$  clearly (I should think) portion, its allotted portion-the kind of thing it had to eat, precisely the force of the sentence. We have the same word in Gen. 1:12.

" They have seen thy goings, Elohim, the goings of my El, my King, in the sanctuary. The singers go first, the players on stringed instruments after; between [or in the midst] were chorister damsels playing on the tabrets."

" In the congregation bless ye Elohim Adonai, ye descendants of Israel."

" There [is] little Benjamin their ruler, the princes of Judah their company, the princes of Zebulun, and the princes of Naphtali."

" Thy Elohim hath ordained thy strength; confirm, O Elohim, that which thou hast wrought for us."

" Because of thy house at Jerusalem, to thee shall kings bring presents."

" Rebuke the beast of the reed, the company of the bulls [or strong ones], with the calves of the peoples-submitting himself with pieces of silver: he hath scattered the peoples, they shall desire to approach."

" Bulls," untamed, strong, proud enemies. (Psa. 22) The general sense of this verse, taken with the preceding and succeeding, is interesting. It is on the rebuke of Antichrist, Pharaoh the beast of the reed, and the complete subjection and scattering of the ' ,topics, the entire setting them aside as incorporated, before that the peoples shall come willingly up to worship at Jerusalem. But the latter part is so abrupt as to be extremely difficult.

" The Hashemanim [or princes] shall come from Egypt. Cush shall speedily bring his power [or submit] to Elohim "

" Ye kingdoms of the earth, sing ye to Elohim; celebrate Adonai."

" To him that rideth on the heavens, the heavens of old. Lo! he uttereth his voice, a voice of strength."

"Ascribe ye [give the praise of] strength to Elohim; over Israel [is] his majesty [or excellency], and his strength in the clouds [the glory of manifested power, the heavens]."

Adonai (Jesus) is the same Elohim who rode on the heavens -exercised the former authority in the wilderness. See Deut. 33:26-29, to which all this refers, or rather to that which is then spoken of-now fulfilled over Israel.

" Wonderful art thou, Elohim, in thy sanctuary."

It is remarkable that this word " wonderful," or terrible, is the same as is applied to Israel in their restoration in Isa. 18:7. Sanctuary is in the plural in the Hebrew, as Psa. 73:17; whence in Greek  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\alpha$  that which was within the veil (so we know Him), to which He was now returned in power on behalf of the children of Israel.

" The El of Israel, he it is who giveth strength and might to the people. Blessed is Elohim."

" The El of Israel," etc. That is, the person who exercised that authority over the Jews, is the same person who now over the same recognized Israel ruleth in the heavens, and this is Adonai Jesus.

If this be compared with Deut. 33, and the return of God to Israel in strength be seen, nothing can be more bright or plain or beautiful than this Psalm.

## Form of Prayer

---

We have the positive direction of Scripture to speak to one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs; but psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs mean compositions rhythmically and metrically arranged; so that I judge that the use of such compositions is scripturally authorized. I would add that I think the spiritual mind will detect at once what is really given of the Spirit in such compositions and what is not, even when merely added to make up the measure or rhyme. Moreover, also, those who believe in the action of the Holy Ghost, as the true and only power of blessing, look for the liberty of the Spirit of God, not bondage-liberty in everything that is of Him for edification. The binding to a form of prayer is not this; but the exclusion of hymns is not that liberty either. Only it is to be sought that hymns should be really composed under His influence, and not mere human poetry.



Matt. 13:52: they are things καιν■ κα■ παλαι■, the old scribe knowledge, and other new things.

## Difference of Greek Propositions

---

■κ has the force (not merely of " out of " but) of " from," as well as ■π■. The difference, however, is according to the meaning of the words: ■κ, out of, that is, from going into; ■π■, aloof or away from. Thus ■κ, in John 12:27; Heb. 5:7; James 5:20, etc. It is a question of saving from, or from going into, this hour, death, etc. Again, ■π■ in Matt. 1:21; 6:13; Luke 11:4; Acts 2:40; Rom. 5:9. The former supposes a state of circumstances, a condition, into which the person might come, but into which he did not come; while the latter supposes some persons or circumstances adverse to their interest, not allowed to act upon them or produce the effects of their malice, or which took them away from them. With ■π■ they are looked at as hostile existences; with ■κ it is a state, as even ■κ νεκρ■ν ■ναστ, from among the dead. They are not hostile persons or things; being among them is a state. So ■π■ του πονηρο■ is a hostile power. Luke 1:74 is a state in which they were or might be. So Rom. 7:24 is the state in which he was; not a hostile power apart from himself. Rom. 15:31 means hostile persons. In 2 Cor. 1:10 ■κ is used again because it is evidently a state: so Col. 1:13, though " out of" the power of darkness might be better here. In 1 Thess. 1:10 it is ■π■ τ■ς ■ργης, as wrath is not a condition but a hostile power of another. In 2 Thess. 3:2 it is from unreasonable and wicked men. This is evident. In 2 Tim. 4:17, I believe it would have been ■π■ το■ λ■οντος, but ■κ στ■ματος, into which he seemed to be getting-a state he would have been in. 2 Peter 2:9 is more directly out of it when they are in it; at any rate, it is a state of πειρασμο■. So in Rev. 3:10 the faithful are kept from getting into this state, preserved from getting into it, or, as we say, kept out of it. For the words here answer fully to the English " out of" and " from." " From," as to place, is the creation of distance from a distinct object, as they went from Jerusalem to Jericho; they put a distance between him and the city. " Out of" means ceasing to be inside and into. With ■π■ it is always a distinct object from the speaker or person spoken of; while ■κ implies a state he is or might be in.

## Additional Notes on the Greek Article

---

Every noun which is not itself a proper name is in direct contrast with this latter; it is the name of what a thing is, not of an individual.

When, in the nature of things, there is ostensibly only one, as sun, moon, heaven, imagination easily personifies them. But as John, Peter, etc., are names of individuals, or become so, so tree, table, glass, etc., is the name of a thing, not of an individual. Such a word, or appellative noun, answers to the question What? Just so a proper name answers to the question Who? I say, " Who, what individual, is that? " The reply is, " Peter, John," etc. If I say, " What is that? " the answer is, " It is a tree, a table," etc., that is what it is.

Habits of language may vary. A language may have an indefinite article, or use the number one for it; and either of these individualizes. Thus in French, un homme, a man; and even in Greek, εἷς (one) is often so used in the New Testament. But the noun in itself states what a thing is-table, chair, etc.

In this lies the whole doctrine of the article, at least the root of it all. The style of language varies as the mind of the people who speak it. An Englishman says " law "; that is, he uses the abstract idea " law,τ by itself.

French cannot bear this; it must have a positive object before the mind, it cannot deal in abstractions. Hence it can say sans loi, because sans excludes existence, but not par loi. Where the sentence implies existence it cannot use a mere abstract word. It must be toute loi, toute loi quelconque, or something tantamount.

Each nation may insist that its own habits of thought are the best. That does not affect the question which we have to treat.

Whenever a word is merely descriptive of something else, not an individual, it needs no article. So even in French, par bonti. In Latin all is thus abstract. Every noun, when not defined by a pronoun possessive or the like, answers to the question " What? " not to " Who? " It is not individualized. German and Dutch are more like French. Our business now is with the Greek; but the general principle will help us to understand it.

A noun, as elsewhere, is always a quality or kind of being, or answers to " What? " As, for instance, ἄνθρωπος, βίβλος, οἶκος, etc. The article makes it individual, ὁ ἄνθρωπος. A similar principle will be found in Hebrew; and its form, when a word is in regimen, shows the individualizing, indicative, character of the article; Ish ha-Elohim, the man of God, that is, a man, that one, that is of God. So we have ha-Adam, that special race, or being, which God had created, and Himself quickened; so ha-nahar the Euphrates; ha-Baal the lord (Baal). Now, in Greek, when once we have taken a noun substantive for what a thing is called, and the article as indicative of individualization, all becomes easy. Νόμος παρεῖσθη (Rom. 5:20), in English, " law," the thing so called; ὁ νόμος, the law; that is, of Moses. ἄνθρωπος ἦλθε, What (not who) came? A being

that was a man, not an angel. In English we should say " a man "; δι' ■νθρωπου, by man. In English, either " by a man," or " by man " would do, but better " by man."

What follows is striking: ■ θ■νατος; but ■ν■στασις νεκρ■ν, anarthrous. The latter-this thing, what is called by that name; the former might have been equally anarthrous, but ■ points it out as the well-known king of terrors. It is individualized, a being to the mind. Abstractions are the chief difficulty; for the article individualizes. But a thoroughly abstract word is made a unity of (that is individualized) by contrast with all other things possible compared with it. Hence an individual of any kind, and an abstraction, will both have the article. When I say " man," I individualize the kind or race, I sum up qualities which distinguish him from animals, angels, God, etc., with which the mind would compare him. Thus ■ ■νθρωπος may be man, that kind of being summed up as an individual being in thought, or a particular individual man, already known. So ■ ν■μος may be " law," or " Moses's law," or any known law; less familiar here, because ν■μος is more difficult to individualize abstractedly by a tacit comparison with other things: a few particular laws are what we think of, or law simply in its nature, that is, the name for what it is. Law cannot be so abstract a thought-is more positively instituted. With abstract qualities the case is simple. That particular one is, itself, in contrast with all other qualities, ■ ■νομ■α, ■ ■μαρτ■α. I think it will be found that of such words, of those that are in kind familiar to us in detail, we make what is called an abstraction; that is, we sum up the various things as a whole, and it becomes a unity and in Greek has an article: as ■ ■μαρτ■α, ■ ■νομ■α. The principle applies anywhere, but such a word as ν■μος, for example, is less liable to be summed up thus. Species afford facility for this; if accustomed to be viewed as species, they are individualized in contrast with other species. In English every species is not individualized: the word remains a kind of adjective. I say man. I say " the " horse, meaning the horse tribe, and the ox or sheep, that class. God and man are alone, I think, given a personal name thus in English. It is not a set of beings, but a being; it is really a name.

Take, now, to illustrate the principle, John 1. ■ λ■γος is an individual personal being; Θε■ς a kind of being; πρ■ς τ■ν Θε■ν a personal being; ■ν ■ρχ■ is absolute (■ν τ■ ■ρχ■ would be a particular beginning, perhaps of all things, but one designated one); ζω■ ■ν, it is, what was there (■ ζω■ would have individualized it, and there would have been none anywhere else-that life would have been in Him alone as a whole); then ■ ζω■, because it is the life mentioned, that is, it is individualized. It is not what, but which life. So τ■ φ■ς τ■ ■νθρ■πων, it was the light of men. Here it is clearly individualized, a particular light, and, indeed, the only one owned as of men. In the case of τ■ σκοτ■, it is important. You could not say φ■ς φα■νει ■ν σκοτ■α because there would be no darkness if the nature (the what) of the thing were in question, but τ■ σκοτ■ is a particular darkness-abstract, no doubt, but what was opposite to the light of men, which was life in Christ the Word. What that found itself in was darkness opposed to it, and which could not comprehend it, the darkness of this world. It is stated mysteriously, but it is that darkness in which the light of men, Christ, shines. That darkness did not comprehend it-no doubt because it was darkness, but the opposite of that light. Whatever is contrasted has an article, for it is thereby a positive object individualized; consequently, as one whole before the mind; hence as above species.

■γ■νετο ■νθρωπος sent παρ■ Θεο■. What was sent? A man, not an angel; here it is evident. So παρ■ Θεο■ is what the being was, he was sent from; παρ■ το■ Θεο■ is Greek, but it individualizes God, παρ■ Θεο■ characterizes Him. The messenger was a man, but a man sent

from God; **νομα ατο** is not " his name was," but " there was a name to him," John. We have, lower down, **το νομα ατο**: then it is a particular name amongst others. Here what had he? a name, which was John. You could not say, I apprehend, as stating a fact, **νομα ατο**, because the genitive gives a particular name- his name. It is known that in ordinary cases the possessive pronoun requires the article before the noun. **Ες μαρτυραν**, that is what he came for-his mission: what particular testimony it was, he goes on to say. **κσμος** is the one individual world, clearly.

**Τα δα, ο δαι**, I note as being plural, where the plurality itself clearly individualizes, gives positive objects as units to the mind-only it also embraces all of them-**τα, ο**, all the units which bear the name or designation of **δα, δαι**. **Εξ αμτων**, etc., is clearly of what: **κ τν αμτων** would have specified the particular kinds, that is, individualized each kind of blood-probably it is meant to exclude all, if not a mere Hebraism. **κ θελματος νδρς** is noticeable because a genitive very commonly brings an article with it, as giving the particular kind of the governing noun, and so objectively individualizes it (**τα φς τν νθρπων**), but here the whole is merely what the thing is, **κ** marking nature or quality. Their birth was not of that kind, this was not what it was. It is not merely an actual will supposed to exist in the individual man.

**λγος σρξ** is a common form of proposition, that individual person or being did now become that.

**Τν δξαν ατο**, there was the particular actual glory which they saw; **δξαν ς** then, what it was, its quality. This may suffice.

**Θεν** stands as a name. Yet involving they saw. Yet even here, where it is used personally and objectively, the article is used; **πρς τν Θεν**, it was somebody He was with; **παρ Θεο**, the quality of His mission. So here **ορακε Θεν**, Him, who is truly such; **τν Θεν** would have been personally, and not have given the force; it would have been the fact. Here it is more in the nature of things.

In John 8 it is **κ το Θεο**, for it was from God Himself [that] He came out. In verse 44, **κ πατρς το διαβλου**; the devil is personal, individual; but they were not out of him personally but characteristically. They had him morally as their father. From the devil as father, the source of what they were.

**Τν ψεδος** objectively contrasted with **λθεια** and so individualized; **ψεστης** is what he is.

**κ τν δων**-of distinct things which are his own.

So **περ μαρτας** is neither one particular sin, nor as an ideal or abstract whole, but what they could or could not convict Him of.

So **λθειαν**, speak truth, what characterizes the speaking. Hence, as heretofore observed, in such cases of accusatives after verbs, and of the verb substantive, an anarthrous word is usual.

In John 5:37 we have an instance which might seem strange, **φωνν ατο**. It is not properly his voice as one known voice which speaks, but a voice, any voice of his; so **εδος ατο**, anything that was his form. It is not one known voice or form, but anything that (what) was that. But **τν λγον ατο** (ver. 38) because that is one recognized word. In verse 41, **παρ νθρπων**, that

character of praise, παρ τῶν ἑνθροπῶν living individuals in fact. So verse 44, δῆξαν παρ' ἑλλῶν, but τῶν δῆξαν τῶν παρ τοῦ μῆνου Θεοῦ.

John perhaps tests the principle best, from the peculiarly abstract way in which many things are stated by him. In more narrative books it is simpler.

I quote now some more peculiar forms. Acts 14:3, ἕκαστον μὲν οὖν χρόνον. Here, clearly, it was not the object to designate one particular, pretty long, time, individualizing it from others-but what the time was; it was a ἕκαστος χρόνος.

With τῶν and ἐγένετο, as stated, it is the question of what took place; there was a ῥῆμα there [ver. 4 and some (σῶν) were with the Jews and some with the apostles], verse 5, ἕς δὲ ἐγένετο ῥῆμα τῶν ἑθνῶν τε καὶ ἰουδαίων σὺν τοῖς, etc. The individuals τῶν of both classes.

It is a mistake to think there is never an anarthrous noun followed by an article. When the first noun depends on another word to which it answers, as "What," and the following one is of individuals who refer to that, you will have the first anarthrous, the second not. When the first is an individual whole, dependent on the following genitive, it must have the article, τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλεως.

It was the multitude, the one whole multitude of that city, not of another (ver. 4); but ῥῆμα τῶν ἑθνῶν, etc., because there it is merely what took place, and does not belong wholly and exclusively as an embodied individual to those people.

Verse 8, καὶ τις ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἑστροῖς δίνατος τοῖς ποσίν. The man was δίνατος τοῖς ποσίν: his two individual feet, though there is no αὐτοῦ (his); χολῆς καὶ κοιλίας μητρῆς (αὐτοῦ), his mother's womb is merely a date to characterize his lameness. The womb is not before us objectively as an existing thing.

Verse 10, ἐπεὶ μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ is somewhat peculiar but accounted for in the same way; μεγάλῃ φωνῇ would do, but simply characterize the manner of ἐπε: τῇ φωνῇ is his voice, raised to a loud pitch,-I have not the character of speaking but Paul's voice; μεγάλῃ φωνῇ is practically one word. Hence the article in the plural, unless there be a limiting word, means all of that kind.

Verse 13, τῶν τῶν, bulls: τοῖς τῶν would be individuals designated; and the what is τῶν, that is, all that comes under that name.

All this is not a different principle from the previous paper on it, but goes to the root; the other more to the form. The former is grammatical, this metaphysical.

The noun is always characteristic, or the what of something, even when there is an article. The article indicates an individual, or single object (many if plural) which is that "what." The form of subject and predicate is merely an effect of this. The person " " or object I call man, the what of the object is an animal. Other words may take the place of the article in individualizing, as τις, πῶς, πολλοί. Οὗ πολλοί is something else; οὗ gives a number of designated individuals in contrast with one, a number of individuals lost in the designation πολλοί in contrast with some one or few otherwise connected though contrasted with them-οὗ ἕμνες, οὗ πολλοί; πολλοί is, becomes, a qualification, not a mere uncertain number. Hence, as a general rule, an unmentioned individual kind has no article; ἄγγελος, ἄνθρωπος, πρῶτος παρθένον. It is what the being is;

singular, but known by its character.

When mentioned, the article comes too as a rule, because an individual (now known) is designated.

There is an oracular absence of the article which, though apparently exceptional, only confirms the rule: πνεμα ἅγιον: κα δναμις υψστου. It specially characterizes what it was and is, not merely historical of what took place, in which case the article would have been used. The translation (Acts 1:8) is right: "Ye shall receive power, the Holy Ghost coming upon you"; not as in the margin: this would have been, I conceive, τν δναμιν.

## Likeness and Image

---

I do not know that I should trouble you with any remarks on the words " likeness " and " image," though evidently of importance, had I not found, in searching the scriptures as to them, the opening out of a good deal of truth precious to my own soul. But I shall be very brief, only suggesting matter for your readers' research into scripture.

I pass by many words translated image and likeness, (as **εικων** which is more the bright revelation of God, Himself invisible, or the attempt to reproduce it; **μορφωσις**, **μορφη**, **εικασμα**, or others which speak of images, statues, etc.), to peak of the words employed of man, **μορφη**, likeness; and **εικων**, image.

First; I reject entirely the thought of righteousness and holiness of truth; that is positively declared to be the new creation, and is not the old. Christ and Adam are not the same. Righteousness and holiness suppose the knowledge of good and evil, which it is absolutely certain by scripture Adam before the fall had not. This point is not without importance as to what our redemption involves. Is it a restoration to the state of the first Adam, or an introduction into the state of the Second? Unquestionably the latter. "As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy; as is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly: and as we have borne the image of the earthy we shall also of the heavenly;" conformed to the image of God's Son that He may be the firstborn among many brethren: blessed privilege! There is no return to the image of the first Adam, no loss of the knowledge of good and evil; but conformity to, as partakers of, the divine nature, which is above evil in holiness; the flesh down here remaining the same. You must alike exalt Adam above scripture, and depreciate Christ, to make our conformity to the latter a return to the former. And this is pretty much what the professing church has done.

This, then, God's likeness and image in Adam was not; but what was it? I reject anthropomorphism; that is, its being in the form of his body. It is lowering God Himself and even Adam's position, and is confusion only, though an early error; though it be true that, as incarnate and anticipating manifestations, God took this form. That is a blessed mystery, but refutes the idea as to Adam. For it is incarnation-and this the creation of Adam was not, though doubtless in view of it. What was then this likeness and image, and what the difference of the two? We are renewed in (into) knowledge after the image of Him that created us. This itself shows it was not Adam's. It is the **νϋος**, the wholly new man which is this. And it is a **καλιϋς νθρωπος**, a new kind of man too.

"Likeness" is a simple word for all of us; it is being like. "Image" is somewhat different: an image represents, be it like or unlike. The image of Jupiter presents him to men. One like another has the same traits and features. Now Adam was like God, and he was His image. He was absolutely without evil. No sin, no evil, was, or could be found, in him. This was a capital point in the likeness, though it was not holiness; in one sense more important, more intrinsic. Holiness is relative; it supposes evil, though being above and hating it. Absence of evil is in the nature itself. God is light; pure, besides revealing all else; but holy, not holiness. He cannot be what is relative; nor does His

being suppose evil, as holiness does. It is good, absolute purity, though this is an imperfect and relative word; but I shall be understood. Adam was very good, no evil or sin was there. But there was more: he was made the center of all affections and reverence in the sphere in which he was placed. No angel was made a center of any sphere. Man was made one, and amiable and good; loving in kindness surely (had he so remained) all around him; the center of a sphere of created good. And I mean now of a character which could be so; for his being so in fact was more his being the image of God. How gloriously this will be fulfilled in Christ in the whole creation, I need not say. He is the true image of the invisible God. Adam was His image. But Adam was fit to be so by his likeness to God-not to deal with evil, for this he had not to say to; nor would have had, had he not fallen; but pure, no evil of any kind in him, and good; a blessed happy center of happiness, looking down on all; fit to be looked up to by all. If Eve was created too, she was to be before him (kenegdo). But this runs into the image, and they are meant to run into one another. Adam stood there from God and to represent Him on the earth. He stood as such to all around and below him. Had he not been from, and for, and like, God, he would not have been fit to be His image on the earth. But he was; and so Christ will be in the highest and an infinite way in the whole creation.

I think we shall find these meanings of likeness and image everywhere. The first point in God's mind was setting man in His image (Gen. 1:26). And this consequently is insisted on in verse 27. He set him to be like Him, to represent Him to their minds, before others; but it was also in making him like Him. It was not like a stone image, merely to recall, but not like; but to be before others as His image, being really like Him. Hence dominion also was given to him over the creation he was in. Hence, in Gen. 9, the grievousness of the fault of putting him to death was not that he was like God, for indeed he now was not at all like Him, but that God had set him in this place. If I deface the king's image, the question is not if it be like him but my defacing his image. In James 3:9, on the contrary, we bless God and curse what was made like Him: what sense is there in that? It is not the evil come in, surely, we curse; but we curse what was made in God's likeness. On the other hand, we read (1 Cor. 11:7) " For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God "- holds thus his place and dignity where he is. " The woman is the glory of the man." Then Adam begets a son in his own likeness. Alas! yes; like him; upon him were the signs of what he was; not like the beasts that perish, surely, but fallen and sinful, and after his image, holding the public place in the world he did; its head no doubt, but fallen head. The image tends to make us suppose that of which it is the image to be like it. See Acts 17:29; Psa. 50:21. The " likeness " has there the simple force of the word; the " image " is the representing, to his glorifying before others, Him whose image we are. Now, if we look into Ephesians and Colossians, we shall find God holding a place in the one which Christ does in the other; and the former occupied with our likeness to God, the latter with His image, which Christ is perfectly.

Remark here, that Christ is never said to be like God, or the likeness of God, because He is God; but He is said to be the image of God, for He does represent and glorify Him and God will be displayed in Him in the millennial glory.

Thus, in the Ephesians, we are to be holy and without blame before Him in love. This is His likeness, and it is before Him, not for display. We are to be imitators of God as dear children, and walk in love as Christ loved us and gave Himself for us, a sacrifice and an offering to God. So God is all; and we are in Christ, a man raised from the dead by God. And if He be in us, it is to be filled unto all the fullness of God. We are to forgive as God in Christ has forgiven us. Hence, when

speaking of the new man, our having put off the old man, and put on the new, there is a difference in Ephesians and Colossians. In

Ephesians, " the truth in Jesus "is....." and to have put on

the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and holiness of truth." The spirit of our mind is to be a wholly new one, one we had not before (ν■ος), and the κατ■ν■θρωπος put on new in kind and nature. It is created after God, like Him in righteousness and true holiness, what He is as knowing good and evil. Such is the new man as characterized in Ephesians.

In Colossians, on the other hand, we have put on the new man, a new one (ν■ος) we had not before, which is renewed, new in character (κατ■ν■), after the image of Him that created us. Here Christ is in all; and the image, not the likeness, is brought out. No doubt it is like; still, what is made prominent is the image, what is to represent and glorify God; and, as we have seen, Christ is all and in all. So it is forgiving one another; as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. Hence, in chapter 1, we have Christ the image of the invisible God; and His place in creation, the Firstborn of every creature. Yet, see how carefully His divine nature and title is guarded. Not only is He the Creator, but all the fullness was pleased to dwell in Him; and in Him, in fact, dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. In Eph. 1, you have " holy and without blame before him in love," which is likeness to God in His presence.

I do not go farther here than to suggest these thoughts. That the second man, the Lord from heaven, is the true image of God, is clearly taught; but, I think, with other precious truth, from which I have no wish to divert the attention of the reader of these precious Epistles, this difference will be found to pervade them. Our conformity to Christ in this respect, and our progressive conformity to Him, is taught in many passages, as Rom. 8:29 Cor. 15:48, 49 John 3:1-3 Cor. 3:18. But it gives a wonderful testimony to what the Christian is, and ought to be; his place in Christ.

## A Letter on the Sprinkling of Blood

---

Dear Brother.,

Allow me to say a few words on the sprinkling of blood. Precious and undeserved as every mercy is to us, our being sprinkled with blood is the lowest in the series; still it seems to me to have its place. It is most true that the blood is presented to God, and that this goes a vast deal farther than our being sprinkled with it. Not only was it sprinkled before the mercy-seat as well as on it, but Christ is entered in not without blood; the efficacy of His work, and blood-shedding is presented to God. In every case it has this character-I mean of being presented to the eye of God. But this may have a double aspect, meeting the eye of God in respect of its own intrinsic value and character as perfectly glorifying God, or meeting the responsibility and need of those for whom it is shed.

Christ (John 13) as Son of man has perfectly glorified God, and as man is in the glory of God now, having glorified the Father upon earth and finished the work which He gave Him to do. In the Son of man's glorifying God the ground was laid for man being in the glory of God, and the counsels of God being accomplished. Man is reconciled to God Himself, and walks in the light as God is in the light: the veil is rent from top to bottom. This is the fullest character and effect of the work of Christ. God is glorified in Him, and, in result, man is with Him.

But besides this there was the positive responsibility of man to be met; guilt, uncleanness, and offense were all under God's eye, in those whom He would take to Himself. I do not speak now of renewal of heart and moral cleansing-that is figured by the washing of water. But Christ came not by water only, but by water and blood. Nor is guilt alone put away and offense forgiven; there is a judicial purgation or cleansing of sins-a καθαρισμ[us]. The [Kopher or Kip-pooreem] was made or offered, death coming in, expiation, and so propitiation, blood being shed, God's character in righteousness, supreme claim, and holiness being perfectly met and even glorified. Further, our sins, borne and sent away on the scapegoat, never to be found; or met in an ordinary sin-offering, which in Christ was once for all, who bore our sins in His own body on the tree. Thus the atonement, expiation, and propitiation are perfect, and we are forgiven. Redemption too was accomplished.

Forgiveness is expressed in Hebrew by [nasa], nasa, to lift up, or take away; [kasah], kasah, to cover, as in the first verse of Psa. 32, and continually elsewhere. The word [kipper], kipper, the form of the verb [kaphar], kaphar, used for making atonement, is used for appeasing or propitiating; as Jacob says, " I will appease him with the present " (Gen. 32:20), speaking of Esau. In this sense it is clearly presented to God.

But then, besides this, the blood was sprinkled on what was defiled. This was still presented to the eye of God; but to God looked at as judging, taking notice of iniquity according to righteous requirement. In the simple presenting it to God, He was perfectly glorified. In the antitype it had the worth of heavenly glory and perfect divine favor. We are in the light as God is in the light, without a veil, in joy, and have boldness to enter into the holiest. As regards the sins, they are all borne and

put away, never to be remembered.

Now comes another thought. I am unclean, defiled by them. Here I get cleansing, not in my inward disposition, but judicially, God being viewed as Judge, and my conscience purged-not my heart and state. The blood is presented to God, but presented to Him as on that which had been unclean. This meets His eye when looking judicially at us, and He holds for perfectly clean that on which the blood is. Thus, when the blood was put on the lintel and the two door-posts in Egypt, God saw the blood and passed over. He was passing through the land judicially; where the blood was, He passed over, His judgment did not apply; otherwise He reckoned the blood a perfect answer to its requirements. So with things that were sprinkled in the tabernacle: the blood was put there because of the iniquities of the children of Israel, amongst whom Jehovah dwelt. They were thus cleansed and fit for His presence and use.

The cases in which there was sprinkling on persons were those of the leper and the sons of Aaron.

In the former case the practical cleansing belonging to the camp began by water, and was followed by blood put on the right ear, thumb, and toe, giving cleanness and the judgment and disallowance of evil, according to the blood of Christ, in every thought and act, and all the walk of the cleansed one; and that followed by oil, or the Spirit, on each same part. But before this, which made the blood and death of Christ the measure of every evil, and shut out all that we might be engaged in which did not suit it, two clean birds had been taken, and one killed and the other dipped in its blood, and the man to be cleansed sprinkled with it. This was not the inward work-sanctification-which followed in the camp; it was done outside. It was the proper efficacy of Christ's work; and the blood being sprinkled on the man he was pronounced clean-judicially clean in God's sight-though more had to be done to bring him into communion and the condition of a worshipper. But he was clean. (Lev. 14:7.)

The case of the priests' consecration was more peculiar. They do not stand in the place of transgressors outside as the leper. But they are washed with water, and the blood of the ram of consecration is put on their ear and hand and foot, as in the leper. So far the fitting them by water and blood is the same in consecrating the priest and cleansing the leper; and in truth what does one does the other. He has loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and made us kings and priests. But after this some of the blood on the altar was put with the oil, and all sprinkled together. The power of the Holy Ghost is effectual in making good in us, as dead to sin and alive to God in Him, the consecration to God manifested in Christ's death in giving Himself a sacrifice to God; so only are we cleansed in God's judgment according to the judicial estimate of God in Christ's death. " If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness " (Rom. 8:10). " The law of the Spirit of life.... has made me free." " For what the law could not do " God has done, when Christ was " for sin," and (He has) " condemned sin in the flesh." This is judicial, but it is deliverance through death. Rom. 8:2, 3, bring the oil and the blood on the altar together. Hence we present our bodies a living sacrifice to God, holy and acceptable. It is still the same judicial estimate of sin according to Christ's death, only looking to realization by the power of the Holy Ghost.

As regards 1 Peter 1:2, it may be taken as a general idea of its value; still it alludes to the Old Testament, when the sprinkling of blood was always the judicial cleansing of that which was sprinkled.

But we find it more definitely elsewhere. Though the general truth may be in the apostle's mind, yet I do not quote Heb. 9:13, 14, because he refers to the great day of atonement and the red heifer, on neither of which persons were sprinkled with blood. Sprinkling, in the original, agrees with "ashes," not with "blood." Still, though the force of that be very different, verse 19 shows that the sprinkling of people was not absent from his mind; and verses 21-23 show that this was in his mind connected with purging, though I do not apply verse 19 to it. It was the dedication of the covenant with the sanction of death. But in the other verses cited, purging and blood-sprinkling on that which was to be purged go fully and expressly together in his mind, and in chapter 10: 22 this is expressly applied to the conscience-" Having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience."

Now the value of the precious blood of Christ does go a vast deal farther. We have boldness to enter into the holiest by it; we shall be in glory by it, and perfect there; we have redemption by it. The cleansing of the conscience is, so to speak, merely negative.; it clears from the sense of guilt, it meets judgment, requirement. On the door-posts in Egypt it shut God out, because He came as an avenging Judge. Still we evidently need it in this character. So in sprinkling everything in the tabernacle, it removed the stains of Israel's iniquities, and enabled the worship to go on. It entitled the leper to come into the camp and partake of all that would practically restore him to God. It was the basis of all, because that by which anything was sprinkled met the whole character of God-was as fit for the mercy-seat and Him that sat upon it, as for the sinner to cleanse him. Still in its application as sprinkling on anything it went no farther than the cleansing from positive defilement by sin: most blessed assuredly, as it is indispensable to have it; but still, as so sprinkled and applied, only going to the judicial but perfect removal of all uncleanness in God's sight. I repeat, what the blood has done goes infinitely farther for us, and in glorifying God. The sprinkling is a purging process; the death of Christ involves all the glorifying of God in it.

I think we must make a slight difference in thought between the death of Christ and His blood-shedding; the latter being connected with purging through expiation and propitiation, while in the death we get besides the perfect testing of all that Christ was for God, and it was a perfect sweet savor as in the meat-offering. Still they are not disconnected, for there is sweet savor in the burnt offering, but blood shedding and sprinkling on the altar with it. I only refer to it as having also a different aspect, which, as we only know in part, we may look at separately.

What is important to remark is, that this sprinkling of blood, though every remedy comes from God's love and sovereign grace, is not in itself the outgoing of that full and infinite love- does not take in the counsels of God, nor the work of Christ as the righteous base of those counsels, nor His so being made sin as to open the wide scene of God's glory. God is viewed as a righteous Judge simply, who requires what is clean in His sight, and we through grace are cleansed for Him as He so requires. Hence I have said that, while most precious and indispensable for us, it is the lowest step in the wonderful scheme of grace. In it grace is measured by our need, and God takes the character of Judge.

J. N. D.

## Exodus 20

---

We must distinguish between the outward public effect of the law, and the intention of God in giving it. There may be a general providential effect of light being sent into the world, while the divine purpose of that light in its spiritual and everlasting bearing may be quite distinct. No one can doubt that the introduction of Christianity has largely modified the general state of society. Men do not do in the light what they do in the dark. Natural conscience, operating in the way of shame, will hinder them, without the least inward moral change. Public opinion is elevated, and it is a great providential mercy. Men are more or less governed by that opinion, and an outward effect is produced. There is, I think, something more—When the word of God is received, the natural conscience is brought into immediate relationship with God. This itself elevates morally. Hence in protestant countries there is a most undeniably higher moral tone than in papal countries. Conscience has to answer for itself to God. Wretched man is not between conscience and God; his being so always morally degrades. Man is in his place, though he may fail in it. He is at least consciously responsible in it. Further, when men are not exercised in direct responsibility to one true revealed God, but have men between them and God (in which case, wherever it is fully developed, the true God is lost in a multitude of intermediate powers, be they called demons or saints); that is, wherever there is a priesthood, a direct power or influence of Satan can and does come in; not merely in the way of acting by temptation on evil lusts, but in the way of religious or spiritual influence and power. But this is the rule of the darkness of this world. When the word of God has direct authority, this is not the case. Men may be more culpable individually for neglecting the light, but there is not the same influence and power of Satan.

Now all this connects itself with the public moral government of this world. When the authority of the word of God is over man's conscience, that of Satan is not; where it is not, the god of this world exercises his sway. But the proper and eternal purpose of God in the gift of the word goes farther. Men are quickened to eternal life by it.

So in its measure is it with the law. It gives a true measure of what men ought to do, and, in its highest character, what they ought to feel, and claims direct authority for God over the conscience, and puts man, as far as claim on his conscience goes, under immediate responsibility to God and the consciousness of it. Hence it elevated the position of man immensely above the heathen who worshipped demons, and as helps to their passions, not God as a holy one for their conscience. Conscience could not be destroyed: God had put it in man by the fall, but it was buried as much as possible among the heathen, and religion helped through Satanic influence to do so.

This the law did away, and so far tended to present blessing; but if I be asked, What is the divine intention in the law, its spiritual purpose as judged of by the perfect light of the New Testament, in which man was looked at as an already lost sinner, and heavenly and eternal blessings are revealed? then I say that God's intention in the law was not and could not be temporal welfare of man by restraining evil. I may look at the whole law given to Israel in this light as a civil code incomparably beyond all that was known among heathens; but it has no such place, now

Christianity is come. Farther, the law besides this contained a deeper element-its nucleus was the divine judgment of right and wrong in the creature. The ten commandments forbid the evils which destroyed the relationship between man and God and man and his neighbor. What the Lord drew out of the law is the essential element of blessedness even in heaven as far as the creature element of that happiness goes-loving God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. Next, in Israel's case, to whom the law was given, there was by the law no revelation at all of another world or its blessings; and so far as Israel was concerned, the law was given for temporal blessings-blessings in basket and in store, in the field and in the winepress; and these as signs of divine favor showing its governmental approval of righteousness and obedience.

But if it be asked, what was the intention of law by the light -the true light which now shines, the whole aspect is changed, because the truth, grace and truth, are come. In the first law has no place at all. The second gives to law (not the law merely) the necessary and inevitable character of condemnation and death; because men have to say to God, not in governmental relationship in the earth, but as personally responsible to God according to the requirements of His revealed nature. As viewed thus in the light of Christianity then it takes a double character. First, as the law dispensationally given to Israel, it was after an unconditional promise which it could not disannul and was the schoolmaster until the Seed came to whom the promise was made. This ceased when faith came. As law spiritually known, it aggravated sin and brought death and condemnation on the sinner. The welfare of man it has nothing to do with, for man is lost and a sinner; and the law was never given to men in general dispensationally. If I argue religiously on law (not the law,) the scripture affords an immediate and very clear answer: " Law entered that the offense might abound " -not that sin might, but that offense might. Its effect is " sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good, that sin by the commandment might become exceedingly sinful." " The motions of sin were by the law." " The strength of sin is the law." It is so doubly. It condemns the sinner and brings in death. Sin is provoked by it. So perverse are we, that prohibitions set will and lusts in activity.

A passage I have not yet quoted requires to be noticed. " The law was added, because of transgressions." This is constantly cited as if it meant to restrain them. But it really means, I have not the least doubt, to introduce them-thus convincing man of his perverse and wicked will. The law could not be added to restrain them, because there were none until it came; for where no law is, there is no transgression. It was added to turn evil in man's heart into transgression by positive commandment, and give the knowledge of sin to the easy conscience of man. It is important to distinguish between the law as a dispensed government of a single people, and law, the effect of law, on the human heart. The English Authorized Version will help us little as to this, though the great body of the Apostle's argument is founded on the nature and effect of law on the human heart.

God's intention then in law was as to spiritual things to bring in transgression and convict of sin-man being already and hopelessly lost. As an outward dispensation for the Jews, it doubtless tended as a civil system to repress grosser evils: but then God was king of the country and people, and the people governed by it, and that in early times, emerging out of heathenism, before Christ came and was rejected. The Gentiles have nothing to say to it in this sense. It was a schoolmaster up to the time of Christ; then faith came and Judaism ceased. The only way a Gentile can be under law is as a principle of personal responsibility, in which he has to answer for himself, and on

which ground it is a ministry of death and condemnation (2 Cor. 3), the strength of sin, and useful only to bring guilt on his conscience, and the sense that he has no power to free himself, or any possibility of his being freed from the power of sin while on this ground.

The law does not manifest God's moral perfections, or pretend to do it. Christ does that. The law tells us perfectly what the creature ought to be and feel, not what God is and feels. Hence it is not the adequate direction of a Christian's faith. There were two parts of Christ's life: He was born under law; but He was also the manifestation of God. Now surely He kept the law, and died under its curse for them who were under it, who were thus delivered from the law, which could only condemn them, or lose its authority if it did not. But the manifestation of God is our pattern. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." He acts in grace, sends rain on just and unjust, loves His enemies. This, law cannot admit. "Be ye imitators of God as dear children," as Christ has loved us. He laid down His life for us. "We ought also to lay down our lives for the brethren." In a word Christ, as revealing the Father, is the model for our walk; and the fruits of the Spirit, who refers the heart wholly to Him, are what are looked for in him who has the Spirit. Law is inadequate as a rule; it is unchristian in principle to be under it, for I am not under law but under grace. It is always in connection with man in the flesh and cannot be with redemption, and as many as are of the works of it are accursed. It is not what I can look to as an object, for Christ is that; and I cannot serve two masters, or, to use the figure of Rom. 7 on this point, have two husbands at one time-law and Christ risen. Whoever sets himself under law in any way destroys its authority, because he has not kept it, yet hopes not to be under its curse; and he uses Christ, not for redemption and power of deliverance, but to make allowance for failure in us and make void the law which would condemn us. If He has delivered me from it, bearing its curse, He has glorified its authority and delivered me by power from sin in the flesh, that I may bring forth fruit unto God. If I am put under it after redemption, it must either condemn me or its authority be set aside. As a rule of life it is inadequate, because grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, and this is my rule of life -not the law which was given by Moses, and which is not grace. To say that it is a transcript of, or manifests, God's moral perfections is nonsense. Is He, speaking with reverence, to love His neighbor as Himself? A creature ought-doubtless unfallen creatures as angels do; but as to man, he is a fallen one and does not, and when raised with Christ has the activity of grace and forbearing love as his rule, as shown in God manifest in the flesh; and the Christian led of the Spirit is not under law.

The subject is too vast to enter into in answering a question, or it would be important to notice that law is a principle of relationship as well as a rule, and to show how we are delivered from law, and that this is the only means of sin not having dominion over us. Those who would place the Christian under law do not believe that in us, that is, in our flesh, dwelleth no good thing, nor ever will; or they do not know what they are saying or insisting on. It were well they should weigh the force of this: "when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin which were by the law;" and "sin shall not have dominion over you, because ye are not under law, but under grace."

The law was then for Israel connected with God's direct government as its sanction, a means of temporal blessing. But this has ceased. All divine light tends to strengthen and elevate conscience when it rules public opinion; but God's spiritual intention in the law was to make offense abound. It does not manifest God's moral perfections, but in its nature claims, and is the rule of, man's duties. The ten commandments do not give the instruction needed by a redeemed people: a redeemed

people cannot now be rightly under the law. Sin has dominion over those that are under it. Christ alone is the rule, pattern, light, and instruction of the redeemed Christian.

## The Third and Seventh Days

---

### Num. 19

Of the use of the third day and the seventh day in Num. 19:12, I should not give any very dogmatically certain interpretation, drawing its meaning more from the experiences pointed to by the figure than from directly scriptural proofs. "Third" is little used in scripture as a number to which meaning is attached; it is, however, somewhat as that which is beyond two. Two seems to import completeness by corroboration in witness; the third more than enough, and hence, also, what leaves the previous state whose witness is complete. It is here used, I believe, only as a division of seven.

But the moral bearing I apprehend is this. The red heifer was a provision for defilement in the way-hence introduced into the Book of Numbers, not in Leviticus. Its use was not to found communion by blood (though that groundwork was first laid and perfectly laid, in that the blood was sprinkled seven times there where Jehovah was to meet the people), but to restore communion interrupted by defilement. The sign (the ashes) of sin having been consumed long ago, was put into running water, and the unclean sprinkled with it the third day. For two days he lay under the uncleanness-must feel it as such. There was no haste in restoration to communion till the privation of it, and thus the uncleanness of sin, was felt. Then in the water (the application by the word in the power of the Holy Ghost), the sense that the sin which interrupted communion was put away before God was given, after the full witness in the soul of the evil. The man was brought out of it in the sense of the grace that put it away, and that cleansed from it; and connected the sense of sin, not with the bitterness of lost communion, but with the grace that had put it away: giving a deeper and more justifying sense of it in connection with grace, making us judge it with God in grace; not in the sense of being, as to enjoyment, without Him, and the Holy Ghost a reprover. Still this is not communion; it is not the soul occupied with God without the conscience having to be exercised, but the conscience in exercise, though now no longer a bad one, but in a renewed sense of grace and goodness. Judging the evil thence, one is in a sense purified, but not so as to be peacefully in communion with God; enjoying Christ for His own precious excellences, which we do in communion. When the full work is wrought; when this purifying is complete, and grace in respect of sin is fully entered into, then communion is entered into, which leaves sin and all thoughts about it behind. The grace that has purified in making us judge sin according to grace makes us now enjoy grace without any more thinking of sin-in a word, enjoy God. Communion is restored, and in the full acceptableness of the offering of Christ understood and enjoyed. I enter into the presence of, and communion with, God-sin, as the subject of my thoughts, being wholly left behind. This is the seventh day. All is complete.

## The Basket of Firstfruits

---

That it applies to Israel's possession of the land at any time is plain. The last words of the first verse imply as much: "And it shall be when thou art come in unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, and possessest it, and dwellest therein, that thou shalt take," etc. Ex. 23:19; Lev. 23; and Num. 18:13, fully confirm this. It was a standing ordinance in the land. The spirit of the offering is also clear: a full profession before God that they possessed the things which He had promised to their fathers. Their father had been a Syrian ready to perish, a slave in Egypt, and redemption had brought them out thence, and into the good land of which they were now in full enjoyment. Therefore were they come up to own the Giver in offering to Him the first-fruits. They worshipped and rejoiced in every good thing Jehovah had given them, and this in grace, with the Levite and the stranger.

How all this bears on the way in which the believer now makes the offering is evident. All his worship is but the answer, the reflex, and bringing back to God of the fruit-the first-fruits, if true faith and godliness be there-of what God has revealed Himself to be to him, and of that heavenly joy into which He has introduced him. Such is properly what the Lord calls "that which is your own;" "for on earth we are pilgrims, in the desert it is not "ours." The characteristic of piety will be found to be, in scripture, and everywhere, and ever, that the first effect of blessing is turning back to God and owning it there, not the personal enjoyment of it, which, without this, turns us from God. The love that gave it is more present than even the gift. See Eliezer at the well (Gen. 24), the cleansed Samaritan leper (Luke 17), and a multitude of other examples. He who gives is more and more before us than the gift itself. This is the elevating character of divine enjoyment. Then surely we do enjoy it, freely and blessedly, and the stream of grace flows out to the Levite and the stranger-to those whose hearts are in need, and who have not an inheritance in the land we enjoy. It is, then, the return of the heart to God in the enjoyment of the heavenly blessings which are the fruit of redemption. The Christian too can enjoy or so worship when he has the consciousness that heavenly things are his. It is the profession, the open avowal, of this; if he has not this consciousness, neither can he bring his basket of first-fruits. "A Syrian ready to perish" was a thing past. The worship was grounded on possession of the blessing and on a known inheritance-type of sitting "in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." It is not thankfulness for promises, however surely this has its place, but thankfulness that they are accomplished-in Christ, yea and amen. Redemption is owned as an accomplished thing that has put us in possession, though for the redemption of the body we have yet to wait.

Indeed, this is the general character of Deuteronomy. It is not drawing near to God in the sanctuary by means of sacrifice, but the people-not the priest merely for them-are themselves in possession, and hence the sentiments towards God Himself, and towards the desolate of men, in the enjoyment of the blessing; for free grace becomes him who has received all through grace. Compare Deut. 16, where even the various degrees of this are traced in the three principal feasts of Jehovah. Hence also the responsibility of the people as to the continuance of the enjoyment of the blessing; for it is in the path of obedience that such enjoyment is known. Deuteronomy is a

book of the deepest practical instruction in this respect.

## Ananias and Sapphira

---

I see no reason for saying Ananias and Sapphira were not saved. The analogy of the apostle's reasoning, in 1 Corinthians 11: 30-32, would lead rather to suppose they were. But it is a mistake to call this dealing with the world. It is God judging in the midst of the assembly and that He surely does, even to death, as 1 Cor. 11, above cited, and 1 John 5:16, 17, and James 5:15 distinctly show. 1 John 5:16, 17, I think, teaches another truth—that there are cases where the charity of the Church is arrested in its outward gracious nature, and takes the form of indignation against evil. So with Christ: " he looked about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts." Perfect love, when forced to take its holy character, or rather to make its holy character prominent, is intolerant of evil, and especially of certain forms of evil, such as a base slighting of God, or pretension to deceive Him under fair forms, or heartless hindrance of blessing to others under the forms of piety. The action of God in this way within the assembly is judicial.

There are cases where discipline is in the course of progress, and might terminate (Job 36:7-12) in death, but where the intercession of the saints may be the means of blessing, and in the administration of God's government in the Church on earth, may avert the threatened evil. As regards this government, the sins would be forgiven and the life of the faulty person spared, the soul being set right. (Job 34:23, 24.)

But there are cases which are not such as can draw out this charity which pleads for the offender, but according to the Spirit, indignation against him as guilty of it. This was the case with Ananias and Sapphira. Peter speaks with just zeal and horror of what they have done, and the action of God, being full in the Church, was judicial on a sin which was unto death. God may and does deal sometimes providentially in judgment with the world, though it is not the time for making His judgment adequately express His sense of right and wrong. And yet it is the time in which, as regards His active full dealing with the world, His grace is in full exercise, and not judgment. Grace characterizes the epoch. But His relationship to the world has nothing to do with Ananias and Sapphira. Although the principles of scripture lead rather to the supposal that Ananias and Sapphira were not lost, yet the very principles we have seen laid down in scripture show us that the act took them out of the active exercise of the Church's charity. It is only in this the Church pronounces anyone saved. And when God's judgment thus comes in, the case is by it taken out of any thoughts of the Church in charity, and she has nothing to say.

## Preface to the Vevay New Testament, 1859

---

In presenting to the reader this new translation of the second part of the holy scriptures, it is well to give him some information as to the plan which we have followed, and the principles which have guided us in our undertaking. With regard to the details of this work, we will only mention those which have appeared to us as needing some explanation.

Thoroughly convinced of the divine inspiration of the scriptures, we have endeavored in translating them to reproduce as exactly as possible in French, that which God has given us in another language, unknown to the greater part of those who read the Bible. We have rendered the Greek as literally as was consistent with the perspicuity needed for the understanding of what is said. The depth of the word of God is infinite, and the connection that exists between all the parts of the divine mystery is not less admirable; although this mystery is not revealed to us as a whole, for " we know in part and we prophesy in part." Therefore it is that we often meet in the word with expressions that, flowing from the depth of the mystery in the mind of the inspired writers, make us perceive (under divine teaching) the connection of the different parts with each other, and that of each of these parts with the whole. To retain these Greek expressions is sometimes disadvantageous to the style of the version; but, when the clearness of the sentence was not injured by it, we have allowed some to stand which might help the reader to apprehend all the meaning and bearing of what is written in the Greek. In other cases, when the French language would not admit of a literal translation, and where the form of the Greek phrase appeared to contain thoughts that might be more or less lost or modified in the French expression, we have given the literal translation in a note.

( Note: The parts which refer only to the French language are printed thus, in brackets [\*] with a star inside them.-Ed. P. T.J)

There is another point which relates to the Greek text itself, and which it is needful to mention. Until the end of the fifteenth century, at which period printing was invented, the holy scriptures-as well as all other books-existed only in the form of manuscripts. The first impression of the Bible was due to Cardinal Ximenes, but the sources from which he drew are still very little known to us. Two years previous to its publication, Erasmus had already given an editio princeps of the Greek text, but he had been able to consult only a very few manuscripts, and indeed for the Apocalypse he possessed but one, and this very incorrect and incomplete. About the middle of the sixteenth century, R. Stephens (Stephanus) published in Paris an edition of the Greek text, founded upon the comparison which he had made of thirteen manuscripts that he had found in the royal library, and of a fourteenth which his son Henry had examined, and which afterward, from the hands of Theodore Beza, found its way into the Cambridge library. Theodore Beza himself published, at about the same time, an edition of the New Testament with a fresh translation in Latin. Also in 1633 a new edition of the Greek text was published in Holland, differing little from that of Stephens, to which they were bold enough to give the title of " Textus ab omnibus Receptus," the text received by all. If, at the present day, we put aside the translations from the Vulgate or ancient

Latin version, we may say that in so far at least as we know, all modern translators of the New Testament have hitherto taken as the basis of their labors, either the text which is called "Text received by all" or another which is even less correct. Now this "Received Text" is founded on a very limited number of MSS. At the time of its publication criticism had made but little progress. The anxiety also of some who feared that the common faith might thereby be shaken prevented the raising of the question as to the accuracy of the existing text thus presented. But since that period many hundred MSS, some of which are of great antiquity, have been carefully examined and compared. Those faults could thus be corrected which copyists had introduced into the thirteen MSS to which Stephens had access, or which, by any other means, had crept into the "Received Text." The learned men who have thus employed their time and their sagacity in purging the text from those errors, which had found their way into it through the carelessness or presumption of men, have formed a corrected text; classifying, according to different systems, and judging, each according to his own point of view, the numerous MSS known at present.

We will name here the most distinguished among these learned men. The first, perhaps, whom we should point out, is Mills, who accumulated an immense number of different readings, by examining the MSS that he found in divers European libraries. Next came Bengel, who suggested the principle, turned afterward to good account, of classifying the MSS in different families. After him Wetstein added many more readings, and published an edition of great critical value. Then Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, Lachmann, availed themselves of the resources furnished by their predecessors in this field of labor, making also fresh researches themselves. We may add to the preceding names those of Birch, Matthaei, Alter, who have also contributed their share to the reconstruction of the text. Other men, no doubt, have labored in the same way; but it suffices to have pointed out the principal ones among the number.

We have then thought it good to profit by all the means which learned and hard-working men have put within our reach. Some among them have preferred to form their text entirely on the most ancient MSS. It is true that every copy tends to multiply mistakes; but a MS which is more modern than some other one may happen to be an exact copy of a MS much more ancient than the latter. The MSS from which a copy was made at a comparatively modern period, may also have been less corrupted by deliberate alterations, so that the true way of having a text as pure as possible is to make use of all the resources that are at one's disposal. There are versions more ancient than the most ancient of the known MSS. Those versions control the text of the MSS. A work has been recently published by Mons. Rilliet, on perhaps the most ancient of all MSS, called the Vatican. His work appears to us very well done, and in many respects interesting; but no one MS can, by itself, furnish a satisfactory text of the New Testament.

We will very briefly point out the character of those editions which, when they agree together, have formed the basis of our text.

Griesbach rests principally on the ancient MSS in uncial letters; but he has weighed the other authorities. His edition, published after the labors of Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, has certainly laid the foundations of modern criticism. He sees it right to distinguish from each other three families or classes of readings or of MSS, the Alexandrian, the Constantinopolitan, and the Western. The greater number of the ancient MSS, that is, those in uncial letters, are of the Alexandrian family; and it is on this family that Griesbach has founded his text; but the learned critic did not confine

himself to this source.

Scholz professes to follow the readings of the Constantinopolitan MSS, which are followed by the mass of modern or western MSS, which, far more than the Alexandrian, countenance the "Received Text." Nevertheless, in reality he often diverges from that family, so that his text differs little from that of Griesbach: his edition is disfigured by many faults of type.

Tischendorf, like Griesbach, follows principally the MSS in uncial letters. In his first edition he is a little rash, but he becomes much more sober in the subsequent editions, in which he has re-established many readings that he had previously rejected.

Lachmann has pursued a line of his own, laying it down at first as a principle, that the autographic text is not to be found; he has endeavored not precisely to come as near to it as possible; but, holding it for certain that the MSS of the first four centuries must be the most correct, he would not examine any that did not belong to those four centuries. This system is too absolute to be safe.

Matthaei has founded his edition on the MSS that are in the possession of the Russian synod, and that belong to the Constantinopolitan family. He also has followed an absolute system, and has even combated strenuously against those who attached themselves in preference to the Alexandrian text. Nevertheless, the successors of Griesbach have availed themselves of the labors of these two last-named men, who have furnished criticism with fresh resources. In result, all these learned men have helped to improve the text of the New Testament, so that we now possess the precious word of our God, purged from many of the faults which the carelessness of copyists had introduced into it.

The MS of the Vatican, which Professor Rilliet has recently translated, is of the Alexandrian family. The MS which bears the special name of Alexandrian is on the contrary not so throughout; the Gospels belong to one family, the Acts to another, and the Epistles to a third. We have merely given general ideas on these points, referring those who wish to study the subject to those books and prolegomena from which, trusting to our memory, we have drawn the substance of these brief remarks.

The result of all the labors of which we have been speaking has been most happy for all those who rightly value the integrity of the word of God. No doubt human weakness has left its traces here also, as is the case wherever anything has been entrusted to man; but the providence of God has watched over His word, so that, in spite of the great differences between the systems which learned men have followed for the revision of the text, they have nevertheless arrived at almost identical results. Apart from one or two passages, the various editions of the Greek text are almost everywhere in accordance with each other as regards the different readings which have any importance. The variations we meet with are few in number, of a secondary order, and, in a translation, would often be almost imperceptible; and the labors of the learned men who have compared the numerous MSS known at present have had the happy effect of removing the mistakes with which the first editions of the Greek text were disfigured.

These few remarks will make the reader understand our reasons for abandoning a text which was known to be inexact in more than one place. It was fit, however, not to give way to an uncertain or venturesome criticism; whenever therefore the principal editions, such as those of Griesbach, Scholz, Tischendorf, Lachmann, and often some others less known, are agreed, we have followed

the text exactly as they have given it, as we have no motive that attached us to a less pure text. On the other hand, as criticism was not our object, we have simply and entirely retained the received text wherever these principal editors were not agreed. Moreover, we have always been careful to point out in a note the passages in which we have departed from the received text, giving the translation of the latter at the same time.

It remains for us to explain to the reader why, in the Apocalypse, we have no longer given at the bottom of the page the readings of the received text. As we have already stated, that of the Apocalypse was printed by Erasmus, from one very incorrect MS that did not even contain all the last chapter, which this learned man translated from the Latin. At present, on the contrary, ninety-three MSS have been collated with more or less care, three of which are in the uncial letters. We have not, therefore, thought it well to reproduce all the faults of one imperfect MS. Erasmus did his best, but there was no need to re-produce errors which he had no means of avoiding.

We have now to furnish some explanations on points of detail. And, first, it may appear singular that, excepting as it depends on the punctuation, we have excluded the capital letter from the beginning of every word which is not a proper name, as such. Thus we have written our god, our father, the son, the word, the spirit.

We desire that our readers should fully understand the motive that induced us to print these words in a manner which is not agreeable to ourselves, and which will perhaps be a matter of surprise to them. We have adopted this plan in order to avoid what appears to us a still greater impropriety. In speaking of the spirit, we find more than one passage in which the state of the soul and the Spirit of God are so united and mingled together, that it would have been rash or even impossible to decide between a small s or a capital S. Now if we had put a small s to the word spirit, and a capital G to the word God, the result would have been most grievous, and, in appearance at least, a denial of the divinity of the Holy Ghost. We had no other resource than to follow the example of the Greek, and to use capitals only for proper names: thus, when the word " God " is a proper name, it has a capital; when it is appellative, it has a small g. We have followed the same rule with respect to the word " Christ," which may be a proper name, or may have the sense of " anointed." This plan is, we repeat, disagreeable to ourselves, but it maintains the ground of truth, which would have been impossible on any other plan. Those who are in the habit of reading the Greek Testament will not be stumbled at it. The passages, Rom. 8:15 and John 4:24 (and there are many others), will suffice to mark the difficulty; in these two passages, in fact, to make the difference between Spirit with a capital S and spirit with a small s, and then to put the one or the other would in either case falsify the meaning.

It is with design that we have sometimes written " Christ," and sometimes " the Christ," that is, the Anointed One, the Messiah. An attentive study of the word will show that, in the Gospels, the word Christ is almost always preceded by the article, and generally expresses that which a Jew would have called " the Messiah." In the Epistles, on the contrary, the use of the article is rare, and in most instances may simply depend on the grammatical exigencies of the Greek language, without taking away from the word " Christ " the character of a proper name. In the latter case French rejects the article, and the translator has therefore to form a judgment as to the intention of the sacred writer. We cannot affirm that we have always succeeded in discerning it; but in the greater

number of the passages the reader will easily distinguish between the office and the name of the person.

The Septuagint has used the word κ■ριος for " Jehovah," translated usually " the LORD " in the Old Testament. It is rendered also by " the Lord " in the New Testament, and is confounded with the same name applied to Jesus, viewed as a man. " God has made him," it is said, " both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). Not doubting but that this word is often the proper name " Jehovah," we think that it will be a service to the reader if we furnish him with a list of the passages in which κ■ριος presents this meaning: those among them which, in this respect, appear more or less doubtful, are followed by a note of interrogation.

Matt. 1:20, 22, 24; 2:13, 15, 19; 3:3; 4:7, 10; 5:33; 21:3 (?), 9, 42; 22:37, 44; 23:39; 27:10; 28:2.

Mark 1:3; 11:3 (?), 9, 10; 12:11, 29, 30, 36; 13:20; 16:20 (?).

Luke 1:6, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 25, 28, 32, 38, 45, 46, 58, 66, 68, 76; 2:9, 15, 22, 23, 24, 26, 38, 39; 3:4; 4:8, 12, 18, 19; 5:17; 10:27; 13:35; 19:38; 20:37, 42.

John 1:23; 12:13.

Acts 1:24 (?); 2:20, 21, 25, 39, 47 (?); 3:19, 22; 4:26, 29 (?); 5:9, 19; 7:30, 31, 33, 37, 49; 8:25 (?), 26; 9:31 (?), 10:4 (?), 14 (?); 12:7, 17 (?), 23; 15:17; 17:27

Rom. 4:8; 9:28, 29; 10:9, 12, 13, 16; 11:3, 34; 12:19; 14:11; 15:11.

1 Cor. 1:31; 2:16; 3:20; 14:21; 15:47 (?).

2 Cor. 3:17, 18 (peculiar character); 6:17, 18; 10:17.

Heb. 1:10; 7:21; 8:2, 8, 9, 10, 11; 10:16, 30; 12:5, 6

James 5:4, 11.

1 Peter 1:25; 3:12, 15.

2 Peter 2:9 (?), 11; 3:8.

Jude 5, 9.

Rev. 1:8; 4:8, 11; 11:15(?), 17; 15:3, 4; 16:5 (?), 7; 18:8; 19:6; 21:22; 22:5, 6.

In the Acts the word is used in an absolute and general way, and applied to Christ. It is usually the same in the Epistles, see 1 Cor. 8:5, 6.

[\*We have hesitated whether to translate the word " λ■γος " by " verbe " or by " parole," the use of a feminine noun being undesirable in speaking of God, of the incarnation, of creation, etc. On the other hand, the connection which exists between the word of revelation and the Word as a person, such as is seen in Heb. 4:12, 13, is likely to be lost by the use of the word " verbe." This last consideration has induced us to employ the word " parole " in spite of its feminine form: custom has, besides, in a great measure removed the unsuitableness of the expression.

After some hesitation we have retained the word " ■vangile," instead of using such terms as " bonne nouvelle," or " heureux message" which, though they would have given more exactly the

Greek sense, seemed to us, at the same time, both too harsh and too familiar.\*]

The use we have made of the word "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον) is not without its danger, and requires that the attention of the reader should be called to the proper meaning of the word, as well as to some facts connected with it. We commonly say, "to preach the gospel" - "this or that is not the gospel"; and by "gospel" is understood a certain system of doctrine. The word, however, means simply "glad tidings," "good news" brought by some one. Thus when Timothy brought to Paul good news of the faith and love of the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 3:6), it is said that he εὐηγγέλισατο (evangelized) Paul as to the faith and love of the Thessalonians.

On the other hand, in the same way that the word "Christ," used at first as a title in the sense of the Anointed One, became afterward a proper name; so the pre-eminently good news, the good news of the love of God and of His intervention in the person of Christ to save men, is called "the good news," "the gospel." It is important that the reader, when he meets with this expression, should bear in mind the idea of a communication of good and glad tidings, as a message from God; and that he should also remember that the word εὐαγγέλιον, translated "gospel," is used to designate various glad tidings or good news. When, for instance, we read of "the gospel of the kingdom" (that is to say, of the good news that God was going to establish His kingdom on earth), this is quite a different good news from that of the intervention of God in grace for salvation. It must also be observed that when we find the expression "the gospel of God," the word speaks to us of God as the source of the good news; whilst when the expression is "the gospel of Christ," it is Christ who is presented as being the subject of this good news. Some other analogous modes of expression will not be passed unnoticed by the attentive reader.

We should add that this word εὐαγγέλιον (gospel) is not common to all the sacred writers, and that we do not find it in the Greek text of Luke, John, James, or Jude. Peter only makes use of it once; in Paul, on the contrary, that great herald of the glad tidings, we meet with it very frequently, but in different acceptations. Matthew uses it four times, always adding the words "of the kingdom." Of all the evangelists, Mark is the only one who employs this word several times in the sense which we now usually give it; and this is readily accounted for by the fact that Mark is particularly occupied with Christ as proclaiming the word, and that he makes no mention of the circumstances which accompanied the birth of our Lord, but begins with the glad tidings at once, and ends his narrative with the commission entrusted by the Lord to His disciples, without giving-as the other evangelists have done-an especial character to that mission. He says merely, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the glad tidings to every creature." The reader will however observe that even in Mark the word is not used independently of the idea of the coming of the kingdom, for it is there written "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has drawn nigh; repent ye, and believe in the glad tidings." This coming of the kingdom is a very different thing from the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, although these events took place before the setting up of the kingdom, and were in fact necessary to it. It is evident that, before the accomplishment of the fact, the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus could not be preached as glad tidings, men being then called on to believe in a living Christ.

Finally and in a general way it may be said that the word "gospel," having by itself the meaning of good news declared, serves to express the preaching of the truth, as well as the truth preached; and that the word is used sometimes in the one, and sometimes in the other, of these two senses.

Thus the study of the text will show that there are, both in Mark and in the Epistles of Paul, some passages in which the word "gospel" is used to point out a system of doctrine, the purport of the message of glad tidings, and not the act of proclaiming it. Elsewhere, when Paul says (1 Cor. 9:14) that "the Lord has ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel," these men preach a doctrine, but they do not live of a doctrine; it is of their service that they live, while preaching the doctrine. In verse 18 of the same chapter Paul speaks of "his right in the gospel," that is, in his service as a preacher; and again, in Phil. 4:15, he points out by the expression "the beginning of the gospel" the beginning of the preaching of these glad tidings.

It was important to preserve the distinction which the word makes between the expression (an extremely vague one however) of ᾠδης, the invisible place, where the souls of men go after death, and that of γέννα, the place of torment. We have therefore retained the Greek word ᾠδης, hades.

Neither ought we to lose sight of the important difference that exists between the expressions, δούλος, δίκονος, and πηρτης. We have retained for the first, the term (of evil sound in the present day) of slave; the δίκονος was a man who served at table or elsewhere, without being, on that account, a slave; the πηρτης, originally a rower in a galley, was an official servant, such for instance as an "apparitor." When the text does not allow us to render these differences into French, we have given the Greek word in a note.

The reader will find the somewhat singular expression "the way" in Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23. We have translated it literally from the Greek, not doubting but that it was a nickname given to Christianity, as at all times the world has invented one for true piety.

We have rendered the Greek word προσκυνω, by "do homage"; this expression applying in Greek to every kind of reverential action, from the simple act of bowing to a superior up to the adoration of God Himself. The reader will easily decide on the character of the homage, by considering who the person is to whom it is rendered, and who it is that renders it.

We frequently find in the Acts the participle of the verb σβεσθαι with the sense of "who serves God." We call attention to this expression because it indicates a class of persons who, although they were not Jews, shunned the vanity and the defilements of Paganism, and took part in the Jewish worship. See Acts 13:43, 50; 16:14; 17:4, 17; 18:7, 13. We also find the same expression in Matt. 15:5; Mark 7:7; and Acts 19:27; used in the ordinary sense of worshipping, whether it be a Jew worshipping Jehovah, or a heathen his false gods.

The equivocal meaning of the word "call," which signifies alike "to give a name," or "to invite a person to come to us, or into some position," makes the use of this word difficult when it is attached to the term "saint" or "apostle." In the absence of a better expression we have nevertheless retained it. Rom. 1:6, 7; 8:28 Cor. 1:1, 2, 24; Jude 1; Rev. 17:14. To translate it, as has been done, by "called [to be] saints," is to pervert the sense; "who are called saints" is still worse. To give the exact meaning, it should be said "saints by call," the persons in question having become saints by the call of God; and the reader will do well to remember this in the passages we have named.

The meaning of the adjective ψυχικος, animal, which the reader will find in 1 Cor. 2:14; 15:44, 46; and James 3:15; may present some difficulty when thus applied, whether to the moral condition, or to the body, of a man. We think it well, therefore, to remark that, in these passages, the word

indicates that which, like the first Adam, lives by virtue of the possession of a soul, and not by the mighty energy of the Holy Ghost. The same Greek word ψυχικος is found also in Jude 19, where we could hardly employ the term " animal," and have therefore replaced it by " natural."

The Greek word ἅγιος demands also a little explanation, as in Acts 13:34, 35. There is no question but that the word is used in the New Testament, as also in the Septuagint, in the sense of " holy," (see 1 Tim. 2:8; Titus 1:8; Heb. 7:26; Rev. 15:4), although the word usually translated " holy " is ἁγιος. The proper sense of ἅγιος is pious, compassionate, that which is not profane, and it is applied to Christ, in whom is summed up all the benevolence and the goodness of God towards men, as well as perfect piety. This application of the word comes out in a very remarkable way in Psa. 89, where the expression is used by the sacred writer to designate the loving-kindnesses of God towards Israel, which are centered in David, and the promises made to David and his seed, that is to say, to Christ (verses 1-4). The same expression is applied in verse 19 to the person in whom all these mercies are centered, in contrast with the other word that is usually rendered by " holy," and which is employed in verse 18 with respect of Jehovah.

The word in Acts 13:34 that is translated " the sure mercies of David " is the same as that which is translated " thine Holy one " in verse 35 of the same chapter, as well as in Acts 2:27; and these holinesses or mercies, which are made sure by the resurrection of Jesus, the Holy One who was not to see corruption, are the same mercies which are set forth in Psa. 89; see verses 29-39.

The reader will remember that the words enclosed in brackets [ ] are added to the text. They are not found in the Greek. The genius of the French language requires the addition. But we desire to call the reader's attention more particularly to a few cases of this, especially in Paul's Epistles, and chiefly in those to the Romans and Galatians, in which the introduction of the article might possibly alter the meaning. Thus, for instance, before the word " law," the article tends to make the reader think that it is the law of Moses which is spoken of. In these cases, and in others of the same nature, the reader must not fail to notice the brackets, which indicate that the article is not found in the original. This is particularly to be attended to when he meets with such expressions as " under [the] law," or " under [a] law," " by [the] law," etc.

The expression " under sin " (Rom. 3:9) is peculiar, but we have retained it in order not to weaken the moral force of the term, which, in the text, points out the sinful condition (as God views it) which presses upon us, a weight, a power, and on every side; the meaning would be lost if it were translated " in sin," or " subjected to sin."

[\*In Rom. 6 and elsewhere, we have translated " si nous sommes morts avec Christ" and not " si nous mourons avec Christ" being convinced that we render thus more accurately the mind of the apostle, though the true form of the verb is altogether lacking in French. " Nous mourons," as an historical tense, presents to the mind only an act which was accomplished at a given moment.\*]

Acts 20:28 has been a great perplexity both to critics and translators. It seems to us that this has arisen from not paying sufficient attention to one of the ordinary senses of τοῦ ἁδίου. We read with all the modern editors διὰ τοῦ ἁματότος τοῦ ἁδίου, not taking this last word as an adjective agreeing with ἁματότος, but as a genitive after ἁματότος. ἁδιος is that which belongs to any one, and, consequently, his family, the people of his house: τῷ ἁμα τοῦ ἁδίου is the blood of some one who belongs to a person,' as a son to a father. The French language requires the addition of a

name to the words " his own." We have therefore said " his own [son]," because we know that He who belonged to God, and whom God gave, was His Son.

By comparing the expressions π βιθααρ (Mark 2:26), π το β του (Mark 12:26), and the analogous form ν λ (Rom. 11:2), we have arrived at the conclusion (evident to ourselves at least) that the first should not be rendered " in the days of Abiathar," but that all three designate a section or heading of a book-a section or heading in which is found the recital of the fact in question. We have therefore departed from the ordinary translation, and have said " in [the section, or heading, of] Abiathar " " in [the section of] the bush."

The translation of Luke 16:9, " that ye may be received," requires justification. The reader can easily convince himself that Luke, in his Gospel, frequently employs the active verb, with the third person of the plural, to express the simple fact which is usually rendered by the passive form, " that they may receive you," for " that ye may be received." Compare chapter 6: 38, 44 (twice); 12: 20; 14: 34, etc.

The expression, " the ends of the ages," which will be found in 1 Cor. 10:11, is rather strange; but to preserve the sense of the Greek, we could not say, " the last times," any more than " the end of the ages," still less " the end of the world." The end of the ages was not yet come; but all the different dispensations by which God had put Himself in relation with man, so far as they were connected with man's responsibility, had come to one point, and were brought to an end in the death of the Lord Jesus. After that-great as had been His long-suffering-God established a new creation. We have therefore used the literal translation, " the ends of the ages."

In the same epistle to the Corinthians we have used the expression, " speaking with tongues," and our excuse is that the thing designated by this term is as unusual as the term itself. To speak languages, or in different languages, is not at all the apostle's meaning. The divine gift, by which they spoke divers languages without having learned them, required a name of its own.

We have not known how to avoid the use of the words " offense," " offend," in an acceptation which is not properly French. The Greek word σκνδαλον means literally a trap, a pitfall, into which animals are drawn by means of a bait; but there are many passages in which this word is used, which could not be rendered by employing the word " snare." In these we have therefore retained (in the absence of a better expression) the usual translation " offend," taking the word σκνδαλον in its moral sense, as presenting an occasion of falling; or, passively, of finding something to be an occasion of falling.

[\*The reader who compares our translation with the Greek, will observe, especially in John 6, that we have often omitted the γ. The Greek language generally admits of the omission of personal pronouns, unless the person designated is to be made prominent; but John often uses this pronoun without the least intention of giving the emphasis which the use of it would give in French. We fear we have even used the word " moi " too frequently after all; but, as its use is a peculiarity of John's style, we were anxious to leave it in wherever this was possible.

There are other expressions in the Gospel of John to which it may be well to draw the reader's attention, because it is difficult to give the force of the Greek in French. Thus the word " venu " in the sentence " venu de Dieu " (John 16:30) is the same as " sorti" of verses 27 and 28 of the same chapter, where we read "je suis sorti d'aupres de Dieu," the only difference being that of the

accompanying preposition. Verses 27 and 28 express the consciousness that the Savior had of His position with the Father before coming down here; verse 30 the knowledge which the disciples had that He had come from God. Without pretending to have succeeded, we have at least sought to express this difference, which is one of real importance.\*]

In the latter chapters of John's Gospel it will be found that in order to maintain the distinction, frequently important, between  $\rho\omega\tau\omega$  and  $\alpha\tau\omega$ , we have translated the first by "demand," the second by "ask." There are cases in which either the one or the other word may be used indiscriminately, at other times each is used in a sense peculiar to itself:  $\rho\omega\tau\omega$  expressing a familiar request where intimacy exists;  $\alpha\tau\omega$ , the request rather of an inferior with regard to his superior. The disciples employ both of these words in their relations with Jesus; but, in His relations with His Father, Jesus demands,  $\rho\omega\tau\omega$ , whilst He never employs the word  $\alpha\tau\omega$  with regard to His Father. For the difference between the two, compare John 16:23.

The words  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega$ ,  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\zeta\alpha$ , have sometimes a peculiar sense, which it is well to notice. The general idea expressed by the verb  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega$ , is that of making a gain at the cost of another, appropriating to oneself the goods of another; it is the desire of possessing oneself of something, and often with the accessory idea that crooked means are used for the purpose; and this desire may apply to the wife as well as to the goods (property so called) of another. We have ourselves the conviction that this is the meaning of Eph. 4:19, 1 Thess. 4:6, and perhaps of yet other passages, such as Eph. 5:3. Nevertheless, as we cannot rest this interpretation on any acknowledged authority, we have not ventured on introducing it into the text. We confine ourselves to the expression of our convictions on this point, adding that the thing in question is at any rate an unlawful desire to possess oneself of something in opposition to good morals; and that, in 1 Thess. 4:6, the word "matter" refers to relations with women.

The translation of 1 Cor. 16:15 does not satisfy us. The word  $\tau\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ , which we have rendered by "have devoted," signifies to appoint an officer to a regiment, or, in general, a man to any post; but here it concerns a service of love. The family of Stephanas-the first converts in Achaia-moved by their desire to serve the Lord, and by their love for the saints, had placed themselves in that which related to service at the head of the saints. They had taken this place with regard to the saints in order to serve them with all their heart. They were thus established over the saints for the purpose of serving them, but they had appointed themselves to it; and Paul beseeches the saints to obey them.

"Many waters" in Rev. 17:1, is feeble; but we have been unable to do better. The Greek says, "the many waters," that is to say, the great extent, with all its windings and various seas.

In 1 Tim. 5:17, we have found no better word for  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$  than "preside," although this expression but poorly gives the sense of the Greek, which does not imply any relation with an assembly as does the French word "preside." The word is used to point out the direction or guidance which a father gives to his family, and is applied in general to all those who undertake to direct others in any way whatever. See Rom. 12:8 Thess. 5:12 Tim. 3:4, 5, 12; and, in a different sense, Titus 3:8, 14.

[\*A difficulty is presented by the Greek preposition following the word  $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\zeta\omega$ , which cannot possibly be satisfactorily expressed either in French or German. A person is baptized  $\epsilon\mu\varsigma$

-becomes attached to something-adjoins himself to something, rallies to it. One adheres to a person by baptism. Thus one is baptized εἰς to the death of Christ, εἰς to Christ Himself, and again εἰς to Moses, εἰς to the remission of sins. The εἰς expressing the object proposed in the baptism, it has been said, " baptizer dans sa mort," but one could not say baptized in Christ, or in Moses; and, moreover, in His death is not the meaning. We have used the word " pour " for, " but it is not quite satisfactory in some cases; for example, " baptisis pour Moise" though it may be everywhere in such a way so as to give the nearest used approach to the idea of the word εἰς.

There is another Greek form of expression which demands a few words, the meaning being difficult to render into French. I refer to the use of the article before the words πλοῖον, ἄρος, οἶκος, literally in English " boat, mountain, house." The expression " a la maison," and that used in Switzerland, " d la montagne" are analogous idioms: "a la maison" does not mean any particular house, but " at home," " not abroad." In the same way " the mountain " means, in Switzerland, " in the mountains " in general, in contrast with the plains. We are convinced that this is usually the force of the article in the cases we are speaking of (the house, the boat, the mountain). He was on the mountain, not in the plain; on a boat, not on terra firma; in the house, not out of doors. We fear we have now and then been inconsistent with this view. However, " on a mountain " does not quite answer to the force of the Greek, nor does " on a boat." But " the boat," " the mountain," supposes a particular boat and a particular mountain, which supposition is unfounded in the cases we refer to. See Matt. 5:1; 8:23; 9:1; 14:22, 32, where one might have said, " en nacelle "; 4: 21, and 13: 2, where one must say " une nacelle "; Mark 1:19; 4:1; 5:18; 6:32; 8:10, 13; Luke 8:22, 37; John 6:17, 22, 24; 21:3.

It may be well to add a few words on the Lord's prayer in Luke. We accept, with the majority of the critical authorities, the alterations made in the text by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others; but, faithful to our principle of altering nothing as to which the chief editors are not agreed, we have retained the

received version. We give here what we believe to be the true reading:-

" Père, que ton nom soit sanctifié; que ton règne vienne; donne-nous chaque jour le pain qu'il nous faut; et pardonne-nous nos péchés, car nous-mêmes aussi nous remettons à quiconque nous doit; et ne nous induis pas en tentation." " Father, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; give us day by day our necessary bread; and forgive us our sins, for we ourselves forgive every one that is in debt to us; and bring us not into temptation."\*]

These few observations made, we place our translation, beloved reader, in your hands. If it contribute to a more exact understanding of the word, it will be owing to the blessing of God having been with us in our undertaking; and it is to God that we also commend the result, in order that He may bestow on it His blessing. We earnestly entreat Him that, by the grace of His Spirit, He will help you to profit by His good and holy word. We trust that we have felt the greatness of our responsibility in venturing to translate the word of God, although we took the work in hand with the desire of reproducing it more faithfully than has yet been done in the French language; but the confidence we felt in the grace of God emboldened us to undertake that which might be useful to souls and tend to glorify Him who alone can bless. May He deign to bestow His blessing on His own word and on yourself in the use of that word!

## The Antichrist, Properly so Called

---

I am still inquiring as to Antichrist, but I had not overlooked the difficulties. It has been taken for granted among those who expect a personal Antichrist, that he is the civil head of the Roman empire. This I question. Without doubting in the least that there will be such a blasphemous Gentile power, it seems to me that the Antichrist is another power, of which the scriptures are even more full; the vessel of evil, religious energy, rather than that of evil public government. At least, two such manifestations of power we find in Rev. 13, for the second is a beast, as well as the first; that is, there is a second temporal power co-existent with the public imperial power, which has the throne of Satan. The first beast had risen, like previous beasts, out of the sea, that is, out of the tumultuous floating mass of population-the Gentile world. But the second beast came out of the earth, that is, out of the formed arrangement of God's moral providence-the sphere where the dragon and the beast were worshipped, and all heavenly association was blasphemed. In form of power, this second beast was like the Lamb; but his speech was like the dragon, or great hostile power of Satan: a religious, though blasphemous, character of evil at work within he sphere where Satan rules. Such a relationship will be found to be Jewish. It is the religion of the earth, not of the dwellers in heaven, and is Jewish in character-a power in the earth ostensibly connected with divine things, falsely, and verified in the sight of men by the exhibition of judicial power as of God. Rev. 19 speaks of the second beast, as the false prophet.

The Antichrist is not spoken of by name, save in the Epistles of John, where his character is religious, not secular-apostate and heretical activity against the person and glory of Christ and the essential doctrines of Christianity. He denies the Father and the Son. He does not confess Jesus Christ come in the flesh. He denies that Jesus is the Christ, which seems rather Jewish in its connection and evil, rather than the denial of the revelation which constitutes Christianity. Antichrist, in a word, is characterized by religious energies of evil in connection with Christianity and Judaism.

In 2 Thess. 2 it is a wicked religious, and not a mere secular power which is spoken of-its impious, then its seductive, character. Verse 4 is moral opposition and insult to God, rather than the object of deference, who was publicly on Satan's throne. It is the active personage, with Judas' title, who opposes all divine authority-the man of sin showing himself as though he were God; the contrast of Christ, who was God, and yet was the man of obedience. His presence too is according to the energy of Satan; and as Christ in truth of righteousness to such as should be saved, so he in deceit of unrighteousness to such as should be lost.

In Dan. 11:36, etc., is the king, and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, etc.; that is, we have the same qualities and acts, and yet he honors the God of forces, and honors and increases with joy a strange god. So that it would seem that the haughty rejection of the true God and self-exaltation is not inconsistent with being servant of a false one, really slave to the enemy-an old lesson learned all through human nature, and never learned. Self-exaltation is not supremacy. I apprehend, or am inclined to think, that this self-exaltation will be, specially in result,

in Judea against God; but my difficulty lies just there, because in Dan. 7 the little horn seeks to change times and laws (that is, I apprehend, the Jewish order), and this looks like the power of the Antichrist, while the little horn there is uncommonly like the first beast (that is, its last head). The difficulty is in apportioning the parts where both work together. The process seems natural, painful to say, the apostasy denying the Father and the Son, and that Jesus is the Christ. This throws them on Judaism (which was always the mystery of iniquity in principle), and thus on Antichrist, who at last throws off all in self-exaltation, and makes them, during the last half-week, worship a strange god, and the tribulation takes place. It seems to me that the deepest troubles in the Psalms (I do not speak of the cross) come from what has a Jewish character, not an open enemy, but a companion or familiar friend, ungodliness and strife in the city. The self-exaltation is moral character, not public power unless in his own sphere. This self-exaltation would be his own apostate setting up in Judea; but, finding it convenient for himself, and it being the work of Satan, he forces all to recognize the Roman Emperor, which for Jews is apostasy. It would be the old Josephus' question, save that saints who flee or bow take the place of sicarii. It is a kind of suzeraineté. This false Christ in the east making head in the interest of the western emperor against all, and deceiving the Jews by satanic power in the east, he wields all the power of the empire; he joins the recognition of the western emperor to the satanic deception of the Jews, his own people probably. The little horn of Dan. 7 certainly seems the more general power, which, while local (like Bonaparte, in France), governs the whole beast.

## On Haggai 2:5-9

---

To the Editor of The Investigator.

SIR,

I do not pretend to an adequate knowledge of Hebrew for a criticism dependent on the language. It appears to me, however, that interpreters have hindered their apprehension of the general force of the passage in Haggai, by confining themselves to the English translation, valuable as it may generally be. The passage does not apparently contemplate two houses at all, but negatives the idea very carefully. The spirit of the prophecy is contained in this: "According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not." The fact of two houses of course was before them; so it has been before us. God in the exercise of His love obliterates this idea (which we have rekindled), and will allow only of a different state of the same house, and that was one of far greater glory. "Who is left among you that saw this house (àÆúìäÇáÇì■éÄú äÇæÆì■ä äÄïëÀáÉâãÉ■å äËøÄàùÉÑ■ãï) in its former glory?" &c.

Then the Lord says (after the verse above quoted, stating His continuance with them), " Thus saith Jehovah; Yet it is a little while," &c., and He will shake all that whose apparent stability has been against the people of His love, and " I will fill this house with glory: great shall be the glory of this house, the latter than the former ": or, simply, " the latter glory of this house [looked at in its unity] shall be greater than the former."

Such seems the idea and the construction of the passage. I find the Septuagint follows it. The thought of God's mind seems to run through this construction, and to be borne upon the plain terms of the passage itself, and to be fully given by it only.

As to the other part of the passage I confess the difficulty. But it is clear to me, that it is much more abstract in intention than is generally supposed. It is not Christ shall become the desire of the Jews, nor merely the gold and silver after which the nations of the world should seek; but that that on which the heart of the Gentiles would be set should be not among them (to wit, the power and the glory), but in those that were broken and despised-God's house now among them, in its power attracting round itself all the honor and glory of the nations whose rebellious stability and consistency had been shaken to pieces.

You are aware probably of the view of Parkhurst; and that, if I remember rightly, some manuscripts insert the Cholem.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

J. N. D.

## Scriptural Criticisms

---

3.

I SEND you some additional verbal criticisms, of importance connected with truth, though comparatively insignificant in point of learning. Those who love the truth will not despise them.

It appears to me that while in general the authorized English translation is one of incomparable value, on the subject of the dispensation of the glory to come there are several passages which the translators have forced from their plain sense, in consequence of their not seeing or not believing in it, and therefore not seeing how it could be possible to take it in the sense the passages plainly represented—otherwise their pains are very remarkable.

Some of these passages I will notice. There is one very important passage, of some length, exceedingly obscured by a fear (I suppose) of popular mistake. The word translated "condemnation" in John 5:24, and in verse 29 "damnation," is the identical word rendered "judgment" in verses 22 and 27, and correctly so rendered. The word properly used for "condemnation" is different, as in Rom. 8:1:  $\chi\rho\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is the word in John,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha$  in Romans. A plain and beautiful passage is obscured by this effort to meet common thoughts, or by a fear of strange ones.

The statement of the passage is, that there are two things in which respectively the Son's glory is shown—quickening and judging. In the former, as a blessing, He exercises His power conjointly with the Father; in the latter, as the vindication of His honor against those that have despised it, He is alone, and executes it in the way in which He was despised. He judges as Son of man: but as to those who are quickened, there is no need of bringing them into crisis, for they through grace have honored the Son when the rest dishonored Him unrighteously; and it is just out of such crisis they are saved, as the subjects of the exercise of the Son's quickening power; but that all men should honor Him, judgment is committed entirely to Him whom they dishonored, securing His honor as the Father's.

These then are the two great instruments by which honor is brought and secured to the Son—quickening power, and crisis. They therefore that are quickened do not come into crisis; they have passed from death into life. How are they known? They hear Christ's word, and believe God the Father who sent Him: thus we know that they have eternal life, and shall not come into crisis at all. Before the  $\beta\mu\alpha$  of Christ they may stand to have righteous appointment before Him; but into crisis they do not come. This is the statement of 2 Cor. 5 to: "We must all appear before the  $\beta\mu\alpha$  of Christ, to receive the things done in the body, good or evil." This then is the positive assertion of the Lord, that the quickened shall not come into crisis, but have everlasting life. The same is the result of resurrection, when this truth is disclosed. They that are in their graves shall come forth at the power of the same voice: they that have done good to the resurrection of life, of which they have been made partakers; not to crisis; and they that have done evil to the resurrection of judgment, a distinct thing, which is the result of the exercise of Christ's voice on an unquickened

soul, and in which none at all can stand, as in Psa. 142 (LXX), μὴ εἰσέλθῃς κρῖν Enter not into judgment with thy servant. (Hebrews and Eng. Psa. 143) Thus the resurrection of life is the filling up the quickening power of Christ as to this mortal body, mortality being swallowed up of life: the resurrection of judgment is to crisis, that is, for the wicked only, for none can stand in it.

The connection of this with present blessing is manifest; the beautiful connection with the exhibition of the power of Christ is made most plain. The change of the word destroys the consequence and connection of the passage. We cease to have the double exhibition of the power of Christ in its pursued effects, and we lose the present peace which results from knowing (conformed to our complete justification in Him who is Himself the judge) that we shall not come into crisis-into question of judgment as to our reception at all. How indeed should Christ do it, save as despising His own sacrifice and righteousness, when it is before Him we stand? Our resurrection is a resurrection of life, whatever our responsibility, which 2 Cor. 5 maintains complete in its place.

To turn to another passage (1 Cor. 11:29, et seq.), where this word is misused: " He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." The apostle is speaking of Christians fallen under chastenings of sickness, or even temporal death-sleeping (the common christian word for a believer's death), because of evils into which they had fallen; and tells them they are but eating and drinking judgment to themselves; but that, when they were judged, they were chastened of the Lord, that they should not be condemned with the world. They were Christians, and therefore chastening judgment came upon them here, that they should not be condemned along with the world. But if, says the apostle, we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged of the Lord.

The first word " judge " is here again a different one, διακρίνει, discern oneself. If by the cherished use of the presence of the Lord with our souls, by the Holy Ghost, we discerned the springs of evil or circumstances of evil therein, which were the occasions of what called forth the chastening, we should not come under it. Examine yourselves-and how? By the light of the presence of the Spirit of God; and hence the importance of keeping it undimmed, ungrieved in the soul, and exercising oneself by examining watchfulness so as not to lose it: otherwise the very power of discernment is gone comparatively, by which the evil is discerned; we become blind, and cannot see afar off. The good Shepherd may restore us, and does, for His name's sake; but it is by chastening, and possibly sorrowful evil. Our wisdom is the spirituality by which evil is seen in its springs, not in its effects; and the watching ourselves in this, so as that unconsciously the power of discernment be not weakened by losing the sense of the very evil which calls for it, and the remedy be the sorrowful but still loving stroke of the Lord's hand. " Make the heart of this people fat " is the worst sorrow of judgment; but any measure of it in us is a grievous evil. May we, by thus discerning ourselves, be kept or made very bright and joyful in spirit, of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord; our estimate of holiness high; because our communion, and consequently understanding, is bright, even with Him who makes us partakers of His holiness!

Another passage I will now refer to (Acts 3:19): " Repent, and be converted, so that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Read, " so that [πῶς] the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord." The mission of Jesus, whom they had lost as a nation, would be on their repentance. It is not here, " Repent and

be baptized every one of you," and individual matter of salvation, as in the former sermon; but an address to the assembly of the Jews, explaining the position in which they stood by the rejection of Jesus; but that even so, upon their repentance, Jesus would be sent to them again; and on their repentance and conversion the times of refreshing would come from the presence of the Lord: **■πως ■ν ■λθωσι**, the only sense of which is " so that they may come." The sermon is a Jewish sermon to them as Jews. It states, verse 18, the sufferings; verse 21, restitution of all things; Jesus in heaven till then; and on their repentance the seasons of refreshing to come. I would also remark that " raise up," verse 26, refers, I apprehend, not to resurrection, but to the same words " raise up," verse 22, stating that what the prophet promised was indeed raised up in the person of God's Son Jesus; the " sent him to bless you," was on His mission from the Father, but it was not done on repentance now, for He would send Him, now fore-preached, in the times of refreshing which would be on their repentance. The **προκεκηρυγμ■νον** answers to the **προηλπικ■τας** of Eph. 1:12. The alteration **προκεχειρισμ■νον**, as to the matter, comes to the same sense, though it is of stronger reproach to the Jews as actually manifested and produced to them. But the whole passage is completely a Jewish sermon. " To you first "-" ye are the children of the prophets." The translators (I suppose) could not see the national repentance, or the dealing of the Lord with the Jews still, as a nation; and the passage is quite changed into rather unintelligible Gentile theology.

We have a similar instance in Rom. 1:31: " Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also might obtain mercy." This is asserting that the Jews as a nation are to obtain mercy by the Gentiles' mercy. So, doubtless, the translators thought; but it is a mistranslation, **ο■τω κα■ ο■τοι ν■ν ■πε■θησαν, τ■ ■μετ■ρ■ ■λ■ει ■να κα■ α'υτο■ ■λεηθ■σι**: " These have now disbelieved in the mercy to you Gentiles, that they also might be brought upon terms of mercy." Promises had belonged to the Jews; but they forbade to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins always, so that wrath is come upon them to the uttermost. Thus, like mere sinners of the Gentiles, it was a matter, though true to Himself, of sovereign mercy to bring in the Jews: fulfillment of promises they had rejected in Him, who was a minister of circumcision to confirm them. God concluded all in unbelief: the Gentiles naturally, the Jews now in the wisdom of dispensation, that both might come in on like terms of mercy, as the Jews surely shall in the latter day.

There is another passage which sometimes perplexes people with deep inquiries, which (I believe) take their rise merely from obscurity of expression.

In Rev. 22:9 we have, " For I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book; worship God." And again, chapter 19: to, " I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus." Now this is commonly taken as if the angel had the testimony of Jesus, and was himself as one of the prophets. But it appears to me the rendering is simply this: **σ■νδουλ■ς σο■ ε■μι κα■ τ■ν ■δελφ■ν σου τ■ν ■χ■ντων**, " I am but a fellow-servant of thee, and of thy brethren the prophets "; thee and the prophets being in apposition, not the angel and the prophets: in the other, " of thy brethren which have the testimony of Jesus," which makes the passage very simple.

I would repeat here what has been noticed elsewhere, which makes an obscure passage very easy: " The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former." (Hag. 2:9.) This should be, I apprehend, " The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former "; and this

is not yet properly fulfilled. If we refer to verse 3, we shall see at once how " this house " is used as to both its states. The house is looked at as one thing-it is Jehovah's house, the temple, in different states; of which her first glory is one; and then " how do ye see it now? " The unity of the house in all its states makes the sentence very plain. Many of these passages may seem very simple; but it must be remarked that one passage, where the mind is subject to scripture, will arrest it in all its course; and thus all its principles will be more or less affected: and thus it becomes of great importance to free the mind from its difficulty.

There is a slight correction in 1 Peter 1:11, which makes it more strong and clear: the sufferings; the glories after these, μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας. It enlarges the scope of the abounding glories of Christ to come, not His present glory merely at the right hand of the Father.

## The Sermon on the Mount

---

The multitudes were present, but the discourse was addressed to His disciples. This, chapter 5: 4 clearly shows. If Luke 7:1 be compared, the facts appear pretty clearly. There it is said, " Now, when he had ended all his sayings in the audience of the people." The moral bearing of the fact is more important. The sermon on the mount characterizes the Lord's teaching in Israel, as introducing His doctrines. At the close of His ministry He has to denounce their rejection of it. Hence, here, as has been remarked, He begins with blessings, and in chapter 23 closes with woes. It will be observed that in the close of the preceding chapter, the power displayed in His ministry, and its effect in attracting the people from all quarters, had been stated. He preached the good news of the kingdom. In the sermon on the mount, He lays down its principles, describes the character of those who would enjoy its privileges, and gives positive directions for the government of their conduct. Meanwhile He was in the way with Israel, judgment awaiting them, if they did not agree quickly on the way. Hence, also, moral principles and precepts, not redemption, are the subject of the discourse. If this be understood, it is easy to perceive why the direct application of the discourse is to those who had received His word, and were entering into the kingdom, though as laying down the principles of the kingdom announced to all, all-at least those who had ears to hear-among the multitude were concerned in its contents. It may be remarked that in Luke the disciples are more formally distinguished-" Blessed are ye poor, for yours," etc., and hence woes are added. Just as in Matt. 3:7 the Pharisees and Sadducees are denounced, in Luke 3:7 the whole multitude. While this address was continued to Israel by Him who had the ministry of the circumcision for the truth of God- in a word, until Jesus was rejected-men were under trial, and, though God knew all things, were not treated as finally rejected; but the death of Christ, and we may add, the resisting of the testimony of the Holy Ghost, has closed the history of that trial, and the fig-tree is judged forever to be fruitless and unprofitable. It did not then become so, but was proved to be so; and in Israel this was proved of every child of Adam, so that a new creation, connected with the Second Adam, risen and glorified, was needed. Hence we know fully the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost

## The Church of Christ

---

I would re-state what I have said once before in the " Present Testimony," and used in testimony, that the difference between the Church of Christ in Matt. 16 and the Church of God elsewhere is correlative. The Church of God would have Christ for its rock: God founds it on Christ. Christ does not found His Church on Himself, or the confession of Himself, but on the Father's action-as by the revelation made to Peter. Those constitute Christ's Church who are given Him of the Father- out of the kingdom of the Son shall be taken all those that offend and work iniquity, and the rest shine forth in the kingdom of His Father.

## Washed, Sanctified

---

1 Cor. 6

Washing naturally applies to some one or thing that is to be cleansed. Our state may show that nothing but death to sin can cleanse us from sin; but the water points to cleansing. So it is said "in John 15, already " ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you."

" Regeneration," means passing from one state, that of ruin, into another and new state of things, and is used only in Matt. 19, besides Titus 3. " Born again," " born of water and the Spirit," is the actual communication of divine life. One is thus born of God. This is life. Regeneration supposes death, and is so de facto, though this can only be by life in Christ. But it supposes, when fully brought to light, an entrance into a new state, of which resurrection is the expression-life out of death, and hence leaves sin and an evil nature behind. Of this baptism is the sign. So we are baptized unto Christ's death, that we should walk in newness of life. Nor is it merely that we have got life from or through Christ, but are quickened together with Him. This of course implies death-the putting away, but judgment, of the old man.

" Sanctified," though it includes this, yet contains somewhat more. We are sanctified to, and not merely washed from. No doubt by this last we are cleansed; but an object is given to which I am attached by grace and so sanctified. A creature practically and morally is what its object is. " That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word " is not quite correct. It is **■γ■σ■ καθαρ■σας**-that Christ might sanctify the Church, having purified or cleansed it, etc. They go together; but the cleansing, though a positive thing from evil, is connected with the sanctifying or consecrating the affections to God. In sanctification there are holy affections; and these clearly exclude evil ones. But there are these two things, though they cannot be separated.

The word is in every respect the instrument. The washing of regeneration is typified by the flood, as Peter shows. The old world was then cleared away, and a new one begun. So it is for the baptized.

## Mark 11:24

---

Mark 11:24 gives the principle on which we are to pray in all cases. Had the disciples asked God then, and we Christ in His lordship and power, or the Father now, all prayer should be with faith. Praying in the Holy Ghost is now connected, in our present state, with Christ's words abiding in us, though there be the distinct element of the energy of the Holy Ghost in us, not merely the words of Christ forming our desires and mind. But, then, as a general principle, the Holy Ghost will, if our hearts be right, keep these words in our mind.

## Preface to the German Testament

---

In order to enable the reader to use this new translation with full profit, it is necessary to notice the end we have proposed in it, the means employed in reaching that end, and some other particulars.

To publish a new translation is to declare oneself dissatisfied with existing ones. We are far from wishing to seek out and uncharitably to judge the defects of the work of others, but the repeated citations from the pulpit of the original of various passages, the improvements on the Lutheran translation, and finally the various new versions which have appeared of late years, prove most clearly the need of our times.

When God at the beginning of the sixteenth century caused His light to break forth on a world deeply sunk in darkness, Martin Luther was the instrument specially chosen by Him to spread the truth in Germany. Thus laborer, full of faith, occupied himself principally with the work with which God had entrusted him. To gain this object he used the Bible, which he himself translated for this end. Others followed him in this, in various lands, some of whom were even compelled to forfeit their lives in attaining the object of their holy zeal. Far be it from us to despise the toil and labor of love of these blessed instruments in the Lord's hand! Surely God Himself has not despised them, and many lands have enjoyed for these three centuries the fruit of their labors. But the requirements of our day are new. While the energy of the Holy Ghost three centuries ago was directed to laying bare the foundations of truth, hitherto buried under a countless multitude of human institutions and traditions, and Luther's translation was blessed as a valuable instrument in this work, the Spirit is active at the present time in meeting other wants. In our days men go farther than formerly. Everything is sought into; the scriptures are searched: and who will blame this? Men desire to understand (not only some truths such as are indispensably necessary for salvation, but) the whole truth, and therefore the mind and will of God in so far as His counsels and revelations with regard to the world and with regard to the Church are concerned.

The Holy Ghost Himself calls our attention to the necessity of understanding the divine will as a means of safety in the last days; and regard for the holy scriptures is in these days a proof that God is honored. The efforts of the enemy also are chiefly directed against His word. Now whilst the learned can examine the original text, this privilege is out of the reach of the unlearned, and of those unacquainted with that text. It has therefore been our endeavor and object to give a helping hand to the latter class, and to furnish them at a small cost with as faithful and exact a representation as possible of the divine word in their own language. Undoubtedly every translation must be more or less defective, and we by no means value our work so highly as that we would set aside one more perfectly executed by another hand. How great the difficulties are of conveying the expressions of one language, especially of the rich Greek, in another, those alone can tell who have tried to make a translation. We can nevertheless maintain with good conscience, that we have devoted the utmost care to the work of presenting the word of God as faithfully as possible, and we therefore cherish the hope that even the most unpracticed reader will find our translation simple and comprehensive. We might indeed have clothed many passages in more elegant

German, but, without being in bondage to words, we have been governed throughout by the thought that the faithful rendering of the original text outweighs every other consideration; and the more so because we believe with the very fullest conviction the divine inspiration of the holy scriptures as the revelation of the infinite wisdom of God, and the expression of His gracious character in Jesus Christ. But since no one is able to grasp the whole expanse of this revelation, and often a meaning beyond the comprehension of the translator lies hidden in a sentence, which would be lost in a free translation but may be found in a more literal one, through deeper teaching of the Holy Spirit-it is evidently necessary to reproduce the original text as in a mirror. Yet of course the limits of this literalness or exactitude must not be drawn so close as to render the sentence translated into another language altogether incomprehensible, and to remain consequently destitute of meaning.

Another ground for making the translation as literal as possible was the conviction that it would not be without profit to a reader unacquainted with the original to learn something of the style, the customs, the thoughts and the manners of the writers of the Gospels. For since the heart, as well as the mind, finds food in the word of God, the forms of expression chosen by the writers are not without importance; and by changing them, even if the meaning of the sentence remains unchanged, the sensibilities of the heart's feelings may often be lost. Above all we have been throughout influenced by the deep sense that it was the word of God which occupied us, and we have therefore striven to accomplish our work as intelligibly, and at the same time as literally, as was at all possible, submitting it to the judgment of thoughtful critics.

To this end we translated directly from the original; but we also made use of the translations of Luther, De Wette, Von de Heydt, and also of Meyer's emendation of the Lutheran translation; besides these, the generally very literal Berleburg, the Dutch and English translations, which two latter are both very exact and excellent, and finally the Polyglot Bible of Stier, which, besides the above mentioned German translations, contains several others. We make no pretensions to publishing a critical edition of the word, but we wished to afford to the reader unacquainted with the Greek language the opportunity of enjoying the fruit of the labors of the learned. A few words on the history of the text will better explain what we have attempted to this end.

Till the end of the fifteenth century, when printing was invented, the holy scriptures, like all other books, were to be found only in manuscript. We owe the first printed Bible to Cardinal Ximenes. This was a great work, compiled from manuscripts in Spain, which was called (after Complutum, the Latin name of the place, Alcala, where it was completed) Complutensian. It is also said that some manuscripts were sent from Rome, but this is, on the other hand, denied; so that we do not know with certainty from what sources the scholars, employed at the expense of the Cardinal, drew. These manuscripts were long lost, and are only recendy asserted to have been discovered at Madrid. This edition is also accused of having too closely followed the Vulgate, that is, the Latin translation; but the learned, to whom alone that work is suited, are not agreed upon this. Although this costly and learned work was the first that was printed, a smaller one, as to the New Testament, was published two years previously by Erasmus, but since manuscripts were not so accessible at that time as in our days, he could only make use of a few and imperfect ones-indeed, for the Revelation, of only a single bad manuscript, in which besides a part was wanting at the end; so that to complete his work, notwithstanding, he was compelled to supply what was wanting by translating the Vulgate into Greek.

In the middle of the sixteenth century R. Stephens published an edition in Paris, which he had prepared by comparing thirteen manuscripts discovered in the Royal French Library, and also another which was examined by his son Henry; the latter belonged at that time to Beza, but is now preserved at Cambridge. Later in the sixteenth century Beza himself published five editions of the New Testament, accompanied by a translation of the same. Most of the European translations have therefore been made from one or other of these earlier editions. An edition of the original text of the New Testament appeared some time after in Holland, which differed little from that of Stephens, although it was entitled, with hardihood enough, " *Textus ab omnibus receptus* " (the universally received text), by which it is still known.

Afterward Mill (a learned Englishman) had many manuscripts in various places examined, and without altering the *Textus Receptus*, placed the reading which was in his opinion the most exact, below the text.

The pious and learned Bengel, in Germany, endeavored to obtain a more exact text by a deep study of manuscripts, etc., and was the first, so far as we know, to turn his attention to the classes (commonly called families) into which they may be divided. We must not here go farther into particulars on this subject, but only make the general remark that two main classes of Greek manuscripts, the so-called Alexandrian and the Constantinopolitan, are the commonest. To the first class belong almost all the oldest manuscripts; to the latter by far the greater number, which, with few exceptions, were written later.

Then followed Wetstein in Holland, who also left the *Textus Receptus* unchanged, and placed the readings he preferred below the text, but examined many more manuscripts, and added observations which, if on the one hand often unworthy of credit, are on the other very useful, because they contain passages quoted from Greek, Latin, and Jewish writers to illustrate the use of words and expressions found in the text. We may, however, here pass over some more or less important editions which are quite beside our object, and notice the labors of Griesbach, who prosecuted with great industry the examination begun by Mill and Wetstein, of several valuable manuscripts, and also examined others, carefully collating them so as to obtain the text as exactly as possible. Without speaking further of Birch, a Danish scholar, who made rich collections of a similar kind, and especially collated the Vatican manuscript in Rome, from which also Bentley, an English critic, had obtained readings; or of Matthaci, who compared the Russian manuscripts and published an edition founded upon them; or again of Alter, who collated and published the most excellent manuscripts in the imperial library of Vienna; or finally of many other less known editions in Germany and England; we will also mention the work of Scholz in Bonn, who greatly increased the number of manuscripts examined; and further, those of Teschendorf and Lachmann, who continued these investigations. To these researches we owe it that, instead of those thirteen manuscripts, some of which are not quite to be trusted, for their authenticity has not been established, we have now about six hundred of the whole or parts of the New Testament, which have been more or less compared, in order to correct the errors which have crept in through frequent copying.

In order to give the unlearned reader a further view of the available sources of information, we may add that the New Testament has been translated ever since the first centuries. We may name the Syriac, and the Latin translation, probably made in the second century; but the latter, corrected in

the fifth century by Jerome, has thenceforth been known by the name of the Vulgate, and has always been used by the Roman Catholics. To these means of assistance must be added the numerous quotations from the sacred books which occur in writers after the death of the apostles, in one of them before the death of John, as they furnish us with more or less exactitude as to the readings of scripture in their time.

The above named editors of the New Testament have also made diligent use of these means in order to ascertain the text as exactly and perfectly as possible, and it is remarkable that, except a few passages which remain uncertain, in spite of the different systems and theories existing with regard to the manuscripts, they are agreed in almost all material alterations. The providence of God has, notwithstanding the weakness of man, watched over His word, so that while few manuscripts even of the most celebrated and widely read classics could be found (as for example only about six of Virgil), of the New Testament (little read by and unknown to the world) we have already become possessed of about six hundred codices. And even the fact that these manuscripts, preserved in convents and public libraries, have remained unused, has been the means of their coming the more safely and unaltered into our hands. Thanks be to God! The worst and most carelessly written manuscript contains the whole truth, and all that is necessary unalloyed, and the errors that have crept in through copying are almost all set aside by the comparison of so great a number. Besides these evident and apparent mistakes, others have arisen from words, introduced as marginal notes'(in order to make certain passages of the text more easily understood by a clearer expression), becoming by degrees incorporated in the text. Some of the manuscripts are from 1,200 to 1,300 years old.

Griesbach, before mentioned, not only carried his researches farther than his predecessors, but also introduced an important change in their plan, by adopting as his own the text he had by careful examination proved to be the original, instead of the one they had formed from a few manuscripts of uncertain worth, yet showing the changes by smaller type, and adding the readings which he rejected beneath the text. Most editors have since followed this plan, inasmuch as they edited the text which according to their opinion was the most exact.

We could see no reason for giving the reader the translation of an imperfect text, founded on but slightly known manuscripts, instead of that which careful toil and research has made as exact as possible, and which is, therefore, nearest to perfection. As before remarked, we could not undertake a critical edition, but we did as follows:-

Where learned men, after the comparison of many manuscripts, and the use of all other means at hand which could aid them to attain to an exact text, were agreed upon a reading, we have followed them; and we greatly rejoice to say that, with the exception of a few passages, they are agreed as to the reading in all important cases. We have also given the rejected readings, that is, the translation of the imperfect text (Textus Receptus) which former translators made use of for want of a better, at the end of the book, indicated by the letters T.R. The unlearned reader need not pay attention to these notes, as we have not added them as marking something uncertain or doubtful, but in order to meet the objection that we had arbitrarily or from carelessness altered this or that passage. Only where the editors are not agreed upon a change in the reading, have we translated according to the Textus Receptus. When, also, the reader finds the note preceded by the word " Or," it is to be understood that the words or sentences in question admit of another

translation. In the same way, when it is said in the note, " Literally," it is to be understood that a literal translation of the text would be too obscure in meaning, and we have therefore preferred to append it as a note, because there nevertheless is often a hidden power concealed in the literal expression. Finally, the smaller letters show the words added which are not found in the text, but which were necessary to make the sentence comprehensible in the German language.

Since we have begun to speak of particulars, we will, besides explaining some points, add a little which may be helpful to the reader in his use of our work.

We have already remarked that where it appeared to us admissible, we have left the style peculiar to each of the several inspired writers unaltered, in accordance with our principle of translating the written word as faithfully as possible. We have always, where the reader could not fail to understand, retained the sentence in its primitive form as we found it in the original text, and only where an imitation of this form would occasion ambiguities have we admitted a change, so as to give the sense to the best of our ability. Thus, for example, we find in Luke, in several places, the word " and " where we, in order to be understood, must translate it by " that." (See Luke 2:15, 5:1, 16; 9:28; 14:1.) Where a form of speech indicates the customs of the East, we have not sought to accommodate it to those of the West; because by a true picture of the former all the circumstances there mentioned are placed more distinctly before the eye of the reader's mind.

We also believe that the representation of manners and customs, in their original character (as for example, " To lie at table," instead of " To sit at table "), not only often pictures the whole scene more vividly before us, but also, even though at first sight it seems most strange, is calculated to place many passages in a clearer light. Thus, for example, the expression " To lie at table," given literally, explains how Lazarus lay in Abraham's bosom, and John in the bosom of the Lord; and other similar examples may be discovered without much trouble.

Some words require a more ample explanation. Mark 14:72 we translate, " When he thought thereon he wept." But the opinion of many, as to the meaning of the words rendered " as he, thought thereon," is very divided, some translating it by " he went suddenly out "; others, " he covered his face "; others, " sore," " much "; others, " he began "; others, " looking at [Jesus]," " beholding [Jesus]." As the literal sense is " he cast on," some have said, adding an object, " he cast a glance on him," or, " he cast his mantle over his head "; while others again seek an idiomatic use of the word, as, for example, " he began."

In the Acts of the Apostles we find the word " way " employed in a special sense (Acts 19:9; 24:22). We have not, however, felt induced, in any way, to paraphrase this expression, as the reader will soon perceive that it was at that time employed in a similar manner to that in which the word " pietist " now is to designate Christians.

But to justify the translation of some passages, on account of the peculiarity of the evangelist Luke's style, and also to explain a passage which is difficult for many to understand, we call attention to the fact that Luke not infrequently employs the third person plural of an active instead of a passive verb, and that even where there is no question of action. We may here adduce several passages in proof of this. Luke 6:38, we read, " They will give," and in the same verse, " They will measure," which is equivalent to " It will be given," " It will be measured," and might here, though not in all cases, be as suitably expressed by " Men will give." The passage (ver. 44), " Figs

are not gathered from thorns," or " Men do not gather figs from thorns," is in the Greek " They do not gather," etc. Chapter 14:35, " They cast it out," means only " It is cast out," or " Men cast it out." Chapter 12: 20, is, " To-night they require thy soul of thee." Here it would not do to say, " Men will require thy soul of thee," but, " It will be required." See also chapter 21:16; and Acts 27:42. These two last examples are indeed not so distinct; but, supported by the many others, we have ventured to translate Luke 16:9 by " That ye may be received "; and this remark explains the reason why we have thus rendered δξωνται.

As to the Lord's prayer, its long use amongst Christians hardly permits any change in it without thereby giving offense. Although it certainly cannot be doubted that some sentences are wanting in Luke, we have, according to our rule, altered nothing where the learned critics are not agreed. We content ourselves with giving in this place the reading of Luke, which, in our opinion, is to be preferred:-" Father, hallowed be thy name; let thy kingdom come; give us to-day our bread till (or, for) to-morrow; and forgive us our sins for we also forgive every one who is indebted to us; and lead us not into temptation."

" The word πλιοσιο, however, calls for a remark here. It will be found rendered, ' his zum Morgen,' or, far Morgen ' (until the morrow, or, for the morrow), and appended as a note: as we find the kindred word πλιοσα (hemera) in Acts 7:26; 20:15; 21:18; 23:11, and rendered ' on the day following.' Whereas, however, the word ' To-day,' may be considered as extending until the day following, we have retained the word ' daily.' "

I add it in a note only, because the second edition is not at hand to consult also.-Ed. P. T. It can hardly be doubted however that this is an inadequate explanation of a term which only occurs in the prayer, Matt. 6 and Luke 11. Far more probably it was coined by contrast with περισιο;, " superfluous," and so means what is actually needed, or necessary, not over and above need. The Syriac thus understood, and the context perfectly agrees; whereas the notion of " tomorrow's " is incongruous if not directly inconsistent. And such is the author's conclusion in his French and English versions; and so it will probably, as it ought to, be found in the latest German.-Ed.]

It will in some measure appear strange to the reader not to find in the Revelation the rejected readings given below as notes, as is the case in the other books. Among other existing causes there were two which introduced a great number of errors into former editions of this book. The first was that the text, as printed by Erasmus, was from a damaged manuscript, in which even, as has been already remarked, part of the end was wanting, and had to be retranslated from the Latin, whereas we are now able to collate ninety-three manuscripts of this book, three of which are very old. A second cause is the extreme irregularity of the grammatical construction of the Revelation, which in a great measure is occasioned by the nature of the book, because the author, guided by divine inspiration and occupied with the object which was " in vision " before his eyes, writes without paying so much attention to the grammatical connection of the sentences he writes. Thus, for example, if he sees a person in his " vision," the verb or participle stands in grammatical connection with the object seen, and not with the preceding substantive. The grammarians who sought to correct these expressions have only introduced confusion into the text; and as soon as the result of these efforts of human wisdom could be set aside by the collation of manuscripts, all these corrections were unanimously rejected. It therefore appeared to us a superfluous labor to add them as notes, because the book was at first printed from a manuscript containing all these

corrections, so that the true text must necessarily appear as a re-correction. In general they have nothing to do with the sense of the passage, and often do not appear in a translation.

We may also remark that in the Revelation, the word "to give" (διδωμι) is used in a peculiar manner, and signifies " To give power, strength," or, " To render valid ι' (chap. 8:3; 11:3). In other passages we might, perhaps, have given the preference to a reading with respect to which the editors are not agreed. But here also we have followed our rule, and have altered nothing, where there was not unanimity amongst the principal critics.

We now introduce a remark for those who understand Greek. It is that we are not content with the translation of the expression in Heb. 9:1, " a worldly sanctuary," because " sanctuary," ἱερον, according to the order of the sentence, ought to be an adjective. There are, it is true, some few examples of this unusual order, as ζωον αωνις, if this reading is indeed correct, and there is no ground for using κοσμικος as an adjective. We have not, however, altered the usual translation; for if this were done, the Greek word denotes a " universal holy order."

An almost insuperable difficulty presented itself in the preposition εως in connection with " baptism," because the German language has no word which in all cases corresponds to the Greek. The Jews were baptized εως Moses (1 Cor. 10:2). The apostle asks, Acts 19:3, " To what were ye baptized? " (Wotzu). They answer, " To the baptism of John " (zu); an answer which in German is entirely without euphony. In connection with the name of Jesus, some translate the Greek εως by " unto " (auf), others, by " in " (in) (" unto the name of Jesus," or, " in the name of Jesus "). In Rom. 6:3, 4, the apostle says, " we are baptized εως Christ Jesus... εως death," and thus, " buried by baptism εως death." If one be translated " baptized into (in) Christ," it must also be said, contrary to the object of this act, " baptized into (in) Moses "; and a similar difficulty would be presented by the expression, " to (an) Christ," for it must then be contrary to all usage of language, " to (an) death." For the translator it is not, however, a question of the doctrine of baptism, but of the most exact translation possible, which is exceedingly difficult to be arrived at, because, as before stated, the German language has no corresponding word for the Greek εως. This word, denoting a direction, can, when used of place, be translated without difficulty; as, for example, " I go to Rome " (nach). When, however, it relates to a moral object to be reached, or to a person or a thing to which one would attach oneself, the difficulty cannot be overcome by the translator in a satisfactory manner. This question of the apostle (Acts 19) clearly and distinctly expresses the meaning of the word. " To what " (wotzu), says he, " were ye baptized? " How shall we answer? A word perfectly suitable in every respect is wanting, which would express to our satisfaction the purpose, viz., the direction, or the attachment to some person or doctrine, which is intended, be it to Moses or Christ, to the doctrine of John or to death. We are therefore, like several other translators, compelled to answer the question with auf or " unto," however little the choice may satisfy us.

The expression, " second first sabbath " (Luke 6:1), at first sight presents some difficulty, which, however, disappears upon a closer attention to Jewish customs. The year, as regards the worship of God amongst the Jews, began with the month Abib (Hebrews "green corn"), which lasted from the middle of March to the middle of April. In Lev. 23, in which we find the Jewish feasts described, we may observe that in addition to the general and weekly recurring feasts of the sabbath, the chief feasts begin with the passover (the 14th of Abib), and that, in immediate connection with it, it

was ordained that on the day after the following sabbath the first-fruits of the corn should be offered in the ear, a foreshadowing of the resurrection of Jesus which took place on the morrow after the sabbath of the passover week, or feast of unleavened bread. The sabbath immediately following the passover was therefore the " first " or great sabbath, and after the offering of the first-fruits on the morrow after the sabbath, the first day of the week, the harvest might be commenced, and the new corn eaten, which was not permitted before, even though corn stood ripe in the fields. On the following sabbath, the " second " after the " first" or great sabbath, we see that the disciples ate ears of corn on the way, for the offering of the first-fruits had already taken place on the first day of the week; and, as seven weeks or sabbaths were counted from this day to the feast of Pentecost, it was therefore the " first" of these seven sabbaths, or the " second " with reference to the great sabbath of the Passover. By these explanations we have, we think, justified the expression, "second first sabbath," and removed any difficulty to the reader's understanding.

We pass on to some other remarks. The word δαίμωνιον, universally rendered " devil " where we read that Christ cast out " devils," is different from that used in speaking of the devil, διabolος (Satan). The word " devil " means slanderer or evil accuser; therefore the great accuser of the brethren, who is also an evil spirit, is called " the devil." " The devils " (δαίμονια) are, however, connected with Satan or Beelzebub (Matt. 12:22-27; Mark 3:22-26). The word δαίμονια was employed by the heathen for certain intermediate spirits whom they regarded in a good sense as powerful ruling spirits affording protection to a nation or an individual. Scripture teaches us (Deut. 32:17; 1 Cor. 10:20) that the gods of the heathen were of these evil spirits. And as such Beelzebub, the god of the Philistines and of other Gentiles related to this tribe, is known to us. As we, however, could find no word in German corresponding to δαίμωνιον in Greek, we were compelled, like others, to translate it by " devil " (Teufel) in German, which is rather the equivalent of διabolος in Greek.

The somewhat strangely sounding expression used by us, " The Christ," instead of " Christ," has been purposely chosen, in order to mark the distinction between the office and the name of the Lord. " Christ" has become in the parlance of the present day a simple name; in earlier days this was not the case. " Christ " (Greek), or " Messiah " (Hebrew), means " the Anointed," who, according to the promise of God, was expected. This word therefore expresses more than merely the name of a person, although this use of it had already appeared at the time the scriptures of the New Testament were written; and since, in our opinion, the designation of the office and the name should not be confounded, in order to retain the force of the word, we have written " Christ " when it is used as a proper name, and " the Christ," when it designates the office of the Messiah, the Anointed. In the Greek, the article ■ marks the distinction.

We have, in like manner, often used the word " law " without an article, or added one in small type. The distinction is very important, because the expression, " the law," always suggests to the mind the law of Moses. The apostle, however, often speaks of law as a general principle, and not of the law of Moses, and then we have used " law " without an article, or added one in small type.

The reader will further find-that we have translated " nations " (nationen) instead of " heathen " (Heiden), and for this reason, that the latter designation, used in our days as the term for unconverted idolaters, is not always its representative. Undoubtedly, in former times, all not Jews were idolaters; for men had turned away from God. The grace which has visited the nations has,

however, changed all; and although, in contrast to the Jews, they have not ceased to be "nations," they are now no longer "heathen." This is the reason why we chose "nations" as a general designation, although this word is an imported one. We could not say "peoples" (völker), because the Jews were "the people" (volk). In the passages in which τὰ ἔθνη signifies a class and not the peoples, we have translated the word by the expression "those of the nations."

The application of the foreign word "hades" will be thought no less striking. The cause of our choice is here important enough. That is, Luther has translated two words by "hell" (hölle), although their meaning is altogether and entirely distinct; one expression being employed for the place of future torment prepared for the devil and his angels; the other in general for the unseen or invisible world of spirits, upon which till the coming of Christ darkness and obscurity rested, as we may see in the Old Testament, where this word is "sheol." De Wette has employed the rather heathenish designation "lower world" (unterwelt). But as we find the same word applied to Christ who went into paradise, we have preferred to retain the Greek word itself, "hades," that it might not be confounded with "hell" (γέεννα) which is the place of eternal torment. In "hades" there may be joy as well as torment. The rich man and Lazarus were both in hades. In hell there is only torment.

We must consider more at length the word ἐκκλησία, usually rendered "congregation or church" but by us "assembly." Though we might in general be indifferent about this expression, we dare not be so ever about a false rendering of the word of God. The Greek word ἐκκλησία means "assembly"; and especially denotes an assembly of those who in the Greek states, as also in some modern republics, had the rights of citizenship in contradistinction to those inhabitants who had them not, and who bore the not easily translated name πῤροικος, which we have rendered "foreigner" or "without citizenship." We have not translated ἐκκλησία by "congregation" (gemeine), because this designation does not represent the true meaning of the word in its original character. In order therefore to obviate any embarrassment of understanding, we have translated it by "assembly"; and the reader will find it used unmistakably in this sense in Acts 19:41, where we read, "The town clerk dismissed the assembly." We felt ourselves compelled, in order not to weaken its true force, to use the same term in every case. It is therefore used for every kind of assembly, whether of the children of Israel in the wilderness, or of the tumultuous persons rushing into the theater, or for the "lawful assembly" at Ephesus (Acts 19); both for the general assembly of Christians in heaven, and for the so-called church-congregation (gemeine) on earth, whether it be the assembly in a place or in a private house. Thus scripture has applied the word, commonly used to denote the gatherings of the citizens, to the assembly of God.

We now turn our attention to the word "repentance" (busse-penance), an expression which, though we have adopted it, does not suffice, because it has too much of an external character, and denotes a work-doing (werke-thun). "Conversion" (bekehrung) was proposed as a suitable rendering; but, although several translators have adopted it, we have not followed them, because conversion is not the signification of the word μετάνοια. In Jer. 31:19 we read, "After I was converted (turned), I repented." Μετάνοια is the moral judgment of the soul upon all the past, upon all that it is as in the flesh before God. Others have preferred "change of mind," and have certainly approached somewhat nearer to the real meaning. But since in this designation the judgment of the soul with respect to the past is wanting, we felt ourselves obliged to retain the word "repentance" (busse). We make no further objection if anyone prefer "change of mind,"

because this meaning is included in μετνοια, although it does not, as we have said, express the judgment of the soul.

In Mark 2:26, and 12:26, we find the expressions " in Abiathar " and " in the bush "; the former expression has frequently been translated by others, " in [the time of] Abiathar." In this passage π may indeed be translated by the addition of the words " the time of"; but we could never say " in the time of the bush." This latter expression, " in the bush," and also Rom. 11:2, where the word is " in Elias," point rather, according to our judgment, to the conclusion that a passage of the Old Testament is alluded to by the use of this form; which is the opinion of several learned men.

The word *eltelse*, " elder " (literally eldest), does not completely answer to the Greek πρεσβτερος, because the latter, though undoubtedly used for an office in various places, stands also in contrast with νετερος (the younger), which is entirely lost in the German expression. The expression " die eltern " (parents), literally, elders, the real force of the Greek πρεσβτερος, has, however, quite another signification in German. It is true πρεσβτερος is not merely an old man (πρεσβτης), but is used for the whole class of the old in contrast with the younger. Among the Jews who became Christians there is no trace to be found of any distinct office of " elders."

In the Acts the word " worshipper," σεβμενος, frequently occurs, as the name of a numerous class of Gentiles who, acknowledging the vanity of Gentile idolatry, and detesting its disorders, attended the Jewish worship, seeking in it a refuge in their moral distress, and in spite of the unfaithfulness of the Jews-so mighty is the truth of God-finding one, though an insufficient one. We therefore find many of this class who followed the apostle Paul and other servants of God. " Proselytes," is another word, although these " worshippers " may also have been such. We might have translated the word as others, " fearing God," but this would rather describe a state of soul than be, as in the Acts, the title of a class of men who, although Gentiles by birth, attended the Jewish worship.

In 2 Cor. 2:16 the unusual expression, " sweet savor of death," will strike the reader. He will be assisted in understanding it by the remark that the expression is a figurative one, alluding to the Roman triumphal processions. They used on these occasions sweet odors, and often killed many captives, while others, on the other hand, were spared. The " sweet savor " was therefore a " savor of death " or of " life." In like manner, says the apostle, is the gospel, when received, a means of life; but when not received-however sweet it be-it is only a cause for condemnation.

The reader, but little acquainted with the manners, customs, and arrangements of ancient times, may find difficulty in several other expressions, which, as we could not without circumlocution render into German, need, we think, a short explanation. They follow in order:-

1. The " Pretorium." This word was applied to the head quarters of a Roman camp, where the commander had his official residence, or in Rome to those of the imperial guard. It was therefore in general the fortified head quarters of the soldiery; and because the provincial governors who were dependent upon the emperor were called " prators," the hall in which they issued regulations and gave judgment, as the commander did at the head quarters, was also called " pratorium." The word is used in the New Testament in all these significations but the first, and we have therefore left it unchanged.

2. The " Sanhedrim " was the chief council of the Jews held in Jerusalem, which, consisting of seventy-two members, was formed of priests, scribes, and elders, and presided over by the high priest.,

The " synagogue " was among the Jews what is called a church in Christendom. Sacrifices were indeed only offered in the temple, but the ordinary divine service took place in the synagogues. Here they read the word and preached, and hence proceeded the discipline which cast out those who were not regarded as faithful Jews.

4. "Asiarchs " were officers in the province of proconsular Asia (a part of Asia Minor), who were yearly chosen from the chief men of the province, to take the place of presidents over the various idolatrous services, and to arrange the games dedicated to the honor of the gods.

5. The "Areopagus ι' was a tribunal established by Solon the lawgiver of Athens, both to watch over the morals of the Athenians, and to see that due honor was paid to the gods. This institution, although deprived of its importance, was retained under the Roman rule. This tribunal held its sessions on the hill of Mars or Ares, when is derived the name "Areopagus," Ares' (or Mars') Hill, and Acts 17:19 may therefore be translated, either " They led him to Mars' Hill," or, " before the tribunal called Areopagus."

6. " Sandals " are soles bound to the feet by leather thongs. As Roman luxury extended, men wore shoes or half boots, called ■ποδ■ματα κο■λα, and as it appears later, merely ■ποδ■ματα. In the New Testament " ■ποδ■ματα " is used as well as " sandals." It does not, however, appear probable that this luxury had reached the disciples; and, as the writers of the New Testament have employed two words for the same thing, the reader will understand by " sandals " those soles bound to the feet by leather thongs.

As to coins and measures, an exact knowledge of the value of the different coins is not very important, because in the New Testament they are only employed in general to denote larger or smaller sums, and this distinction is apparent in the passages themselves. As we have, however, used some Greek names, we give here the value of the different coins, but without seeking to be perfectly accurate. We only remark with respect to the drachma, that some estimate its value at less than we do. " Lepton " is a 1/2 pfenning (1/5 of a farthing) or even less; the smallest coin. " Quadrans " is equal to 2 lepta. Assarion: the value of this coin is uncertain. Some give 4, some 2 pfennings (1/5, or 2/5 of a penny). Drachma (100 to a mina) is about 7 groschen, (Sid.j. Didrachma is 2 drachmas = 14 groschen. The Mina (60 to a talent) is about 22 1/2 to 23 thalers (£3 7s. 6d. to £3 9s.). But the worth of a talent was different in different countries. The Babylonian talent had 12 minas more than the more generally used Attic talent. In the New Testament it is probably the Syrian talent. The silver talent was valued in Syria at something over 320 thalers (£48), the golden talent at 3,935 thalers (£590 8s.). [A. Bockh reckons the drachma at 7 1/2 Sg. (9d.); the mina at 25 thalers (£3 15s.); and the Attic talent at 1,500 thalers (£225).] The Chenixa is commonly what a man needs for a day's sustenance. Bath = 6 hins, or about 1 eimer (bushel?). Corus = 10 baths. [written 1855]

We now think we have given sufficient information as to the object before us in this translation, the means therein employed, and finally the way and method in which various passages are translated. In publishing our work, we commend it heartily, and with confidence, not for the first

time, to Him from whom alone blessing comes, and whose approval is worth more than that of all men. We by no means presume to look upon our book as free from errors, but we hope it will be of some use to every upright and Christian reader. Our aim has been exactitude throughout, and we have therefore, as before remarked (while making use of several translations, in order to find suitable expressions, and to arrive at the force of the passages in question), from the beginning to the end, exclusively translated from the original Greek. Should anyone think it worth while, either privately or publicly, to make remarks upon any errors, we shall gladly use them hereafter for the purpose of rendering the word of God as exactly as possible in the German language.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

We cannot publish the second edition of this translation of the New Testament without praising the Lord that He has impressed the seal of His approval on the first. We have good hope that this work is the fruit of His will and of His grace, and that it has been useful and welcome to many believing souls. We have little to add to the preface of the first edition, for all things essential have remained unaltered in this second. Yet we have carefully revised it, strictly re-examined the translation, and corrected the style in various places, always remaining true to our principle, viz., to give the word of God as exactly as possible in a language in which it was not written. The most essential alteration we have made is the change of a number of participles, as the too frequent use of them is not common in the German language. The word "saying," for instance, occurs continually in the Greek Testament, and we have almost everywhere changed it to "and said," or "as he said," etc. We have done the same with many other participles, where the sense would not be lost, always keeping the object before us of giving the meaning of the words exactly. In some passages, where the exactness and force of the rendering seemed to be endangered by this change, we have given the Greek form literally in a note. But there are sentences where euphony cannot be satisfied without losing the true meaning; as, for example, 2 Cor. 5:19: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." In such cases we have sacrificed the style to the true meaning. We hope that the translation in general is somewhat clearer, and in some minor things more exact: otherwise, except the changing of the participles, it remains the same. We have still a few short observations to make.

We had translated Rev. 2:20 by "thy wife," following the majority of the manuscripts and editions; but as the very old Sinaitic manuscript, published since our first edition, has "the woman," we have returned to the old reading. The same reason has led us to translate chapter 22:14 by "who have washed their clothes."

With regard to the words *πλεονεξία* and *πλεονεκτής*, which all have translated by "covetousness," and "covetous man," we have also retained this meaning. We are, however, convinced that this word, indicating an unbridled inclination (or affection) for that which does not belong of right to the one filled with *πλεονεξία*, signifies "fleshly lust," as well as "covetousness." See Eph. 5:3, 5; Col. 3:5 Peter 2:3, 14 Thess. 4:6 Cor. 5:10, 11; Eph. 4:19. The last passage explains the general use of the word. Some of the passages quoted are not so distinct, but they may help the reader.

Another word is *παις*, translated by "servant." Besides this word there are two others, *δούλος* and *δίκονος*, which are translated in the same way. *Δούλος* is a slave; *δίκονος*, an ordinary servant, at table, etc.; but *παις* is more official. The first meaning of the word is a

"rower," and it therefore in general denotes some one who has a distinct service. As we could only translate this word by "servant," we give the passages in which it occurs: Matt. 5:25; Mark 14:54; Luke 1:2; 4:20; John 7:32, 45, 46; 18:3, 12, 18, 22, 36; 19:6; Acts 5:22, 26; 13:5; 26:16 Cor. 4:1.

Finally, one more short observation on the little word "so," οὕτω, in John 3:16. It is possible that this word relates to the preceding, "have eternal life," and then the following clause expresses a consequence, and the "so" denotes more the object, the kind of love, than its strength, so that we might say, "for God has loved the world in such a manner," etc.

Heartily thanking the Lord that He has caused His blessing to rest on our work, it having been received by many Christians, and read, as we hope, with profit, we now place this second edition in His hand, and entreat Him to crown with His rich blessing our effort to place His word before souls as exactly as possible.

## Suffering in the Flesh

---

The will of the flesh is the practical principle of all sin. Will is not obedience to God, and hence is sin in its very principle, but being the will of the flesh shows itself in the flesh's lusts. It does not turn towards God, but the contrary, and does turn towards what the flesh desires. It is the acting of the nature at enmity with God's. Suffering in the flesh is the opposite of this will, or acting of the nature. This is applied both to Christ and to us; but in the case of Christ it is applied to His death. (See 1 Peter 3:18.) Rather than be disobedient in anything, and perfect in obedience, from the divine surrender of all will in Psa. 40 to take the place of obedience, He goes on to death, as man's weakness, Satan's power, God's wrath, and was obedient through all these, and in the former passed through both the latter rather than not obey. He was perfect in obedience, not sparing the flesh in anything, and died to sin once; that is, He went on to death in its fullest forms, rather than withdraw from doing God's will, or have one of His own. His died rather than He would have a will or ought but God's will. Thus sin found no inlet or place. An apple served to lead Adam into sin; nothing could lead Christ into it. Not only He had never any sin, but He went through everything that could induce will, and all failed to lead Him into it. He suffered in the flesh. Sin was baffled forever, and totally-the whole proof gone through, and nothing served to introduce it; all possible trial is over, for He has gone through it in weakness, as to His human nature. He has thus rested from all further question of sin, He has a divine and eternal sabbath as to it. How blessed! On the earth He had not. He had always victory over it-never let anything but obedience in His heart-proved He had a nature contrary to it, on purpose to obey, and nothing else. This was perfection, and the rather because He was tempted; but it was not a sabbath or rest. Between Him and His Father, in the exercise of love in obeying, He had joy, but till He died, (ο πικρυταλ,) He had not rest from it. This has, as a great principle, its application to us. " He that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin," is an abstract principle. When the will of my flesh works, I have not ceased from sin; but when, by the power of the Holy Ghost, I act entirely and feel entirely in the new nature, and the flesh has no will allowed, nor a thought belonging to it has entrance, because I am full of what the Spirit gives me, and obey in the delight of obedience, though suffering as regards man, in that I have ceased from sin. As sin is in the flesh, it may be in us a question of degree. It is partial, temporary, perhaps, in its realization; but the principle remains ever true, and suffering (that is as far as suffering) in the flesh, sin has no place in me, my thoughts, mind, and moral being. The flesh is not changed; but if I only suffer in it, it in me then has no operation as to will. It is important that scripture truth- perfect moral truth-should be given us unmodified in its own truth and nature; because then we can see what it is, and judge the comparative degree of attainment. Besides the spirit is refreshed by the thing itself. We have the same thing in John's epistle, who never introduces the modifications resulting from the adverse action of the flesh or any hindrance. The difficulty of the passage in Peter is its abstract nature. The point important to hold clear is that it is Christ's death that is spoken of in His case, though, of course, all His life was consistent with it.

1 Peter 4:6

1 Peter 4:6 refers to verse 5. Christ is ready to judge the quick and the dead. Good news of promise were addressed to those now dead, that they might be thus judged; but not for that only, but that through grace they might live in the Spirit. In respect of their human position in flesh, they were to be judged for the deeds done in the body, but, if they received the message, live spiritually to God. Their being judged shows clearly, I think, that it is no preaching to spirits, that they might be judged for that. Read, it has been preached. It was preached to those now dead. It must be remembered that Peter is writing to the strangers of the dispersion or scattered Jews. Christ has suffered. They are suffering among the ungodly, no longer doing the will of the Gentiles as other Jews were. Now Christ, being exalted, is ready to judge. The Church has only to be complete and caught up for Him to do it. He is exalted and ready; and if He comes and judges the quick among whom they were suffering, His authority to judge extended to the dead also who had received promises (compare Heb. 4:2) that, if they did not live in the Spirit to God, as the believing Jews had to do now without a rest or present Messiah according to promise, they might be judged as responsible men in flesh.

He had made a previous statement to the same purport in respect of those who were in the time of Noah. The Christian Jews were now a little flock; so were the spared in Noah's time. They had Christ only in spirit (a trial and reproach for a Jew who spoke of Messiah's being come); and so had Noah. (Compare chap. 1: 11.) But what was the effect of their rejection of Noah's preaching? Their spirits were now in prison, a proof that the Lord knew, as he says elsewhere, to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished. So the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks, in contrast, of the spirits of just men made perfect. It would be a strange thing, if those of whom it was said, " My Spirit shall not always strive with man, but his days shall be one hundred and twenty years," should be the only ones selected to be preached to afterward. But this by the by.

ON 2 Cor. 5:10

I find nothing in scripture which speaks of manifestation to brethren. The question is apt to connect itself very closely with the state of the conscience. It presses on it when there is anything from which it is not entirely purged before God. There may be a conviction that God will not impute without the conscience being de facto pure or purged. When purged before God or practically pure in walk (though this, as the apostle says, does not justify), the soul is not anxious about being manifested at the judgment-seat, because it is manifested to God now. This is of great practical importance.

The passages on the subject are these. They will be seen to be of two classes.

Rom. 14:12. So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God, connected with verse 10, We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. So 2 Cor. 5:10. For we must all be manifested (appear) before the judgment-seat of Christ to receive the things done in the body.

1 Cor. 4:4, 5. For I know nothing by myself (no evil of myself); yet am I not hereby justified: he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and shall make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God.

Rom. 2:16. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men according to my gospel.

This is one class of texts. The other here follows:-

Matt. 10:26. Fear them not, therefore, for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known.

Mark 4:21. Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel or under a bed, and not to be set on a candlestick? For there is nothing hid which shall not be manifested, neither was anything kept secret, but that it should come abroad.

Luke 8:16-18. No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel or putteth it under a bed, but setteth it on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light. For nothing is secret that shall not be made manifest; neither anything hid that shall not be known and come abroad. Take heed, therefore, how ye hear, etc.

Chapter 12:1, 2. Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy, for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, neither hid that shall not be known.

Three great principles are here presented. First, the great general truth, that man can keep nothing secret, though it may seem so, and can conceal nothing: all must be in light; God must have the upper hand, and light shall prevail. Secondly, that we are to give an account of ourselves to God. And thirdly, that we are not to fear the secret machinations of men, but to fear God and bear witness according to the light given to us. When I say man can conceal nothing, it is scarcely absolute enough. There is nothing secret but that it should be manifested.

This is a very important principle. It maintains the authority of God as light. For could anything be withdrawn from this, it would escape His power and judgment, and evil be maintained independent of Him. It maintains also integrity of conscience.

In the second point, our personal responsibility to God is maintained in everything. Each one shall give an account of himself We may be helped by every vessel of grace and light in the Church, but man cannot meddle with our individual responsibility to God. Each one shall give an account of himself.

The third point maintains confidence in God, in presence of what might seem otherwise a wickedness which was of a depth with which it was impossible to deal, and for which Christian truthfulness was no match.

All this is to maintain the conscience in the light before God. Where there is anxiety as to manifestation before the brethren, shame before men has still power over the heart and will. Self-love and character govern the mind. We are not in the light before God, nor has sin its right character in our eyes, because self has yet its power and place.

All is to be brought into the light, all thought of concealment rooted out and destroyed in the heart; but God will not maintain the influence of men and reputation by presenting a manifestation to them in the word, which is exactly what falsifies the moral judgment; and He does not. If the heart is comforting itself with the thought it will not be known, He breaks through the heart's deceit relentlessly, and says it will be known: everything hidden shall come to light. He does not neutralize His own authority and destroy the purity of moral principle, in saying it will be known before your brethren in that day.

Everything will be in the light: thank God; it is for the blessing, and for the joy too, of every upright soul.

It is not necessarily simply in the day of judgment that this takes place: the Lord may deal with it now. "Thou didst it secretly," says God by Nathan to David; "but I will do this thing before all Israel, and before the sun."

Thus the bringing of sin to light and judgment may be here from the hand of God. Men are chastened of the Lord that they may not be condemned with the world. 1 Cor. 11.

One passage remains, demanding more particular notice- 2 Cor. 5:10-"For we must all be manifested before the judgment-seat of the Christ, that each may receive the things done by the body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad."

I would first say, to remove what obscures the passage, that I am satisfied that the passage is general, and embraces all men. I cannot conceive how the context can leave a shadow of doubt on this point in any mind. It ought not. It is not a question of the time of appearing, but of the fact. Secondly, it is very important to remark that as regards the saints there is no calling in question their righteousness. The manner of their arrival before the judgment-seat, and their state in arriving, clearly show this, as well as the declaration of the Lord (John 5) that they shall not come into judgment. But how do they arrive on high? "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also." Christ comes Himself to complete His work of perfect grace in bringing us there. In that state we "wait for the Lord Jesus Christ [as] Savior, who shall change our vile body and fashion it like his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things to himself." (Phil. 3:20.) We shall be already like Christ, conformed to the image of God's Son, bearing the image of the heavenly. He who sits to judge according to His righteousness, according to what He is, is our righteousness.

The judgment of the saints begins when righteousness and glory are complete, when we are the same as Christ-Christ in them by grace.

What immense gain will our manifestation now be to ourselves! We shall know as we are known. If now, when perfect peace is possessed before God in a purged conscience, the Christian looks back at all his past life before and since his conversion, what a lesson of grace, patience, holy government for his good, that he may be partaker of His holiness-of care against unseen dangers, of instruction and of love, will his new history afford the Christian! How much more, when, freed from the very nature which produced the evil in him, he knows as he is known, and can trace now perfectly God's ways with him! It will immensely increase and enhance his apprehension of what God has been for him, and of His patient perfect grace and purpose of love. It is surely a solemn thing, but of immense price and value to us. It is all wrought out in the conscience, as we learn from Rom. 14:12. Here it is the fact.

Remark the true effect on a right state of mind as here described by the apostle. First, not a thought of judgment as to righteousness has any place whatever. The judgment-seat only awakens that love which thinks of those still exposed to it. "Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." Secondly, it is realized so as to put him who realized it responsibly in the presence of God. Now "we are manifested to God." Oh, what a healthful and blessed thing this is

for the soul! The rest is a mere effect readily hoped for-" I trust that we are manifested in your consciences." The other considerations produced a conduct proper to have this effect; but if a man was before God it was of little matter, it did not affect the soul, save in the desire of others' good and Christ's glory. This double effect will certainly be produced in any such manifestation before others, and we then shall as certainly desire nothing else.

The shame of a nature we have left will not be there then; the just judgment of evil will. I say this, however, in respect of the present condition of the soul. Anxiety on this point is a proof that the soul is not wholly in the sight of God. There it disappears because we are wholly there. Scripture never brings in the thought of brethren as concerned in this manifestation, and could not; but it does maintain, in the fullest way, manifestation in the light, so that if the heart reserves anything-has not brought it wholly out before God, it should be ill at ease. We certainly are perfectly manifested to the Lord, consciously I mean (for we always are so), and to ourselves. If it be for His glory that anything should be known to the saints also, we shall not regret it then; but our proper full manifestation is certainly to God, and in our own souls. All that is needed to verify the government of God will, I doubt not, be made manifest. All that has been through evil sought to be hidden, so that the heart was false-the counsel of the heart evil, will be brought to light; but where men have walked in the light, the counsels of the heart, however man may have judged them, will be made plain; for in that day God will judge the secrets of men's hearts. His grace and His government may have wrought all this in this world, and some men's sins and good works go before to judgment, but those that are otherwise cannot be hid.

My answer then is, that the brethren are never, and can never be those, manifestation to or before whom can be the subject of the revelation of scripture-everything being brought into light is. God is light, and the light manifests everything; He will bring every secret work into judgment. Further, as to responsibility, our thoughts are directed to God and to the judgment-seat of Christ. But all that is needed to display God's ways and government, and His approval of His saints, will surely be brought out, as the passages quoted clearly prove. The saint loves the light, as he loves and blesses God for the grace which enables him to stand in it, and makes him meet to be partaker of the inheritance of the saints in it. This, though doubtless imperfect, is, I believe, the true scriptural answer to the question. Where the thought of shame is introduced, it is referred entirely to the presence of Christ, and regards the service and work done for Him. (1 John 2:28.)

## Luke 21 Compared With Matthew 24

---

As to Luke 21, it is much more historical because it opens out, as revealing the Son of man, the period in which Israel is set aside and not counted in its history, or what concerns the Gentiles. Hence the Spirit records no inquiry of " the sign of thy coming and of the end of the age," but the general history in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. Thus, from verse 9 to verse 19 inclusive, we have the state of things from after the Lord's death until the encircling of Jerusalem by the Roman armies, and no mention made of the abomination of desolation, and verse 20 gives the reply to the question of verse 7, founded on verse 6. The statement accordingly says nothing of the tribulation such as never was, but that vengeance then comes on the people and city that all may be accomplished. This still continues, and will continue, Jerusalem being trodden down, till the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, in the close of the Gentile dominion begun in Nebuchadnezzar. Then the fact is revealed of the state of things at the close of the dominion of Gentile power-signs in sun, moon, and stars; on earth, distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring (the last expression showing, I think, that the words are employed figuratively, though there may be possibly portents also); men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven (the sources of the earthly state of things) shall be shaken. And then shall they (not " ye," but they, these proud rebellious Gentiles) see the Son of man coming in a cloud.

Such is the prophetic revelation, which presents, it seems to me, little difficulty. The exhortation which follows may suggest more; at the same time it offers some remarkable helps as to the use of expressions. For example, " this generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled " (verse 32) proves necessarily, either that " generation " must be taken in an extended sense, as in Deut. 32:5, 20, and as in other passages, or that " all " could only apply to the establishment of the state of things at the setting aside judicially of the Jewish people, because we have the treading down of Jerusalem for a long continuous period revealed. Hence we have to seek the guidance of the Spirit for the application of the passage, there being an incipient accomplishment at the destruction or treading down of Jerusalem, its desolation, vengeance, etc., which subsists still, and a far fuller one at the close preceding the coming of the Son of man. Hence the Holy Ghost records here an expression which may apply to both: " Know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." I do not doubt that this had a certain accomplishment in the absolute suppression of the Jewish order, but no fulfillment; and that the kingdom of God will be established by the coming of the Son of man after the signs of verses 25, 26. Note also, that this passage precludes the possibility of the application of " the coming of the Son of man " to the destruction of Jerusalem, because we have already had the long treading down consequent on the encompassing with armies. The full natural application of verses 28-31, then, is to the close, when, these signs having taken place, the full deliverance of the Jewish faithful will take place. So verse 35 has a limited application to Judea or Palestine; but it is evident to me that there is the larger application of the coming of the day of the Lord on the whole earth. It is the day that is spoken of. Verse 36 seems to me also to refer absolutely to the character of a Jewish remnant (though, in a still better sense, it will be true to the

Church); but in its proper application it is the escape of judgments then, and standing before the Son of man when He takes the kingdom.

In Matt. 24 the Lord passes over all the times of the Gentiles unnoticed, and speaks only of Jerusalem, as though under judgment recognized of God, so far as to be the object of His thoughts and dealings. Verse 14 only takes the broad fact that the gospel of the kingdom should be preached to all the nations (a thing not yet accomplished to the letter), and then the end should come. I judge then that, while the whole reply will have an accomplishment at the close, there was sufficient in the early part to guide the saints between the Lord's ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem; but that its fulfillment will yet take place, to the end of verse 14 being general, and from verse 15 being absolutely and exclusively the last half-week of Jewish tribulation.

There is a point which, I think, has not been duly borne in mind; it is that the unfaithful servant will, for the judgment, pass over into the time of the Son of man's judgment, so that what is called the Church may go on, in whatever apostasy of condition, into the state of things which takes place when the body of the faithful is gone. Laodicea is threatened with being vomited out of the Lord's mouth, but when it is vomited is not said, if it be taken for literal judgment. I am disposed to think Judaism will play an active part in connection with the apostate Church, and that there will be an astonishing amalgam; though, besides that, the Church form may continue until destroyed by the horns and the beast.

## On the Greek Article

THE doctrine which, for nearly thirty years, has satisfied my own mind on the subject of the use of the Greek article is so simple, and at the same time (as being merely the intelligent application of a universally well-known principle of Greek grammar) so readily appreciable, that I have been surprised no one has stated and developed it. Nothing but my own habits, the conviction of how little I could pretend to critical scholarship, and the pressure of other service, has hindered my giving it publicity. But as it is a material help to the study of scripture, I venture to do so.

The rule is simply this, illustrated in the known form of a proposition in Greek, That whenever a word presents the object about which the mind is occupied, as objectively present to it, the article is used; whenever a word is merely characteristic, it is not.

In most simple cases this will be self-evident. It will confirm also many subordinate rules given in treatises on the subject; as, for example, those relating to abstract nouns, previous reference, and the like. In some cases it will leave a choice of using or not using the article, so far as the sense is concerned, and merely affect vigor of style: in some it will require the power of abstraction, a power absolutely demanded for the critical study of the Greek Testament. But it will explain all, and give the special force of a vast number otherwise left uncertain. This last reason, and the more perfect understanding of scripture connected with it, is what leads me thus to give it publicity.

The metaphysical reasons may be subordinately interesting, and confirm the rule. It may cause the article to retain its name of "definite," though I should perhaps prefer "objective." It may explain its early Homeric pronominal use. It may show, that in translating Greek into English, "a," or "the," or neither, may be required: for that depends on the genius of English; our inquiry, on the genius of Greek. Our great point will be the truth of the fact.

If I say  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$   $\sigma\tau\iota\zeta\omega\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\upsilon$ , the object before my mind to be described is  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ .  $\zeta\omega\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\upsilon$  is the description—that which characterizes, in an explanatory way, the object about which I am occupied: it is not an object, but the character given to an object. The object is  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ . It may be the archetypal idea of the race (that is, an ideal object), or an actual individual previously spoken of; but it is the object before my mind to be spoken of;  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$  designates it;  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$  names the thing designated. The anarthrous word describes, or attaches a descriptive idea to, the designated object. Hence, though the usage was subsequently lost, we can easily conceive that where some one had been named, it stood alone as a pronoun, answering to "he"; and in many phrases is rightly rendered "this," or "that," when in English the reference is specific, though equally well in general "the."

Hence, too, the well-known usage in reciprocal propositions, that both nouns have it. That is, they are co-extensively predicable one of the other; or, rather, they both name or designate one identical object. This will only be the case as to the terms themselves, when the two words stand alone. When one is limited by the annexation of a governed noun or otherwise, it will only be true, of course, within that limit; that is, of the terms so modified. Thus in  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$   $\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\alpha$

the terms are reciprocal, because both are taken in the abstract totality of the things in their nature. But  $\tau\omega\varsigma\ \tau\ \phi\ \tau\ \nu\ \nu\theta\rho\pi\omega\nu$  necessarily limits the reciprocity to the historical facts by the verb, and to a certain sphere of fact by the genitive following  $\tau\ \phi$ . That is, the article, as presenting an object, presents the whole thing named. If it be abstract, it is the whole thing in its nature, as  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$ ,  $\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ ; and in this case the terms are properly reciprocal. If not, it affirms it as a fact within the limits given in the sentence. It requires some close attention of mind to see that limited propositions are reciprocal; but they are really so. In practice and in translations it is little attended to. The mind generally makes an ordinary proposition of it, and has all that is really important; but it would not have become me to pass over the case, as explaining the use of the article. The doctrine that an article to each noun makes the proposition reciprocal is one universally admitted; so that it does not affect my idea of the article. It was the limited case which had to be explained.

And now to open a little more the metaphysical order in the mind. The mind is ignorant, that is, has to receive, and be directed to, an object whose existence is assumed or recognized; it has to be informed about that object.  $\tau$  turns its attention to an object (designates it, as an intellectual finger-post), supposed, I suspect, in all cases to be before the mind, named or unnamed; and, next, what accompanies  $\tau$  gives the object its name, as  $\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ . The predicate informs the mind about the object. Now in a reciprocal proposition both are names attached to the same object. Hence both are objective, and both descriptive.  $\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$   $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$ .  $\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ , lawlessness, is the object before my mind—that is, sin. So also sin is  $\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ . They are different titles of the same object. But  $\tau\omega\ \nu\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\ \nu$  is not an object at all. It is a descriptive idea, to enlarge so far my idea of my object,  $\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ . It may be applied perhaps to other objects.

Hence too the effort of the ancient logicians to define by the genus and essential difference; because one gave the general race or character of being, and the other that which distinguished the object from all other classes, and thereby made it one to itself. It was really classification, and so far well, but no more, Locke's attempt to give, instead of that, all the qualities, informed more but was not a remedy: first, because many of those qualities were common, and not distinctive; secondly, because some might be individual. Hence the various efforts at classification in different branches of natural history by collections of distinctive marks sufficiently generalized.

#### EXEMPLA

To take now various examples, as they present themselves in a chapter of the New Testament (John 1):  $\Theta\epsilon\ \nu\ \lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ . the question is not at all if  $\Theta\epsilon$  is supreme; it is something affirmed of  $\lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ . Were it  $\Theta\epsilon$ , it would exclude from Deity the Father and the Spirit, and confine the unity of the Deity to the Word.

$\lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \nu$ .  $\Lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  is the object before my mind. It existed in the beginning.

$\nu\ \pi\rho\ \tau\ \nu\ \Theta\epsilon\ \nu$ . Here again God is an objective being to my mind, with whom the Word was. It has been supposed that there can be no rule given for prepositions. I believe, though the cases require more power of abstraction and apprehension of the relation of ideas, the one rule holds.

$\Theta\epsilon\ \nu\ \lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ . Here the same word characterizes  $\lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ . We have again  $\pi\rho\ \tau\ \nu$  for the above reason, verse 2.

The passage now leads us to another case—the use of the article with a verb substantive. This is generally left as optional. It is true, the noun accompanying such verb is used with and without an article; but the meaning is not the same.  $\alpha\tau\zeta\omega$ . Is it not evident here that the possession of  $\zeta\omega$  characterizes the person or being spoken of? And  $\zeta\omega$  becomes a noun characteristic of the existence affirmed. Hence constantly with verbs substantive, when the thing is generally affirmed, the article is wanting. A thing which could be called life was found in him: that name characterized the existing thing. It might in many other cases too, and hence it is only characteristic of the existence implied in the verb substantive. The existence is before the mind, and hence the verb is called substantive. There was.... what? Life. This will be entered into fully farther on, for it is true of all impersonal verbs, there "was," "fell," etc. Had it been  $\zeta\omega$ , there would have been no life anywhere else, for the whole thing designated by would have been in Him.

Next we have  $\zeta\omega$ . Now it becomes the object before my mind. This life (life as in Him) was  $\tau\phi\zeta\tau\nu\nu\theta\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$  a reciprocal proposition. But it is directly affected by the use of  $\nu$  instead of  $\sigma\tau$ .  $\nu$  confines the reciprocity to the time, place, and circumstances of which it speaks. It amounts to a revelation that life, as in the Word, gave itself up to be exclusively that in the circumstances historically spoken of, by the word  $\nu$ . The light of men and the life in the Word, then and there, are names of one identical object. It is evident that the addition "of men" gives it a particular application. It gives it exclusive application there, as does the  $\nu$ . There is no other light of men: man is darkness. If I find light in man, true light, it is the life in the Word. In man himself was death and darkness. Christ alone was light there, whether it shines on or shines in, for both may be true. Nor was life, as here spoken of, light to others than men. But it does not state it in the whole extent of  $\zeta\omega$  as being an equivalent term in itself to  $\phi\zeta$ , because  $\tau\nu\nu\theta\rho\pi\omicron\nu$  gives a specific application, and takes it out of the nature of the thing; nor is it life abstractedly, but life in the Word under given circumstances; that is, it ceases to be purely abstract.  $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\tau\phi\zeta$  would have made life and light names of the same object. The word  $\nu$ , as we have seen, confirms this; it is historical, not affirmative of the constant nature of the thing like  $\sigma\tau$ . It supposes there may be  $\zeta\omega$  in some other circumstances, and says nothing of it; that is, it is historically, or in that fact, not abstractedly, though exclusively true. So of  $\phi\zeta$ .

In the following words we have another case:  $\tau\phi\zeta$ . Here it is the object still, abstractedly, I believe; but as there is none other than the one mentioned, the abstraction and the individual object previously mentioned coincide. Which therefore is specially meant is a question of mental intelligence. It is the whole object represented by  $\phi\zeta$ . If that has been recently mentioned in such a manner as that it should be the object before the mind, the mind recurs to it. If not, it is the abstract mental idea.

$\nu\tau\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau$ . Here again it is abstract, that is, an ideal object, and presents no difficulty, only adding a clear example of a principle. This is common in cases of contrast, where, by the contrast, two objects are put definitely before the mind.

$\gamma\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma\pi\alpha\rho\Theta\epsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\alpha\tau\omega\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$ . Here we have examples of the absence of the article, which at once raises a question. Were it simply  $\omega\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$ , the object would be evident, and the mind would wait for this. This is evident; for if there were merely  $\gamma\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma\pi\alpha\rho\Theta\epsilon\omicron$ , the mind asks, Who? What man? The answer is,

■ ■ω■vνης. The previous phrase then would be characteristic of John-his description. He was a man sent from God-so as to be sent from God. It was characteristic of John. A man sent from God was what he was. Man in mission from God was the thing that described him. Παρ■ το■ Θεο■ would have been true, but it would not have been merely descriptive of John, but introduced the Being, God Himself, as an object before the mind. This would have explained all, had it been. But, as it stands at present, another form of the principle is introduced; one, however, familiar, though perhaps undefined to the English reader -the impersonal use of verbs without any object, existence or the event described by the verb being itself the object. " There was," " there fell," " there lived," etc., the being, falling, living, first occupies the mind, and then the thing spoken of comes in as a descriptive circumstance, the anarthrous word in either case answering the question, What? ■ ■νθρωπος ■στ■... What? ■γ■νετο. What? In English: Man is... What? There was... What? the answer to " what " being the predicate, and therefore without the article. A verb substantive would not have the article after it, unless for some reason connected with other parts of the sentence or context, save in a reciprocal proposition, because the word following is a predicate. But the rule is wider; and every impersonally used verb contains within itself its object, and what follows is predicated of that. Hence we have a new phrase in the case before us---■νομα α■τ■ ■ω■ωης. So again, ε■ς μαρτυρ■αν (for witness; that is, not himself to be an object of faith) is characteristic of what he came for. The use of the article with φ■ς has already been spoken of.

In verse 9 we have another case-that of an adjective-which is a common one, and will thus explain many others. The article, as the designation of the object, takes in the adjective, as that without which the real complete object would not be before the mind, φ■ς and ■ληθιν■ν making one idea in such a phrase. But though the two make one idea, there is a difference of force when the noun comes first with the article; the mind rests on it for a moment, as τ■ φ■ς, and is in suspense till something follows, if the word be not abstract and so complete in itself. If it be not, the article regularly follows before the adjective, and has its proper indicative force and becomes emphatic; that is, puts the adjective in contrast with some other quality of an opposite character: the light, not the false, but the true. When the adjective comes first, it is simply a quality of the right way, to press in the strictest way only one idea, but the adjective first in the mind: τ■ ■ληθιν■ν φ■ς; there is no contrast; something else is affirmed about the true light. When the adjective follows with the article it is really affirmed about the substantive. The real logical structure of this phrase, however, is τ■ φ■ς ■ φωτ■ζει τ■ φ■τιζον, ■στ■ τ■ ■ληθιν■ν etc. Of that light, of which I can affirm φ■τιζον, etc., I can affirm ■ληθιν■ν. And, as to light, the lighting everybody and true are reciprocal and co-extensive; a light which is not the true cannot light everybody; and a light which does not light everybody is not the true light; and one which lights everybody cannot be other than the true. The sentence is really τ■ φ■ς τ■ φ■τιζον.... ■στ■ τ■ ■ληθιν■ν [φ■ς].

The first form then (τ■ ■ληθιν■ν φ■ς) gives ■ληθιν■ν as distinctive, and makes it the leading idea, φ■ς being assumed as the subject. The idea comprised in the adjective and substantive together is one, marked by τ■; but its truthfulness is the thing referred to. Hence τ■ ■ληθιν■ν τ■ φ■ς would give two objects (for ■ληθιν■ν; would refer to something else, of which, qualified by ■ληθιν■ν, φ■ς would be declared to be truly the name); or it would be the idea of truthfulness and the abstract idea of light; τ■ ■ληθιν■ν having fixed the mind already on an object much more abstract than light... φ■ς ■ληθιν■ν is not usual Greek; for the object really before the mind is the

truthfulness of the light. Light is of course needed to characterize the truthfulness before the mind.

In το φως ληθινον, φως is presented as the object; but in itself it would not be sufficient: it would be distinctively the light as contrasted with all other objects, and therefore the mind has to resume its exercise, and to fix it on a particular light; that is, the true light, which contrasts with any other light. Here the general abstract idea or object is φως, τ » φως: but there is an added object of the mind to which attention is substantively drawn: φωτεινοντα ανθρωπων, equivalent to φωτεινον of which it is affirmed, not that it is (ληθινον, (a mere character in that case), but τ ληθινον [φως], distinctly and definitely that one particular light in contrast with false ones. It is a reciprocal proposition. The last word, φως, comes in merely as repeated, to secure from mistake, as the subject-matter, of the truthfulness contended for. Its being the true one is the object of affirmation. This merely amounts to the mental phenomenon, that the mind can have not only existences for an object, but acts or qualities; that is, the article can be used with verbs, or participles and characteristics (that is, adjectives), as objects, the substantive being assumed or expressed for clearness sake. Were this not so, the mind could only have actual existences, and not actings or characters, for its object; but this is not true. This designation by the article in the case of infinitives, participles, and adjectives, by making them objects, makes, in fact, nouns of them in the mind. Thus, 1 John 5:20, γινσκωμεν τον ληθινον, where the person is absolutely designated by having that quality. So, in a bolder form, Mark 9:23, τ ε δνασαι πιστεσαι, the question of power lies in believing, the man having said to Jesus, ε τι δνασαι. στ being understood, gives πιστεσαι without any article; otherwise it would make believing absolutely identical with power as a reciprocal term. The verb-substantive constantly, indeed, takes away the article, as we shall see. In the same verse we have the article with a participle, τ πιστεοντι, not exactly equivalent to " a believer " (though for most purposes it is), because it supposes the act, and not merely the abiding quality.

The next case which requires remark in the chapter of John we are examining, is δωκεν ατοξ ξουσαν. Now δωμι will regularly have a noun without an article, unless some other principle introduces one, as being united to a possessive genitive, or reference to previous mention of the subject, or the like, so that it is the designation to the mind of a specific object for that reason. Otherwise the phrase is a general one, and the thing given comes in merely as characterizing the giver and the gift. This will apply to every ordinary case of a simply active verb, because the word governed is merely the complement, or explanation of the idea in the sentence, though many other rules may introduce it as a specifically designated object to the mind. It is merely the kind of thing given; that is, characteristic. Were it a known object, it would have it. Δδωκε ζω, " he gave life," τον ζω, if a particular life before mentioned was before the mind, or that the noun was abstractedly viewed in its absoluteness.

We next come, after obvious cases, to the cases in verse 13- κ without an article. This signifies the mode or manner of something else (which something else is the object), here of being born. Hence all are without it. An important instance of this is κ πιστεως (Rom. 1:17), the manner or principle of the revelation; ες πιστιν, that to which the revelation is made, characterizing the manner of the reception of the revelation. κ πιστεως, again (Rom. 3:30), on the principle of faith, for they had sought it ξ ργον νμου, by law-works; the Gentiles δι τς πιστεως, because here it is presented as the actual faith they had. Hence, inasmuch as it was κ πιστεως, and not in virtue of being a Jew, they could be justified too. So δι τοτο κ πιστεως να κατ χριν

(Rom. 4:16); so verse 14, ο κ νόμου; their character a little after (ver. 16), τ κ το νόμου, that is, the law, Jews; ο κ νόμου, those who claimed it by law, on that principle. Then we have τ κ πιστεως βραμ, a remarkable case, meaning " of Abraham-faith "; not by Abraham's faith, but on the same principle- that kind of thing. These may afford a clue to many passages, and show how little also the prepositions are out of the rule. But it is so important a principle in Paul's writings that we may consider it further hereafter.

To return: λγος σαρξ γνετο needs no remark, unless that γνετο makes a proposition like στ. Τν δξαν ατο -ατο gives the article as designating necessarily that glory as a specific object: δξαν ς, " glory as of," evidently only characterizes the subject. Consequently, μονογενος παρ πατρς characterizes the glory. The glory is assumed to be before God, or it would not be true glory; but it was glory of an only-begotten from His Father. So χριτος κα ληθεας characterize His habitation here. It might have been τς χριτος κα τς ληθεας, and stated the fact of these two things. But the whole passage is characteristic of the Word made flesh, and not relating facts; though of course the facts must have existed to make the character true. Of ρχμενος, and λβομεν, κα χριν, etc., the principle has been already given. Χριτος cannot receive here the article; it would destroy the sense, because τς χριτος would be the whole abstract thing, χρις; and no other χρις could be ντ that. It is some grace, some other grace or other. Hence when it is used as an abstract idea, contrasted with νόμος given by Moses, we have χρις, and αλθεια. I am disposed to think that there is no article before Μωσως and ησο Χριστο, not because they have not been mentioned, but as being the means and manner of the coming of law and grace. But we will consider proper names apart.

We come then to a difficult case, but one which attaches to the nature of the word: speaking of that which is so little within the limit of human thought, and especially in the expressions of one whom the Holy Ghost employed to speak more profoundly than all but one on these subjects. Still the gracious Lord meant us to understand as far as it is conveyed, and as it is; and I judge, that while the application is special, it confirms the principle which we seek to use in the explanation of the word: I refer to Θεν οδες ρακε πποτε. I believe this absolute negative purposely sets aside objective personality here. If it had been τν Θεν, it would have been a designated object, and hard to speak thus of, hard to point out an object to say it could not be seen; or inconsistently, as one seen by faith. But the object here was to keep Him in the unseen unseeable majesty of His being; He was such a one as could not be seen. It was not ς, that being pointed out to the mind, but one dwelling in the light unapproachable. And this is exceedingly confirmed by the absence of ατν after ξηγσατο. If that had been there, it should have been τν, for He would have been an objective person known. It may perhaps partially confirm this, that in Matt. 5:8, we have ατο τν Θεν ψονται. There He is the object of creature-vision as a person or being in whose presence they are, as far as that can be.

It is a specific testimony in verse 19, μαρτυρα has it from το ωννου. Ατη is the predicate, and is in fact ατη.

This leads me to a controversial passage, Luke 2:2. The natural rendering would be, " The enrollment itself first took place, Cyrenius ruling Syria." Otherwise the regular structure would have been ατη ς πογραφ ς πρητη, " this first enrollment," supposing others, and designating that one as the one in question; or, if not supposing others, supposing their previous possibility, and

emphatically designating that there had been none before: as we say, " This is the first time he did so," though I might say as characteristic, " This is a first fault."

Α■τη, however, constantly takes an article with the noun following. The difference of meaning when the order is different, though it be not sometimes more than a difference of style, will best explain the use of it.

Ο■τος ■ τελ■νης (Luke 18:11). The publican had been spoken of before. Hence he was a designated object, ■ τελ■νης. Ο■τος designated more emphatically, often so as to be contemptuous, specially where alone (given in the word " fellow " in the English version), the individual there. Ο■τος ■ τελ■νης designates first the individual, and then designates him by his character; This [fellow] the publican; but, the person being supposed, the character becomes the object, as we have seen in the case of the adjective, as τ■ φ■ς τ■ ■ληθιν■ν. If ■ν were there, it would not have the article; it would be merely characteristic, ο■τος τελ■νης ■ν. The whole object is evidently ο■τος. ■ν is a kind of copulative participle, giving τελ■νης as a predicate, as σ■ ■νθρωπος ■ν, etc. (John 10:33.)

Both these forms continually occur. I cite sufficient to show the use.

Α■τη ■ ■σθ■νεια. John 11:4. Ο■τος ■ λα■ς. Mark 7:6.

Το■το τ■ γ■νος. Mark 9:29. Ο■τος ■ ■νθρωπος. John 7:46.

Το■του το■ ■ρτου. John 6:51. Τα■την ■πο■ησε τ■ν ■ρχ■ν. John 2:11.

In all these cases we have something mentioned immediately before, emphatically designated by ο■τος-this before our eyes or mind; this just spoken of, but requiring (or clearer by having) the name of what the object designated was, the added word sometimes giving special force, as ■ρχ■ν, γ■νος, or enlarging or peculiarly characterizing the particular object. The ο■τος is complete and emphatic-this, whether thing or person. And the noun with the article presents the object, the word ο■τος necessarily specifying one.

I add instances of the other use: he [namely] the man, it [namely] the generation.

■ λ■γος ο■τος. Luke 7:17. ■ ■νθρωπος ο■τος. Acts 28:4.

■ ■λλογεν■ς ο■τος. Luke 17:18. ■ μακαρισμ■ς ο■τος. Rom. 4:9

■ ■νθρωπος ο■τος. Mark 15:39. ■ λ■γος ο■τος. Rom. 9:9

■ λα■ς ο■τος. Matt. 15:8.

In all these latter cases the object is simply given, first in the usual form, and then particularly recognized as an object already under consideration. These cases, and those previously mentioned, are examples of the general rule, that the mind naturally first mentions the object which occupies it. When ο■τος precedes, it is the individual person or thing; when the descriptive adjective or noun, it is the designation of the object by its name existing in the individual case.

Now, of these in the first three, the emphasis is particularly on the word to which ο■τος is joined; the other form would have weakened and made it unnatural in point of style, though the sense is the same as a fact, but not in mental apprehension. No English can mark the difference well. The

first two are so distinctly thus, that " the rumor of this " and " the stranger from among all these " would have been nearly equivalent. Matt. 15:8 deserves notice, because it is parallel with Mark 7:6. It is evident here the sense must be the same. I should say the passage in Matthew was the more energetic, as designating formally the Jewish people in their iniquity (represented by the Pharisees addressed). It is so in the LXX. Mark's is more historically given, contrasting them with other people. It is plain this is a mere question of style. Ο■τος so used has often in itself a contemptuous force; but I should doubt that in this case. The Lord was referring to them. He cared for this people. Others did not so draw nigh. In Matthew it is the character of the people. The whole people did so. It was their common guilt.

I would make the same remark on Acts 28:4, and Rom. 4:9. The subject of the sentence is more present in the mind of the writer than the particular identification of the fact or person referred to. Ο■τος is almost supplementary. Rom. 9:9 requires another remark. The translation should be, " For this word is of promise." ■παγγελ■ας without the article characterizes the λ■γος Τ■ς ■παγγελ■ας had preceded-" the promise "; and then the apostle declares that promise characterizes the word he is going to quote about it. Further, the preceding remark is confirmed.

To continue our original chapter-■ερε■ς κα■ Λευ■τας is the character of the persons who went. Had it been said το■ς, it would have held up the priests before the mind, and would have meant all of them.

Then ■προφ■της, the prophet, as has been remarked by others, before the mind of John and of the speakers, who should come. That Christian faith recognizes that the prophet spoken of by Moses was the Christ proves nothing to lead us to suppose any inconsistency in the ill-informed inquiry and expectation of those who went out.

We have another instance of the example already explained in ■π■κρισιν. ■γ■ φων■, etc. requires more remark. It is a quotation, varying in some words, from the LXX, and a sort of public, prophetic title affixed by the Lord on John-" I am that passage," not merely that thing. Hence it is stronger than saying ■γ■ ε■μι ■ φων■. It is an oracle recited attached to ■γ■.. Ε■μ■ (understood) does not indeed require the article, unless it is specifically reciprocal-that is, exclusive of all others: as ■γ■ ε■μι ■ ■μπελος ■ ■ληθιν■,-■γ■ ε■μι ■ ■ρτος τ■ς ζω■ς, -■γ■ ε■μι ■ ■ρτος ■ καταβ■ς ■κ το■ ο■ρανο■. John 15:1 and 6:41, 48.

Κυρ■ον comes under the question of proper names, not meaning a title of Jesus, save as He is Jehovah.

■ν ■δατι-the character of the baptism. John 1:26. ■ρχεται ■ν■ρ. Here we have no article, because it is not any particular man designated as an object to the mind, nor the whole class as an ideal object, which, indeed, would be rather ■νθρωπος, save as used for husband. It is a man. It characterizes, or gives the quality of man to him of whom all this is said.■ ■ν■ρ would have quite another sense. ■ρχεται ■ν■ρ is, " a being comes," he is not any other thing, he is a man: that is the quality of the comer. It is really impersonal, and comes under that rule. ■ ■ν■ρ would have been some known man.

In verse 26, John specifically characterized his baptism. Here (in verse 31), though many authorities have not the τ■, I judge it is well retained, because he is speaking of the fact that actually occupied him. He therefore does not refer to the manner merely, but to the fact, and the

■δατι is referred to as the known matter employed, with the water as I have said or of which I have spoken. Hence, when he is again contrasting the character or nature of it, we have ■ν ■δατι and ■ν πνε■ματι ■γ■, where, remark, therefore, the absence of the article does not touch the question of what πνε■μα is meant. It is not there, because it only characterizes the baptism.

Verse 34, ■ υ■ζ το■ Θεο■ is evidently a specific title, and complete ideal object in itself.

Τ■ ■πα■ριον was one particular to-morrow, that is, of the day previously spoken of.

■ ■μν■ζ, one particular lamb, the Lamb of God. A genitive following necessarily involves in such a case the article as designating a specific object. A Christian would understand ■ υ■ζ, or ■ αμν■ζ, from his previous knowledge, as a reference to one particular known Son and known Lamb. But here it follows the designation by a subsequent genitive, which confines it to a designated object. Here we have also τ■ν μαθητ■ν, the whole body of them so called as an object, and δ■ο, some two of them, but specifically designated: afterward ο■ δ■ο, because now we have them as the designated two, though unknown.

Verse 40 (Gr.), ■κε■νην coming after necessarily makes a specific day as an object before the mind.

■ρα requires more attention. It is indeed an exception to general rules. It never receives an article with a noun of number, unless some other reason makes it an especial object, as previous mention, a particular hour, or the like. Such idioms as to time are found in all languages. It is the haste of familiar style, being an accompaniment to any act in general, showing when anything was done. This applies to many familiar and commonly used words.

There is one apparent exception to this, Matt. 20:3; but the article there is rejected by all the editors. On the other hand, when the mind is to be directed to a particular hour as a point of time as being a remarkable or definite one, the article is there, but attached to the numeral as the leading idea. (Matt. 20:6.) This exception remarkably confirms the rule. It is to be remembered that ■ρα did not mean " hour " in Greek till very late in the history of the language. When it is used in the original way as a word, it follows the usual rules in connection with numerals marking the hour of the day. It has become a kind of name, as a known thing every day, and the article is never used-the same when used for a portion of the day in general; as if " time " had become in English the name for an hour. We should speak of spring-time, winter-time, etc., and also it was at seventh-time, eighth-time, which would show it then meant hour, and attach as to time a character to the act done. But when in Greek a specific point of time is meant, then ■ρα with the numeral takes the article. The cases of absence are too numerous to quote. We have περ■ τρ■την ■ραν, περ■ κτην ■ραν, περ■ νν■την ■ραν, etc. So ■ως ■ρας ■νν■της. So we have when it merely means much of the day, ■δη ■ρας πολλ■ζ, ■δη ■ρα πολλ■. (Mark 6:35-) But then we have, when noticed as a critical point of time, Matt. 27:46, περ■ δ■ τ■ν ■νν■την ■ραν; chapter 20: 6, περ■ δ■ τ■ν ■νδεκ■την ■ραν, and so chapter 20: 9. So Mark 15:34, και τ■ ■ρα τ■ ■νν■τη. τ■ ■ρα το■ θυμι■ματος, and such cases are common where the word follows the usual rules. So John 12:23, ■λλ■λυθεν ■ ■ρα. Acts 3:1, ■π■ τ■ν ■ραν τ■ς προσευχ■ς τ■ν ■νν■την. So Acts 10:30, τα■της τ■ς ■ρας... κα■ τ■ν ■νν■την ■ραν.

Thus its exceptional use, when used as a name of the hours of the day, does not affect the general rule. Nor is this confined to the word ■ρα: in expressions relative to time we have ■φ' ■μερ■ν

■ρχα■ων, ■π■ π■ρυσι, ■π■ τετ■ρτης ■μ■ρας. (Acts 10:30.) In this last the ellipse or irregularity of construction is much greater than relates merely to the article; as indeed in the first also. The last means "four days ago"; that is, κατ■ τετ■ρτην (or τ■ν τετ■ρτην) ■μ■ραν, ■π■ τα■της τ■ς ■μ■ρας. It is contracted, and ■π■ attracts the government to itself. As regards these idiomatic expressions as to time, we are familiar with them in English. We say "last year," "next month"; whereas we must say "the next king that reigns," "the last that reigned." They are merely idiomatic habits when a word is very frequently used, and lead to no mistake or uncertainty of grammar.

I have owed this to the reader to show that ■ρα is no such exception as in the smallest degree to set aside the rule; being merely an idiom found in other languages where the general grammar is certain. The truth is, from the peculiar circumstances in such a case as the hours of the day, the number becomes the designating power to the mind, as the article in other cases.

One other case remains in this chapter important to notice- δ■λος ο■κ ■στ■. (Ver. 48 Gr.) Two reasons might seem to deprive δ■λος of the article here. First, the verb ■στ■; because, unless in the case of a reciprocal proposition, ■στ■ makes what follows it a character of the subject. And this is so much the case that when another verb is such as to make the following noun characteristic, it has not the article. So in τ■νος α■τ■ν ■σται γυν■; γυν■ characterizes the relationship-"Shall she be wife?"-bear that character. ■ γυν■ would have fixed the mind on the person, and meant rather the woman in that relationship. (Mark 12:23.) So, in the same verse, ■σchon.....γυνα■κα, "to wife," as wife; again, as μ■νος ■χων ■θανασ■αν (1 Tim. 6:16); ■χοντες χρε■αν very frequently ■χοντες ■ξουσ■αν. This was the condition or state of the persons spoken of, of God Himself. The anarthrous nouns are attributes or conditions of something. Yet ■χομεν will have the article after it whenever the word is not merely characteristic, but positively fixing the mind on a definite object. ■ν ■ ■χομεν τ■ν ■πολ■τρωσιν. (Eph. 1:7) Redemption is more than a characteristic of us. It is a positive object marked out to the mind. So Phil. 1:23, τ■ν ■τθυμ■αν ■χων. The same principle very plainly applies to Eph. 3:12, ■ν ■ ■χομεν τ■ν παρρησ■αν. Now this might seem rather a contradiction, but if examined illustrates remarkably the principle. It is not here a quality in Paul, but a special designated boldness to which he refers: τ■ν παρρησ■αν κα■ τ■ν προσαγωγ■ν ■ν πεποιθ■σει δια τ■ς π■στεως α■το■, that boldness and confidence of access which we have before God through Him. Where πα^ησ■αν is used as a quality or state of the person, it has not the article, as Heb. 10:19 John 2:28; 3:21.

But to return to δ■λος ο■κ ■στι-δ■λος is not a predicate here, nor exactly characteristic of Nathanael. The negative modifies the sentence. It is not merely that the complete abstract idea, guile, is not in him, but there is none of it. To put it in another shape; you cannot make an object as existing before the mind of what is denied to exist. Hence we have δ■λος ο■κ ■στ■, rightly translated "no guile." So in 1 John 3:5, ■ν α■τ■ ■μαρτ■α ο■κ ■στι, "in him is no sin." The same holds with ■χει used in a similar way, as John 4:44, τιμ■ν ο■κ ■χει. We have a confirmation of this by seeing that, where it is a positive object about which something is denied, and not the denial of the existence of the thing, ο■κ does not alter the common rule; thus ο■κ ■στ■ν ■ Θε■ς Θε■ς νεκρ■ν. (Matt. 22:32-) It is not, "God is not." God is presented as the object, and He is denied to be Θε■ς νεκρ■ν. Whereas in LXX, Psa. 13:1 and 52:1, we have ο■κ ■στι Θε■ς, there is no God. In Mark 12:27, on the contrary, we have the idea in a different shape: ο■κ ■στ■ν ■ Θε■ς νεκρ■ν. If this be not elliptical, and if so, identical with Matthew, the sense is

different, and Θεός becomes a proper object of the mind based on what has been said, and is a term of relationship, as Θεός Αβραάμ, etc. He is not the God of dead persons, as called their God. If this be so, the article as designating a positive object is positively necessary. It is a question of spiritual intelligence which is the meaning here. The grammatical rule is maintained equally by either. I incline to the latter. The cases of οἱ κῆρυξ and similar forms without an article are too numerous to mention.

An English expression here may assist the reader. In "similar forms without an article," "an article" is merely characteristic of "form." It is a form without an article. The article would fix my mind on the article itself as the subject of inquiry, or, if recently mentioned, refer to it as so mentioned; only that English is neither as accurate nor consequently as uniform, nor as universal in application of the principle.

This leads me to another principle-application, that is, of our principle: if a noun singular be taken distributively, or a noun plural partially, which is the same thing at bottom, there will not be an article; if the singular, as already spoken of in totality, that is, abstractedly, or the plural universally, there will. The former is merely a case of the non-existence of a definite object pointed out to the mind. This connects itself with the employment of prepositions also. A singular noun is taken distributively when it is not an abstract complete idea, but as applied to any given existences of the case. Δύλος οἱ κῆρυξ comes under this, and has led me to it. It is not merely that the abstract thing δύλος is not, but that nothing coming under that tide is there. So of all the cases given above with οἱ κ. Other cases are very numerous. (Mark 12:19, 20, 21.) ἕν τῶνος δελφός... καταλῆπῃ γυναίκα. ἔλαβε γυναίκα.... οὐδ' αὐτὸς φέκε σπέρμα. So in the plural πῶν δελφῶν ἕσαν. ἕθεος νεκρῶν. ἕταν γῆρ κ νεκρῶν ἕναστῶσιν, dead people, that condition,-not as an object before the mind-all the dead. So ἕναστῶσιν νεκρῶν frequently, but Luke 14:14, τῶν ἕναστῶσιν τῶν δικαίων, because all would rise, as a definite object-these persons. So ἕδῶτες τῶν γραφῶν, all these writings so designated. So ἕς χεῖρας ἕνθρῶπων, men's hands. It is characteristic. Instances of the converse are found in every page: οἱ μαθηταί, οἱ δελφοί. So ἕλος involves the article, τῶν excludes it. Hence we know πῶν with an article following has not the meaning it has with a noun without it. In the last case it is distributive-"every": in the former not, but means "the whole." Πῶσα γῆ "the whole earth." Πῶσα φυτεία, "every plant." Hence, not Eph. 3:15; πῶσα πατριῶν "every family (where ἕν οἱ ῥανοῦς καὶ πῶν γῶν characterizes the families, and therefore have not the article); that is, as Jehovah knew only Israel of all the families of the earth (Amos 3:2), the rest being not called by His name. (Isa. 63:19.) All the families-every heavenly, or earthly family-were ranged under the name and authority of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I will now go through several difficult cases in which, from the extreme exuberance of matter and the narrowness of human language to meet it, and yet the need of accuracy in divine things, and the certainty of it in revelation, we shall find the principle most severely tested, but most fully proved. And here I shall particularly take notice of prepositions which come as fully under the rule as every other case.

Eph. 1:1, πῶστολος, characteristic of Paul. Δι' θελήματος θεοῦ, the same thing. He was an apostle by divine will.

Verse 2,  $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\epsilon\rho\eta\nu\eta$  are used distributively with  $\sigma\tau\omega$  understood. It is not the abstract word pointed out as an object, but that these things may be with-characterize-the condition and state of the people. The apostle did not wish grace and peace in their abstract totality to be so, but that their state might be characterized by these qualities.  $\pi\Theta\epsilon\omicron$ , etc., gives the character of the grace and peace, that kind. It is not a wish that it should come from Him, but that grace and peace thence might be with them.

Verse 3. In this verse we have the article, for  $\Theta\epsilon\varsigma$ , etc., is presented as a personal object. I will revert to this as an instance of an important point.  $\tau\omicron$ , before  $\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , shows where they were, or had the blessing. It was not the blessing merely characterized by that place.

Verse 4,  $\pi\rho$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\varsigma$   $\kappa\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$  characterizes the election by the date; does not relate the fact by a date: that is, it is not given as a specific date to which attention is drawn, but that which preceded, or the infinity preceding that, characterized the election. It renders it much stronger. " Ere a mountain was formed," or " a foundation of the world laid," would not give a date, but contrast a period in character.

Verses 4, 5. So  $\nu$   $\gamma\pi$  characterizes the saints,  $\epsilon\varsigma$   $\upsilon\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$  their predestination. It was predestination to adoption; but it was not  $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\epsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\alpha\nu$  merely. The good pleasure of His will is made the object before the mind, of the source from which it flowed.

Verse 6. We now come to some more difficult cases, because complicated, where they have in part, in part not, the article; but it flows from what we have been seeing we are to be; our whole state, and the work which has brought us there,  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu$   $\delta\zeta\eta\varsigma$ . This is to characterize the matter. But the grace is a positive designated object, which is thus glorified and praised, or gloriously praised. Hence we have  $\tau\varsigma$  (called for, indeed, by  $\alpha\tau\omicron$ ). His grace is set before us as praised and glorified. This apparent anomaly is therefore at once made easy by this simple principle.

Verse 7. I have noticed this already. We have all these as God's part, noticed as positive objects of our soul (save  $\sigma\phi\kappa\alpha$   $\phi\rho\nu\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , which characterize the grace, verse 8. So verse 9.

Verse 10. But  $\epsilon\varsigma$   $\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\nu$ . It was a will, or purpose of, or for, administering: this will or purpose was such. This gave its character and quality to the will or purpose; but the fullness of times was a positive object before the mind. It did not characterize the administration. It is a direct subject of thought. We have seen before  $\nu$   $\omicron\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\pi\gamma$  characterize every family. Here they are designated as places where the things are pointed out as such, and they have the article.

Verse 11. Again we have the unusual form  $\kappa\alpha\tau$   $\pi\rho\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$   $\tau\omicron$ . But  $\kappa\alpha\tau$   $\pi\rho\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$  denotes the nature of the predestination, and connects itself with predestinated. We are predestinated according to purpose (not the particular purpose) of Him who, etc. And then we have again the article associated with this work in God where it has its source, and it is presented as a positive object of the mind. We are merely characterized, and our predestination by purpose. Our predestination was not  $\delta\iota'$   $\rho\gamma\alpha$ , but  $\kappa\alpha\tau$   $\pi\rho\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ , and that of Him who, etc.

Verse 12. The  $\mu\varsigma$  is the subject,  $\epsilon\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu$  its character: to praise. We are to be such. It is the character we clothe. The  $\tau\varsigma$  before  $\delta\zeta\eta\varsigma$ , though disputed, is, I judge, rightly maintained.

We are " to praise " as according to purpose, but it is of His glory, presented again as the direct object of the mind. We have then several with the article, evidently presenting positive objects, till we come to

Verse 14, ἁρραβῶν characterizing merely in this case the Holy Ghost: ἡμῶν accounts grammatically for the article after κληρονομίᾳς, according to the principles previously stated. It is a specific object. But the words which receive the article here are spiritually full of the most perfect interest and weight of instruction. ἡ ἁρραβῶν would be pretty much a reciprocal proposition: here it is a predicate of an ordinary proposition. The inheritance, again, is an object presented. Ἐξ πολλῶν τρωσιν characterizes ἁρραβῶν, as ἐξ οὐκονομῶν previously did the purpose, κατὰ τὴν ἐδοκῶν αὐτοῦ.

Verse 15, τὴν ἡγίαν τὴν I notice as merely a new form of the principle, the second τὴν necessarily making the first objective.

Verse 17, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης is not the same as ὁ πατὴρ δόξης, or πατὴρ δόξης. He is the author, source, and head of glory; the glory that is actually to be, as Father, as God of our Lord Jesus Christ. Πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ὑποκατάστατος characterized what was given to them. It was not τὸ, that is, the whole of it abstractedly to them. It may be the Holy Ghost; but what is stated here from ἡμῶν to αὐτοῦ is the character of the thing given. I should translate " the Spirit." It is surely by the Holy Ghost, and the form of His presence and power in the mind; but it is that form of it which is spoken of here.

Verse 18. We get a succession of positive objects presented to the mind as so known.

Verse 20. So here, where we have only to remark the resurrection of Christ: it is not ἡνστάσις κτὴν νεκρῶν, that is, not from designated persons, but a state. It characterized the resurrection, and did not point out persons. It is ἡνστάσις κτὴν νεκρῶν, that is, from that condition.

Verse 22, κεφαλῶν, as head.

Eph. 2:2. In this verse, note, we have the evil system presented, not as characterizing the walk merely, but as a positive subsisting system, according to which they walked. And so all through till we get our resulting character. Τὴν φῶσιν οργῶν, this characterized us.

Verse 5, χριστι, the principle which characterized the way of salvation. Then,

Verse 7. It was by goodness to us that He showed the positive things spoken of Him: that goodness (χρηστότης) characterized it.

Verse 8. We have τὸ ἡγίον χριστι ὅστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Because it is a positive assertion about this thing presented directly to the soul-by that thing and by faith, existing faith: not merely as characterizing the salvation, but by these things, so set before our minds.

Verse 10, ποιήμα characterizes us; so πνεῦμα ῥοις ἡγαθῶν characterizes the condition of the creation: ἡν σαρκαῖ, verse 11, the manner again.

Verse 11, τὸ ἡγίον. He speaks of them as the whole class. It was not some having such a character, but living actual beings as such, taking in in principle the whole body of them, not ἡγίον,

in character from among τῶν ἠθνῶν. Ye were " the Gentiles." Λεγόμενοι gives κροβυστῆα the force of character evidently. I have only to remark repeated instances of the noun after an active verb being without the article, as giving the character of the result of activity. Where this is not the case it has the article. ποκαταλλάξαι τὸς μφετερους (ver. 16), necessarily an object; but ποιῶν ἐργον ν (ver. 15), ἐηγγελῆσατο ἐργον νην (ver. 17), this characterized the making and preaching. There are two classes of accusatives after the active verb: one the object, the other the fruit of the action. Τῶν ἐχθραν, enmity, specially known and mentioned: first, assumed as a known object, and then referred to. It was not enmity that was to characterize the act, but a particular enmity, which was before their minds, that is referred to. Εἰς and κατ very often have anarthrous nouns (not always), simply because, from their meaning, they speak of what characterizes something else.

One point remains, of which this chapter gives two examples, and of which we may therefore speak here. I mean the use of one article with two nouns of different meaning, and even necessarily sometimes distinct. Thus we have Ἐθες κατ πατρ (chap. 1), τοὺς ποστῆλους και προφῆτας (chap. 2,3), and in chapter 4, τοὺς ποιμνας και διδασκῆλους. Now our rule here is still the same, and much facilitates the apprehension of these cases. The article directs the mind to an object in view; or a whole class seen together in the speaker's mind, as one for the purpose for which he is speaking, as a unity, or as a whole. Thus, in the first, Ἐθες calls my attention to an object: two names are given to this object-God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, τοὺς calls my attention to a whole class complete in itself, forming as one company the foundation, united in this, apostles and prophets. So shepherding and feeding with the word present themselves as in one class of persons in the apostle's mind. They may be elsewhere separate ideas, but they are united in one class of persons here. So Matt. 16:21, the Lord Jesus should suffer many things πῶν τῶν πρεσβυτρων και ῥχιερων και γραμματρων. They were a joint common band of enemies, and so spoken of as present to the mind of the speaker.

I now turn to an important instance of this, Titus 2:13. First we have τῶν μακαρῶν ἡλπδα και πῆνειαν τῶς δξης. Δξης is the governing idea here. Grace had appeared (ver. 11). They were waiting for glory: that was their hope (that is object of hope, so used elsewhere), and it would appear hence, the object of hope and the apparition were identical, namely, the glory. Hence, τῶν marks both. But what glory? That is the question. Τοῦ μεγῆλου Θεοῦ και σωτρως ημῶν ἡσοῦ Χρῆστοῦ. Δξης still governs the sentence, and God and our Lord Jesus Christ are identified-were in the apostle's mind in the Spirit-in the glory which was to appear. Hence, it was the glory of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, viewed as perfectly one in glory. They are not the least separated in the mind of the apostle when speaking of that glory. It is certain that, in saying Θεοῦ και σωτρως, the apostle had but one object in his mind presented by the Holy Ghost. But I do not myself believe that μεγῆλου Θεοῦ and ἡσοῦ Χρῆστοῦ are here names of one person. I have not the smallest doubt that Jesus is the true God-Jehovah; and I do not believe that this sentence could have been written, had not the glory of the Great God been ascribable to Him. But I do not see that this statement amounts to His being the same person as the great God; though I do not see how it could be true were He not, for they were one in glory.

There are many other examples: 1 Thess. 3:11, 13 Cor. 11:31; Rom. 15:6. We have 2 Peter 1:1, ἡν δικαιοσῆναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν και σωτρως ἡσοῦ Χρῆστοῦ. Here the same remark applies,

I judge, as to the passage in Titus. The righteousness is one, as the glory there, and both are identified in it-which could not be said unless Jesus were God. But this last is not the statement of the passage. The righteousness here spoken of is, I judge, spoken of as the righteousness which has secured their having the faith, not the object of it. We have a phrase exactly similar, 2 Peter 2:20, **■ν ■πιγν■σει το■ Κυρ■ου κα■ σωτ■ρος ■ησο■ Χριστο■**. Now here the mind acknowledges the identity of person at once: but I judge the mind recognizes it in the words **Κυρ■ου κα■ σωτ■ρος**. So in 2 Peter 1:11, **ε■ς τ■ν α■■νιον βασιλε■αν το■ Κυρ■ου ■μ■ν κα■ σωτ■ρος ■ησο■ Χριστο■**. So we have (ver. 16) **τ■ν το■ Κυρ■ου ■μ■ν ■ησο■ Χριστο■ δ■ναμιν κα■ παρουσ■αν**. The power and presence are in one scene or one object before the mind. Compare Rom. 1:20.

In two of the above passages, **■πιγν■σει** and **δικαιοσ■ν■** have not the article, because by **■ν** they designate the manner or principle on which the main subject is received or escaped. So, 2 Peter 1:10, we have **βεβα■αν.....τ■ν κλ■σιν και ■κλογ■ν ποιε■σθαι**. The two are identified as a common object to the mind, assured together; but they are not one thing, though united in one idea by **τ■ν**. And note the singular adjective.

In French, where two ideas are sufficiently near to make one only an explanation of another, a similar idiom may be observed. "Sa tranquillita, son calme a," not " out "; because I have only one idea, which my first word imperfectly expressed. With that one idea in the mind the verb agrees.

Note in Eph. 2:22, **κατοικητ■ριον** characterizes the building in its use; but **το■ Θεο■** because you have God as a personal object there, not merely characterizing the house: **■ν Πνε■ματι** because this characterizes the manner of God's presence, and (though it be a person) does not speak of the person of the Holy Ghost, but of the manner of God's presence. A multitude of examples show the fallacy of any conclusion that it is not the Holy Ghost personally, because of the absence of **τ■**.

It is, I think plain, from the examination of a number of passages, that in cases where one article is used with several nouns, (while the grammatical agreement of the article is, by attraction and the usual analogy, partially with the nouns which follow), the object designated by the article is mentally another, to which all the nouns used apply, or with which they associate themselves. Where each is made a distinct definite object of, each will have the article. That mental object may be a person, who unites in himself the various names or titles. It may be association in a common object or common circumstance. In a word, the nouns are united in some common fact which the mind has before it, so as to group them together. This may be expressed or understood from the context. Thus it is expressed in the following: Titus 2:13; Eph. 5:5 Thess. 1:12 Peter 1:1.

In 1 Tim. 5:21, it is contained in the preposition **■ν■τπον**, which gives the idea of" the presence of"-the one idea which governs the mind, but **Κυρ■ου** is left out by most. This may be a person, as Matt. 12:22; 13:23; Mark 16:16. In Luke 11:28 we have several grouped in one class.

Heb. 3:1 is a very plain and express Case. In Phil. 1:7, it is the work in which the Philippians sympathized with Paul, which consisted in these two things: **■πολογ■α και βεβα■σει**. So in Rom. 15:6. It is readily understood from the context. In a word, there is always one definite object before the mind, of which the various nouns come in, not merely descriptively, but as together forming the completeness of that object. The grammar follows the noun, as the relative pronoun does, in its case, that to which it is related.

I shall now give some cases in which it evidently is not one person, and in which the common idea is not expressed in the passage. Only before citing them I will here recall the principle I have laid down, as we are at one of the most important and difficult applications of it. The article points to some definite object of the mind. The noun following gives the name to this object. In some cases, where this is sufficiently certain by specific contrast, the name is not even added, as **■ μ■ν, ■ δ■**. Earlier in the language, this was more extensively the case; and it hence became a pronoun, as in Homer. The object is assumed to be one we have before us, and known as an object, though we add a name (but a name known as designating that object), and much perhaps else about it.

Now in the cases we are about to mention, the object is not named, but the nouns used combinedly make it up. The article supposes the common object in which they are united.

To proceed to the cases: Phil. 1:7, **τ■ βεβα■σαι κα■ ■πολογ■α**. It is evident that Paul is speaking of one single common work which could only be expressed by using both words-confirming and defending: but he had but one object in his mind. So in a passage already quoted, 2 Peter 1:10, **βεβα■αν.....τ■ν κλ■σιν κα■ ■κλογ■ν... ποιε■σθαι**, calling and election are united in the one thing to be secured, in the security they sought. They could not secure one without the other. They formed one object in the apostle's mind in the diligence he recommended. God had chosen; God had called them. Being so chosen and called, they were to have this a settled and not uncertain thing in their minds, through the diligence recommended.

A still more remarkable case is where there are several decidedly distinct and independent persons, but who all form one object before the mind. Matt. 17:1, **παραλαμβ■νει ■ ■ησο■ς τ■ν Π■τρον κα■ ■κωβον κα■ ■ω■ννην**. Acts 3:11 **κρατο■ντος δ■ α■το■ τ■ν Π■τρον κα■ ■ω■ννη**. Acts 4:19, **■ δ■ Π■τρος κα■ Ιω■ννης**. In the plural the same thing, Acts 14:5, **■ρμ■ τ■ν ■θν■ν τε κα■ ■ουδα■ων**. This last would come under the class also of cases where the uniting idea is expressed. They were joined in one body in the assault. Gentiles and Jews made only one body, one object in the apostle's mind. In 2 Cor. 13:11 we have an example where the peace he desired the Corinthian disciples to be in, as a means of enjoying the presence of God, at once introduces, as thus speaking of God's presence, that love which necessarily accompanied it, and made one thought with the peace. Love and peace were together one idea of the blessed power and sweetness of the divine presence.

There are many other examples in scripture, but these sufficiently explain the principle, and, by this much debated point, confirm its soundness in the fullest way. Reference to Middleton, Green, etc., will furnish examples. I have examined them, and confine myself to having satisfied my mind that the same principle alike explains them all. Quotations from profane authors will be found there, equally proving the same general principle. Contrasted cases, where the object of the author was to make two separate objects before the mind, confirm also the doctrine.

Thus Heb. 11:20, **ε■λ■γησε.... τ■ν ■ακ■β κα■ τ■ν ■σα■**, where it is evident they were to be kept in mind as distinct objects. There is another text which I will notice as presenting an interesting question of interpretation-2 Thess. 1:8: **δ■δοντος ■κδ■κησιν το■ς μ■ ε■δ■σι Θε■ν, κα■ το■ς μη ■ιτακο■ουσι τ■ ε■αγγελ■**, etc. Here the apostle, or rather the Holy Ghost, designates two classes or forms of guilt, which elsewhere may be in the same persons. Openly hostile heathens and idolatrous enemies certainly are supposed, for they were the then persecutors; and Jews, who could not be said exactly not to know God, but who were disobedient

to the gospel. There were those who professed to obey the gospel, yet did not really know God. There were these two moral classes designated by the Holy Ghost as objects of judgment; a description which must both have been applicable then, and be so at the return of the Lord to judgment.

Acts 15 furnishes notable instances of the introduction and omission of the article. Γενομένης οὐκ ἔστι συζητήσεως οὐκ ἔστι Παύλου καὶ τῆς Βαρναβᾶς πρὸς ἀποστόλους. Here they were the Paul and Barnabas whose history we have had in what precedes. ἔταξαν ναβαίνειν Παύλον καὶ Βαρναβάν καὶ τινὰ ἄλλους. Here they are presented with several others as persons now chosen for the first time to go on this errand. Then we have τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, apostles and elders being one company here. (Ver. 2.). Again (ver. 12), κοῦον Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Παύλου. Here again we have the relaters of the facts brought for the first time before the assembly in this character. Then (ver. 22) κλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἕξ ἀπὸ τῶν πεινησμένων ἐντιχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ. Here they were jointly concerned as representatives in this matter, and one article is used to both. They were associated in one objective idea in the mind of the writer. Paul and Barnabas have an article, being known as already engaged in it: Judas and Silas are new persons, and hence their names are without the article.

I may remark, in passing, the evident sense of 2 Peter 1:19 is, we have the prophetic word confirmed, namely, by the vision of Christ's glory. And this passage leads me to remark that, when a word is characteristic of the action of the verb, it does not claim an article. Ἡμερὰ διαλύσῃ, not the day but day. It is the day-light. So φωσφορός. It is the character of the rising in the heart.

The examples we have had afford sufficient to clear up the use of the article after prepositions, which is indeed to the full as simple as any other part of the subject. We shall meet with others.

I will now proceed to notice-

#### A FEW IDIOMATIC CASES

In such cases as τῷ ἄρῳ, I judge it is idiomatic, from the locality being objectively contrasted with τῷ πεδῷ. It is the same in French: "Il est a la montagne" is no particular mountain, but they go in summer there from the plain. We say it as to "the plain." It is the whole tract in contrast with the plain. Το πλοῖον-I believe also that is aboard. Middle-ton's reference to a ship which was to attend him would be good grammatically. ἄρτος is occasionally used technically for the bread at the Lord's supper, when the subject is spoken of, though in Matt. 26:26 τὸν ἄρτον means the loaf on the table for the supper. These are questions of usage, not of grammar. Who would ask what particular loaf was meant, or what emphasis, if in a history of a family I should say, "The child said at the end of supper, 'Give me the loaf, or the bread'?" The only emphasis is that it is the one they had to eat: that made it a particular object. So we should all feel the difference, if I said, "he spoke at breaking of bread," or "at the breaking of the bread." One refers to a common usage; the other gives a particular objective act. The Lord took bread, ἄρτον, or τὸν ἄρτον-the bread that was there. Κλάσας ἄρτον is the fact given; τὸ κλάσει τὸν ἄρτου is the specific act of the Lord's supper. (Acts 2:42, 46.) ἐν τῷ ἐπιστολῇ (1 Cor. 5) is clearly some letter known to them, to which he refers. The rest is matter of interpretation, whether the letter he was writing (which would perfectly answer to the words), or another letter, of which the Spirit of God has only preserved this.

I apprehend τὸ κτρώματι (1 Cor. 15:8) means the κτρώμα of the set-like one in comparison with them, and then the article is required. We say "the foot" (as being of a body), "the eye." He was τὸ κτρώμα of those mentioned. In John 8:7 τὸν λίθον is the stone supposed in the law spoken of. ὁ διδασκαλός (John 3:10) is equally simple; it is "teacher" in contrast with "scholar." We should say, as thus laying emphasis, "Are you the teacher of Israel, and yet do not know that?" Such a contrast always leaves out any other individuals who teach, or absorbs them all into one. In the expression "The foot cannot say," it would be feeble to say "a foot," and yet equally good grammar; a mere proposition to state, and not an idea which ought to be evident to the hearer, and hence emphasis laid on what gives weight to that idea. It is viewed as a part of a particular body; and hence, as in every such instance, it is a positive object distinguished from another.

## THE CASE OF PROPER NAMES

I will now examine a little the case of proper names; and then, for profitable use and further evidence, take some of the more important cases to which the doctrine can be applied in the Epistle to the Romans. I recur to John 1:6, ἡ νομα αὐτοῦ ὠνονήσ. Here it is evidently something referable to αὐτόν. ἔγενετο, as a verb of existence, gave the rest of the phrase the form of attributes of what existed; this, its name.

We might expect to find some apparent anomaly here, inasmuch as a name itself designates. But if this be carried in mind, we shall find the usual principles, namely, that where it has become an object (being named) in the sentence, it will take the article: where it has not, it will take none. In verse 15 he is named. Here he is not an object; he has his name as the one bearing witness: so in verse 17, Moses is a description of the giver of the law; Jesus Christ, of him by whom grace and truth came. In verse 19 we have an objective person introduced in a certain position before the Jews: he is the subject of the mind in the sentence. ὁ λαός points out the person, naming him for the first time here. (Ver. 21.) ὁ Χριστός is not properly a name-it is the long expected Messiah the Anointed. (Ver. 20.) ὁ σααός (ver. 23) designates the person again simply; whereas ὁ σααός would designate Isaiah as himself the object, not the mere name of a person who did something. In verse 26 ὠνονήσ again becomes a distinctive object already known: in contrast with the others, and in respect of his conduct, he is the subject of thought. So in verse 19.

In verse 28 Bethabara is just a name. ὁ ὀρθνός takes the article, as designating the river specially as an object: it is an idiom of all languages from the nature of the thing-an object, not a mere name. We say "the Thames," "across the Thames," though we say "across London"; so in French: the division of the country by a river, and the continuity of it, requiring an identification of the object, lead to this. I go forty miles, but it is still the same river, it is the Thames-the Jordan. The "the," or the article, gives unity or completeness as an object, to the whole course of that which would otherwise lose its identity to the mind in separate parts. This may be traced in many such objects, as oceans, tracts of country treated as one district. ὠνονήσ loses the article here: it is his name as acting merely, the acting itself being the object. In verse 29 Jesus is introduced as the positive object of the mind; so evidently is τὸ Ἰσραὴλ, verse 31; in 32, it is merely his name historically. In verses 35, 36, both John and Jesus are introduced as specific objects; so verse 38. In verse 41 ὁ ἰδρῶς is just a name, as ὁ Σίμωνος; so now again John as having spoken, and ὁ Σίμωνος; again showing that recent mention does not annex the article when merely historically named and not a definite object of the mind. It gives merely the name of his brother. In verse 43

Jesus is twice the object of the mind distinctly. The other names are evidently given as such characteristically. In verse 45 Philip becomes the object. It was the same Philip, this particular person; and the evangelist proceeds to give an account about him who had been just mentioned; but in the next verse, historically mentioned, he loses it: so Moses, so Jesus. Joseph has it as particularly marked to designate who Jesus was, and τῷ πάλαι Ναζαρεθ marks this distinctly. Ναζαρεθ, as a mere name, has it not.

Ναθαναὴλ is the only case peculiar here. (Ver. 46.) Who is he? Why is he thus designated as a special object? Not because he has been mentioned before, according to the ordinary rule, for he has not. As historically mentioned several times in the succeeding verses, he has it not. But, it is to be remarked, the article is designative. It is first in the mind of the speaker; it points out an object of thought to the hearer. Hence, when anything is such, it is used; though why it is only comes out afterward. Hence it is used anticipatively. So here Nathanael is the subject specially of what follows, and whenever spoken of has the article, though not when mentioned historically.

Galilee (chap. 2: 1) is a district on the same principle as Ἰορδάνου: the article gives unity to it as a whole. So Matt. 3:5.

This, which many minds might overlook (I mean as to names), has made the readings sometimes uncertain, and the presence or absence of the article is with the name a delicacy of thought, of which, as far as I know, Greek alone is susceptible. But, though in some cases a careless or inattentive mind, not bred in Greek thought, may scarcely see it, and the historical substance of the passage be no way altered by it, I think enough has been given to show that, while a name designating a person is, so to speak, an article, yet that, when it becomes an object of thought, it comes completely under the usual rule, and singularly confirms it. A name is evidently in itself either the designation of a person, or a mere attribute or character. Thus, when I say " John said," it points one to a person itself. If I say " His name was John," I attribute to him something characteristic. In neither case would there be an article. If I talk about John, as a subject in the sentence, this comes under the common rule of the objective article. In a rapid conversation, I apprehend the names might have it, having practically the force of μὲν, δέ. That is, replying one to another animatedly, they would be kept up as objects before the mind; when it returned to the historical account, they would drop it again. Such distinctions as these would evidently demand entering into the spirit of the author; but they form good writing and style. The presence of the article constantly with the name of Jesus would stand most clearly and evidently accounted for on the principle here spoken of. He may be named historically, of course, but He was constantly the subject and object before the inspired historian's mind—the central and chief leading figure in the scene, on which the eye was, and was meant to be, fixed. I suspect it will be found that Κερίος is often a name, when used in the New Testament—Jehovah; as Luke 1:16, πάλαι Κερίον τὸν Θεὸν ἀγατῶν. I doubt that it is simply conversion to the Lord, as characterizing conversion, but to Jehovah. But this would be a subject for inquiry in each case. So τοῦ μόνου Κυρίου λαῶν. It may be questioned whether it be ever otherwise than a name, when used by itself, and not coupled with the name of Jesus, or the like, so as to ascribe lordship to Him. If the first chapter of Luke be referred to, where there are many names, abundant confirmation will be found of the general principle.

Before noticing the peculiar cases in the Romans, I will state certain applications of the principle, one of which may, to many minds, bring out the principle itself more clearly. We have seen that the article, giving the object of the mind, necessarily gives the definite totality. This is true even of the plural: only that there the entire object is composed of parts, as ο μαθητα is all the disciples as one whole, but made up of many members. Now the evident consequence of this is that, when a noun does not embrace the totality but means only some, it cannot be such an object. It gives these some as characteristic of a class, so as fully to come under and verify the principle. The use of nouns after active verbs comes really under this head. When a nominative characterizes the action, it will be true of it, as of the accusative. Under this the historically used names and characteristic plurals come. Ποισατε αυτος φλους (Luke 16:9); κβλλω δαμνια (chap. 13: 32). But when it is a complete object it has: πθηκε τς χερας. So in singular, δοναι μν τν βασιλεαν, but δε λεημοσνην: so οα δ μν, Γραμματες κα Φαρισαοι: so προσηλθον ατ Σαδδουκαοι. On the other hand, συνηγμων δ τν Φαρισαων (Matt. 22:41) as a complete body of people in the mind, though, of course, all the individuals were not there. So τι τ μρος στ Σαδδουκαων, τ δ τερον Φαρισαων; then στεις τν Φαρισαων κα τν Σαδδουκαων, the body of them there. Σαδδουκαοι μν γρ.... Φαρισαοι δ, that kind of persons. (Acts 23:6-8.)

The same rule holds with the singular, where it requires more abstraction to see its force-these differences, however, English fully represents-because every one could understand the difference of " Sadducees hold so and so," and " Pharisees so and so 'ι-that is, that kind of persons. It is characteristic of any of a class. " The Sadducees " and " the Pharisees " affirm it as a fact of a whole class.

I now give instances of the singular when used as a nominative, which is the more difficult case. Περιτομ φελε: περιτομ, giving an actual object, would be either the fact of circumcision physically, or, by a figure, the whole class. In fact it means neither, but the state of circumcision-that condition or character; so κα περιτομ καρδας ν πνεματι.

Another remarkable example of this is δικαιοσνη γρ Θεο ποκαλλπτεται.... ποκαλλπτεται γρ ργ Θεο, a righteousness which is of God, a wrath which is of God.

Another case important to remark is a time which is characterized, and not given as a date, as μρς( κρσεως. It is not " the " day of judgment, that is, specifying a time; nor " a " day, as if there were many; but " in judgment day," as contrasted in character with men going on their own way without judgment. (Matt. 11:22, 24, etc.)

I turn to the Romans:-

Rom. 1:1-7. I do not know that this passage needs other notice than the remarkable confirmation it gives to the rule laid down. First a series of anarthrous words, attached as characters of the name of Paul; then Christ as an object, περ το υο ατο. Υο Θεο, verse 4, characteristic, has it not.

Verse 14. This kind of persons, not the body of persons themselves as an object.

Verse 17 is important. It is not " the righteousness of God," as a known theological object presented to the mind, but on the Greek article " righteousness " which is " of God." This is what

man wants, and what makes the gospel a subject of boast, not shame. It is not man's presented, or claimed, but God's revealed.

Verse 18. The same remark on ἡργία Θεοῦ-wrath from God; this characterizes the revelation. It will often be found that, when a second noun is the most important, and is characteristic, it gives its characteristic form to the other, and forms one characteristic idea. Here the whole expression, ἡργία Θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ characterizes the revelation; but when it is ἡ ἡργία, it must be τὸ Θεοῦ properly, that particular kind of wrath which belongs to that Being. The wrath is a wrath designated as an object, and then is of that Being- Himself an object therefore too. But if wrath characterizes the revelation, I add, as characterizing the wrath, Θεοῦ. Τὸ Θεοῦ would suppose some wrath (or other thing) objectively known, which was of that Being. Θεοῦ gives a character merely to some instance of the thing: a wrath (a kind of wrath) which is of God, was revealed.

Chapter 2: 4, ἐξ μετνοιαῶν. The character of the leading: actually it did not lead, ἐξ τῶν μετνοιαῶν.

Verse 5, τῶν σκλήρητῶν σου καὶ μετανῆτον καρδῶν: σοῦ gives, as in every case of a personal pronoun, the article; but I notice it as another case of the article with two nouns, completing the description of the one mental object, which accounts for μετανῆτον καρδῶν: τῶν μερῶν ἡργίας, etc., is the case already spoken of, a noun of time characteristic, not a date.

Verse 7. All the nouns characterize the seekers or the search. Ζῶν ἀντιον, the gift, as heretofore noticed.

Verse 8. Τὸς δὲ ἕξι ῥιθεῶς, καὶ πειθοῦσι μὲν τῷ ἡληθεῖ, πειθομένοις δὲ, etc.: several ideas completing the character of τὸς, as verse 5. But τῷ ἡληθεῖ is known revealed truth. There is a change of grammatical structure from ποδοῦσαι to ἵσταται.

Verse 9, τὸ κατεργαζομένου is attracted to ἡνθρώπου, but really governed by πῶσαν ψυχῶν, as παντὶ τῷ ἡργαζομένῳ (ver. 10), and denotes (as in all participles standing alone, with an article) an objective person or thing characterized by the participle.

Verse 12, ἡν ἡμῶν characteristic, evidently answering to ἡνομοῦς; so διῶν ἡμῶν.

Verse 18, τὸ ἡμῶν, the law, the law of Moses.

Verse.14, ἡθνη, characteristic, Gentiles; not the Gentiles, but such persons as they. They have no law-no such thing. Του ἡμῶν, the law known well to a Jew.

Verse 15. Note here the work (not the law) is written in the heart.

Verse 16, ἡτε κρινεῖ still only characterizes, so much as ἡμῶν κρῖσεως.

Verse 17, τῷ ἡμῶν presented as an object to designate the Jewish law. ἡν Θεοῦ characterizes the boast.

Verse 18, τῷ ἡλημα is remarkable as that will, namely of God, known only to a Jew; τὸ ἡμῶν the Jewish known law.

Verses 19, 20 are plain; they characterize what the man is.

Verse 23. In law, in having law. Thou breakest the law.

Verse 25, περιτομή has been noticed; νόμου, a law-keeper, a law-transgressor, characterizes the parties: ἡ περιτομή, the thing (σοφία also necessitates this).

Verse 26, ἡ κροβυστία, the class: ἡ κροβυστία ἀληθινή, the actual state of such a one.

Verse 27, διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς is character, διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβῆτην νόμου, is all characteristic of τὸν νόμον. I notice this, for it takes the article from νόμου, which otherwise would have it.

Chapter 3:5, ἡ δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην. This is a remarkable case. The first part is very simple; but the second, which seems the same grammatically, is changed by the sense. Our unrighteousness is a definite objective thing. Divine righteousness is characteristically opposed, not a defined object: τὸν ὀργῆν, the wrath implied in it. Whereas, verse 3, it is τὸν πιστὸν τὸ Θεοῦ, because there it is not an opposed characteristic quality, but the actual faithfulness already known and shown: the faithfulness of God-divine righteousness.

Verse 9. Jews and Greeks as characteristic classes, not τοῖς, the members of them.

Verse 11, ὁ ὅτι ἐστὶν (ver. 10) gives the ἴδιον to συνιέναι, and to ἐζητεῖν τὸν Θεόν. Not that one who, if there had been one, could have been pointed out objectively. As we say in English, There is not "the man living who could do it." This is a matter of style, and stronger than "a man," or συνιέναι, though both could be right. Hence we have (ver. 12) ὁ καὶ στίχοι ποιεῖν, which must be used here, because it is added, ὁ καὶ στίχοι νόμος ἴδιος. ἡ ποιῆται with this would have been out of place, for ὁ νόμος ἴδιος was said in that form already. Hence we have δικαιοσύνη ὁ ὅτι ἐστὶν, and ἡ κροβυστία.

Verse 17, ἴδιον, any way.

Verse 19, ἡ νόμος... τὸ νόμον, the known Jewish law.

Verse 20, διὰ νόμου, by law is knowledge of sin; ἔργων νόμου, by law-works.

Verse 21. Without law, any law, not the Jewish: τὸ νόμου, that particular known law. Also we have another example of a righteousness of God, of that character.

Verse 22. It is added that it is by faith of Jesus: that is the manner of it. Ἐστὶς πνεύματος, still characteristic, being of God: it is towards all in character; ἡ πνεύματος τὸς πιστεύοντας, actually on them objectively considered.

Verse 25. The question of τὸς before πιστεύω amounts to this: is it the character or manner of being a mercy-seat? or is it the faith in the person who comes? Both would be true. Ἐστὶς ἴδιος is the character of the thing. Ἀληθινή gives the article to δικαιοσύνης: διὰ τὸν πνεύματος was an actual overlooking.

Verse 26, πνεύματος, not here ἐστὶς, as it was not the immediate effect, but a result or object of the immediate effect, marked in τὸν νόμον κατὰ (compare Eph. 4:12), included in the completion of that aim: τὸν καὶ πιστεύω ἴδιος, one so characterized.

Verse 27. Διὰ νόμου cannot have the article, for it inquires what is the law. τὸν ἔργων makes it precise and objective: τὸ νόμου τὸν ἔργων, is it that of works? The article disappears in διὰ

ν■μου π■στεως. It was excluded in that manner-a faith-law. There was no particular known law of this kind to refer to; it was the character of the excluding power: so verse 28, law-works; π■σται, in that manner, what is called the instrumental dative, but which is practically adverbial, hence characteristic and not a specific object. We are justified is the object, π■σται is how, simply.

Verse 29. Of Jews only; that character of persons, not " the Jews "; so Gentiles.

Verse 30. More remarkably in περιτομ■ν, that state, not the Jews called ■ περιτομ■, though they are the people alluded to; but the apostle refers to the condition and character, not the people. Hence ■κ π■στεως, in that manner-■κροβυστ■αν δι■ τ■ς π■στεως, because (the justification being in that manner) the uncircumcision having actually faith, would be justified: hence faith, their faith, becomes a positive object to the mind.

Verse 31. Law, and again, law-not "the law." He did not establish this as a system; but he gave its full authority to law, in all its extent and requirement, by the doctrine of faith.

Chapter 4: 2, ■ξ ■ργων, in that manner.

Verse 5, τ■ν δικαιο■ντα, a person known and supposed as an object before the mind. This is the usual case of an article denoting a person or thing and a participle giving his or its character.

Verse 11 offers a peculiar construction: more naturally it would seem to be περιτομ■ν. Τ■ σημε■ον τ■ς would not do, as ση με■ον of anything would specially mean what indicated that thing, not the thing's being a sign; σημε■ον regularly has not the article after ■λαβε, as we have heretofore remarked. This, too, takes it away before περιτομ■ς. Δικαιοσ■νης gets it from the following words, which make it a positive objective thing, Περιτομ■ς is the character of the sign; but δικαιοσ■νης is a particular righteousness, characterized by the words which follow it.

Verse 12, πατ■ρα περιτομ■ς, his character; τοτς ■κ περιτομ■ς, one class so characterized; τοις στοιχο■σι το■ς ■χνεσι, another class so characterized, namely, believing Gentiles; τ■ ■κροβυστ■ςτ, that condition already spoken of.

Verse 13, δι■ ν■μου," not by law, but by faith-righteousness," or " righteousness [which is] of faith."

Verse 14, οι ■κ ν■μου, those who adopt this principle.

Verse 16, τω ■κ το■ ν■μου, as a fact, the Jews under the law; τω ■κ π■στεως, Αβρα■μ, of Abraham-faith, noticed before; not of the faith which he had, but of that kind of faith.

Chapter 5: 2, τ■ν προσαγωγ■ν. The difficulty of this phrase is as to which reason is the true one for the use of τ■ν. It might be that particular access there was by faith; but I suspect, from its use in the three places it is found in, that it is a technical word for admission into some favored place; as we say, " those who have the entree." ■π' ■λπ■δι τ■ς δ■ξης, and, verse 5, δι■ Πνε■ματος ■γ■ου το■ δοθ■ντος; these examples show that a preposition, with an anarthrous noun, can be used characteristically, though there be added that which depends on it as a positive object. ■π' ■λπ■δι; characterized the joy, but το■ Θεο■ necessarily makes δ■ξης a positive objective glory. So Πνε■ματος αγ■ου was the manner of the pouring forth in the heart, but, when spoken of as given, the objective person must be marked.

Verse 6, κατ' καιρον, seasonably: πρ' σεβν, for such characters: so verse 7, πρ' δικου, not for all the persons, but for such a character; whereas το γαθο points out in a special manner a remarkable person; as in English, " for the good man."

Verse 13, μαρτα. There was sin: μαρτα δ' οκ λλογεται is more obscure, but the obscurity arises only in an English mind. It is not reckoned to the person (the real force of λλογεται, Philem. 1:18) as sin; μντος νμου is clear. Indeed, the οκ more naturally takes the article away, as in general it does not admit an existing object, never in a general proposition.

Verse 15, ο πολλο is in contrast with ες: the fault does not rest in the individual doer, but involves the body connected with him.

Verse 16, ες κατ'κριμα, the characteristic tendency or bearing of it: so ες δικωμα.

Verse 18, rather by one offense, towards all for condemnation, having that character and bearing; so by one accomplished righteousness towards all for justification of life. It was the bearing that characterizes this accomplished righteousness. Life-justification expressed the bearing of this δικωμα.

Verse 19, ο πολλο again contrasted with ες, with which it is connected.

Verse 20. But the law, not law. " There entered "... what? "Law."

Verse 21, ν τ' θαντ', in that actually well-known present thing. Δι δικαιοσνης ες ζων ανιον, the bearing of the reign of grace.

Chapter 6: 4, θνατον takes the article, because it is an actual known thing about which they were speaking, into which they were baptized. In verse 3 ατο gives it necessarily.

Verse 13, πλα δικας... πλα δικαιοσνης, affirmed about τ' μλη. "As," in English, often best renders the anarthrous noun.

Verses 9, 14, θνατος and μαρτα are taken as names by reason of κυριεω.

Verses 14, 15. " Under law... under grace;" the state they were in, not the law.

Verse 16. All these words are characteristic, dependent on εαυτος already spoken of.

Verse 17, τς μαρτας, the plain moral fact, this thing; and note δολοι, characteristic of the persons spoken of in τε: τς μαρτας, that which the discussion had already introduced.

Verse 19, ες τν νομν, because νομα had been already mentioned, and it ended in that very ανομα. The first, with καθαρς, are abstract nouns in their moral totality; ες γασμν, the characterizing tendency of the δικαιοσνη to which they served. The remaining cases are easy from the principles stated.

Chapter 7:1. " Who know what law is "-not the law. νμος is put abstractedly here from the evident necessity of the argument; this thing, law, that we are speaking of. Το νθρωπου, the man we suppose to be under it, whom κυριεει.

Verse 2. " Is legally bound."

Verse 3, το νόμου, the law we are speaking of.

Verse 4, τὸ νόμου: the Jewish law, or law abstractedly; which is a question of spiritual interpretation.

[Up to this point it may be remarked that Χριστός and ἠσοῦς Χριστός never have the article, being used historically as the name of a person, not a proper subject of theological teaching.]

We have here then, for the first time, τὸ Χριστό; whence I judge that νόμος means the Jewish law, and that that well-known subject of Jewish theology, the Messiah, is contrasted with the law. There was the law and the Messiah, both well known, and having their proper respective αἴτιον: hence νόμος and Χριστός. It is not merely an historical person. τίς τίς righty translated " even to him; " τίς τίς τίς would be " to the other who;" but it is to another than the law-whom? " Him who," etc.

Verse 6. I judge ἐποθανόντες: compare verse 4.

Verse 7. " But by law."

Verse 8, " for without law." ἀμαρτία is, I apprehend, used exactly as a name from its use in a pithy proverbial saying, as in other exact languages like French, a short affirmation about a principle which does not stop to put an object before the mind. So, indeed, in German. See note on proverbial sayings at the end. See page 83.

Verse 21, τὸν νόμον.... τίς. This, or the law that.

Verse 25, νόμος Θεοῦ, ἀμαρτίας, is special, like δικαιοσύνη, ἔργον Θεοῦ. It characterizes the service; it is service to God-law, that is, divine law, or sin-law, that is, the state of the mind of me myself. It was not presenting one or other as a definite object, but explaining the state of the mind serving. It is a mind that serves God's law, a mind that serves sin's law."

Chapter 8:3. We may notice the character of Christ's mission. Περὶ ἀμαρτίας is not affirming that it was about certain sin, but that His mission was such, and, by a well-known phraseology, that this characterized His sacrifice.

Verses 4, 5, κατὰ σάρκα.... κατὰ πνεῦμα, their character, and principle of life and being. I notice this as showing that it does not raise the question of what Spirit, which the following words fully show to be the Holy Spirit Himself. So verse 9, ἐν σάρκι ἢ ἄλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, their state.

We will examine all the texts before going farther:-

## SPIRIT

Matt. 3:16. Clearly a definite object even of sight.

Chapter 10: 20. So here one speaking-not they.

Chapter 12: 28. The manner of casting out. Luke 1:17. Not the Spirit of God, but manner, " according to."

Chapter 4:18. A quotation of a prophetic title. It is the constant form of prophetic announcement. See Matt. 2:18; 3:3.

John 14:17. A personal object-one who was to remain with them.

Chapter 15: 26. The same evidently.

Acts 5:9. The Spirit of the Lord is a definite person presented. Κυρ■ου I take to be a name; otherwise it would be used, as the name of God may be, to characterize an object.

Chapter 8:39 first calls for special remark. And here, I doubt not, it is designed, in rapidity and abruptness, and intentionally, to drop the idea of the person. It is not as if the Holy Ghost as a person came and took him. He was rapt, not by man, nor by human means, but by the sovereign power of the Holy Spirit. This was the character and manner of his rapture. He was rapt in spirit from the eunuch's sight; hence it is only said, he was found at Azotus. The article is intentionally and expressly excluded. I do not think, when it is Πνε■μα Θεο■, or Κυρ■ου, God's Spirit, Jehovah's Spirit, that the object is to present a person, but a power, or agent emanating thence, as the spirit of a man. Many would call it a Hebraism; but I cannot accept mistakes on important points induced by Hebraisms.

Chapter 16: 16 is on usual principles.

Rom. 1:4. Evidently characteristic of how.

Chapter 8:2. The grammar is regular and ordinary as to sense. Though doubtless the Holy Ghost is really the power of it, the object is not to present Him as a divine person, but like Christ breathing that communication of life from Him which they had by and from a present Spirit. It was the power of life by the Spirit. Hence in John 20:22 there is no article. Πνε■μα ■γιον, the Holy Ghost, I doubt not, was there, but it was as more abundant life, and the power of it. It was not the Comforter sent. " He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. This comes out more importantly in chapter 8: 9 (compare ver. 10), where, though doubtless personally the Holy Spirit, it is spoken characteristically of the state. You are ■ν πνε■ματι, in that state, if such a Spirit dwell in you, namely, God's. If any man have not Christ's, he is none of His, so Χριστ■ς: ■ Χριστ■ς would be His person as an object: here He is a life characteristic of the person, and we get σ■μα and πνε■μα, two contrasted definite objects, and so with the article. The body is not the spring of living movement (it is held as to its living will to be a corpse), the Spirit is, to such a one.

On the other hand, in verse 11, we find the Spirit brought forward (necessarily) as a definite personal object, for it is on account of His being there that we are raised; so τ■ν Χριστ■ν. It is Christ who was personally raised; so our bodies, because of the Spirit of Him who raised Him dwelling in us. He could not, if such a one (even the Spirit of that life-giving power or being who raised the Head, Jesus) dwelt in us, leave us under death who were the members. Could the Spirit remain thus? It would belie His nature as the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus. But this is not characteristic; it is a living Being. Verse 14 characterizes the leading.

Verse 15, πνε■μα δουλε■ας is evidently characteristic, and a common case; so πνε■μα υ■οθεσ■ας.

Chapter 15: 19. The character of Christ's working.

1 Cor. 2:10. Here it is evidently a personal object, one acting. In verse 11, τ■ πνε■μα ■νθρωπου is marked out definitely as an object, and indeed personified. Το πνε■μα το■ Θεο■ is clear. In

verse 12 τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κοσμοῦ follows the ordinary rule, that when a genitive follows, it commonly marks out that particular case of the first noun, and hence is necessarily a definite object of the mind-not spirit, or any spirit, but the spirit of the world: so τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Chapter 3: 16. He is the personal inhabitant, and definitely presented as such, not characterizing a man, but one dwelling in a temple.

Chapter 4: 21. Clearly the character of his coming.

Chapter 12: 10 is plain. It is the kind of spirits: τῶν πνεύμων would have been some particular known spirits. Here it is the discernment what manner of spirits these were.

2 Cor. 3:3. The manner of writing.

Verse 17, ὁ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου, the Holy Ghost Himself personally. Κύριου, I suppose here, is a name; or else it is used to characterize πνεῦμα, τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου being as one word: in verse 16 πρὸς Κύριον, the direction in which it turns. But the Lord in question was actually the spiritual revelation of Him by the Holy Ghost, called τὸ πνεῦμα, verse 17; for there is not a setting aside of the person of the Holy Ghost, but often an introduction of Him into that in which He works. " The words I speak are spirit and life." " The letter killeth, the Spirit giveth life." But He is there, and there is liberty. ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν is then-that the Lord (Jesus) is the thought and mind of the Spirit referred to (ver. 6) -actually known in Christ, revealed by a present Holy Ghost; so verse 8. Verses 7-16 are a parenthesis.

Matt. 1:18. Evident manner with ἐκ. So verse 20, and chapter 3:11.

Chapter 4: 1, person objectively.

Chapter 5:3. Their spirit as men; rightly, in English, " in spirit.", Ἐν πνεύματι would have much rather referred to the Spirit of God, as chapter 22: 43.

Chapter 12: 31, 32. The person as an object.

Chapter 22: 43. The manner of his speaking. (Compare Mark 12:36.) There it is by the Holy Ghost, not the state of David, but the power by which he spake, that blessed person called the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 26: 41. Their spirit as men.

Chapter 27: 50. His spirit as a man.

Chapter 28: 19. A person objectively.

Mark 1:8. The character of the baptism.

Verse 10. The Spirit objectively. So verse 12; chapter 3: 29; and 12: 36. (Compare Matt. 22:43. See above.)

These cases are important as to the article with πνεῦμα, and confirm the doctrine as to the force of the article, the presence of which is no proof of its application to the Holy Ghost, nor its absence that it is not the Holy Ghost. As to this or man's spirit, it follows the usual rule.



Verse 52, πληρονο... Πνεματος γου.

Eph. 5:18, λλ πληροσθε ν Πνεματι.

This last, " by the power of." Were it " their spirit" as men, it would be, I am satisfied, τ πνεματι, the man's spirit, as an object, contrasted with the body.

So Matt. 26:41; 27:50; John 19:30; Matt. 5:3. So Mark 8:12 (with αντον however). So Mark 14:38. (I have no doubt also Luke 10:21; some editions add τ γ.) John 11:33; 13:21. Acts 18:5, " pressed in spirit" (that is, his, if we take the text in the ordinary version). Acts 19:21, " in his mind "; chapter 20: 22, " in his spirit within him." Hence Rom. 8:15, 16, the sense is plain; " Ye have not received a spirit of bondage, but of adoption, crying, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself (or Himself) beareth witness with our spirit." We have the nature, or character, of our spiritual condition; then the Holy Ghost; then our spirit, or inner man. Note, such statements may suppose (but do not touch the question of) the renewal of our natures, that it should be so. See 1 Thess. 5:23, where the use of τ πνεμα for the spirit of a man, contrasted with mere soul and body, is evident. See 1 Cor. 14:14, seqq.; we have the man's spirit distinct from his intelligence, the vessel of the action, or power of the Holy Ghost.

Note also, in connection with Θεο, Χριστο, Κυρου, there is an absence of the article, which is worthy of note. We have δικαιοσνη θεο, ργ Θεο, πνεμα Θεο, πνεμα Κυρου, πνεμα Χριστο: but in all these cases it is characteristic power, righteousness, etc., not an objective thing separately considered from God, but the nature of the person characterizing something else: a refinement of language which English hardly bears, though it does by using divine in some cases- " for wrath divine is revealed," " divine righteousness." In the case of spirit it does not. Θεο attached to πνεμα evidently characterizes the man's state contrasted with flesh.

2 Cor. 3:18, τν δξαν Κυρου I notice as again an instance of the remark above. See page 70.

π Κυρου πνεματος is, as regards our rule, the manner of the change. As to the passage, I should rather translate " the Lord the Spirit," perhaps more nearly conveyed in English by " the Lord in Spirit." Thus Moses looked at the Lord and was changed. We look at our Moses and see the glory of the Lord unveiled. We are changed into it thus as by the Lord. But it is only in spirit; that is, the Lord is to us known in the spiritual revelation of Him. It is really and solely (and indeed much more excellently) the revelation of the Spirit, whose presence and power is there, but as revealing (by which we know or see) the Lord. Compare verse 3.

Gal. 4:6. It is one crying,-a proper personal object.

Chapter 6:1 is the manner, and indeed means also disposition.

Eph. 1:17, a case already spoken of, δη. It was not the whole person of the Holy Ghost, as an object, that was given. What was given was a spirit of wisdom. Doubtless the power of this was the Holy Ghost. Chapter 4: 23 requires no remark.

Phil. 1:19. Here the Spirit objectively as a person, or at any rate as a power, working in him. The remarkable point as to the article in this case is, one article with the request and reply for its common subject,-τς μν δεσεως κα πυχρηγας. These two made up the means of its turning to salvation; they could not be separated in the apostle's thought.

2 Thess. 2:8 calls for no remark. It is an allusion to Isaiah governed by ordinary rules.

Heb. 10:29 does not either. The Spirit is specially set up as an object. The sin was worse by His being the Spirit of grace.

1 Peter 1:11. It was a personal Spirit working in them as an object, not of the Christ as a mystic head, but of that person as a name.

Chapter 4:14 calls for no remark but that it shows that it is not merely a state, but one who is pointed out who rested on them. Further, it distinguishes the Holy Ghost as the Spirit of glory and power on them, and the Spirit of God, or at any rate of glory: the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God; not two spirits, but distinct objects in the mind. If we read  $\delta\upsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ,  $\delta\epsilon\zeta\eta\varsigma$  and  $\delta\upsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  are the united character connected with the object;  $\Theta\epsilon\omicron$ , a distinct one. This reading, adopted by Scholz and Griesbach, I prefer.

1 John 4:2 calls for no remark. We see, what has been remarked before, that the Holy Ghost is spoken of in that in which He acted. The doctrine as to this is fully taught in 1 Cor. 12-the one Spirit that is in these various gifts. I say this, because of  $\pi\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$ , where it is taken as it stands, as a  $\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$ , in the man. Further,  $\pi$  cannot have the article, because  $\tau$  giving, as we have seen, the object in its entirety,  $\pi\ \tau\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$  would be all the Spirit, and the distributive  $\pi$ , every, cannot have the article.

No passage in the book of the Revelation calls for notice, as far as I am aware, unless chapter 11:11, where it follows the case which gave rise to this examination. This was what characterized what entered to set them on their feet-a Spirit of life. It was not to present the Spirit as an object, but what characterized this sudden event in its source. Here it would have been going too far to say,  $\tau\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\ \zeta\omega\varsigma$ , which would have amounted to a declaration that the Holy Ghost came and dwelt in them; but this was not the object, but merely that of God, this living power changed the whole state of things. It is not a spirit, as if there were many, nor the Spirit, as if it marked specifically the Holy Ghost. A spirit of life, or the Spirit of life, may either be used in English; the latter giving emphasis to life only, and so making it characteristic, and a leaving it indefinitely, with its force in life. (But in English more depends on emphasis of voice, or italics.) Neither represents the extreme and perfect accuracy of the Greek, specially from a in English being a special sign of distributive unity. It was a man, not a woman; or, it was a man, not two men. But we can hardly say, "spirit of life from God." So Luke 24:39. Here we have  $\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$ , "spirit hath not," a thing of that nature:  $\tau\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$  would have been evidently quite another sense, either from habit of scripture thought the Holy Ghost, or else the abstract idea-spirit (hardly, from the ordinary use of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$ , a legitimate expression); but the abstract idea would be quite out of place to affirm anything about. Hence "a spirit," or "spirit," is the nearest in English.

In Luke 1:35 we have a remarkable case of the absence of the article; but I judge, though no other than the Holy Ghost is meant, yet it is looked at as power characteristic of the act. So  $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ , as we have seen,  $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\eta$ ,  $\rho\gamma$ , and other cases. We have seen another case in the rapture of Philip (Acts 8:39; compare Acts 5:9), where the Spirit is personally presented.

So chapter 2:25: we have the principle of what characterizes in power the man; whereas, in verse 26, it is a revealing person. So in verse 27  $\pi\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  would have merely been his state when he came in:  $\pi\ \tau\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ , he came, led by the Spirit there, as I judge. So in chapter 4:1.

Chapter 11: 13 is the already noticed case of characterizing the gift.

So John 1:33 and Acts 11:16, the baptism. So John 3:5, the birth; chapter 4:24, the character of the worship; but this was by the Holy Ghost. In chapter 7:39 it depends evidently on ο πω... ν, on principles already stated as to a negative. There was no Holy Ghost yet (not therefore an object, its presence being denied). Chapter 11:33; 13:21; 19:30, have been already noticed-His spirit as a living man. We have then an important passage in John 20:22. Here it was not the Holy Ghost, come down as a distinct person as on the day of Pentecost, or (in 1 Cor. 12) distributing to every man severally as He will, but the communication of living power in connection with Jesus, which would act in them (in manner) as it acted in Him. It is not that it was any other than by the Holy Spirit; but as God breathed into Adam's nostrils the πνεμα ζωζ, and he became a living soul, so the Last Adam, who is the Lord from heaven, and a quickening Spirit, breathes into them, so that there should be communion of life, and they have life and spiritual energy through Him. Τον Πνεμα would have been, if we may so speak, the whole Holy Ghost in person; but then He would have been in such sort communicated and received. Sent He was afterward, and come He did; but then it was personally acting and willing.

Acts 1:2, 5 require no comment; it is the manner of the giving commandments, and of the baptism. On the other hand, in chapter 5: 9 the Holy Ghost is presented as a person to whom the lie was really addressed, and who was tempted (that is, wickedly put to the test), as if He could be deceived. For what was Peter? The Lord, or one, Spirit of the Lord, was there. Πνεμα Κυρου is taken as one title, Κυρου being really the name of Jehovah. It was not man's spirit they had essayed to deceive, but Jehovah the Lord's. This often gives an adjectival force to the words, God, Lord, etc., seeing they give the whole bearing to the nature of the thing they are thus affixed to, in a way which nothing else could.

1 Cor. 2:4. The whole passage is evidently characteristic of the preaching, and therefore no article is in it; and yet it is evidently the Spirit of God which is in question, in contrast with man. The same chapter, verses 10-12, presents a collection of cases, which, as very simple on the principles presented, require no remark, though confirmatory of them. We may notice τ πνεμα το κμου as presenting the case of the genitive following, as usually presenting a precise object and showing that τ does not involve a person, but the way in which the word is used. Verse 13 is most clearly the Holy Ghost in person, and yet there is no article, because the whole phrase is merely characteristic of these speaking.

Chapter 5: 3, τ σματι, τ πνεματι, objectively presented as in contrast, but not going beyond himself, as is confirmed by the next verse. So chapter 7: 34, where it has not the article, because it only characterizes the extent of the holiness. Verse 40 of the same chapter (7) is a remarkable case, but instructive. The aposde did not mean to say that he possessed the Holy Ghost objectively spoken of. So Acts 19:2. We have seen always that such an accusative characterizes the possession, or receiving; and the more especially, as in this case, the possession of the Holy Ghost was characteristic of the judgment Paul had given.

I notice chapter 12:3, 4, 7-10, only to remark the former as manner; the latter as evidently the Spirit as a person objectively, the force being otherwise the same. Compare also verse 11, where the personality of the blessed Spirit is so plainly and peculiarly stated, with verse 13, where the same Spirit is without controversy meant, but there is no article as being characteristic of the

baptism. The use of the article in this last case would have quite altered the sense; it would have been a distinct personal act of the Holy Ghost.

Another remarkable case is found in chapter 14: 14,16, if we receive the reading of many ancient manuscripts. The first is already noticed; he is speaking of his spirit under the power of the Holy Ghost, in contrast with his mind; but, this contrast existing no longer, he uses  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  as characteristic of the blessing spoken of. This reading, however, is not adopted by Griesbach nor Scholz.

2 Cor. 3:3 is a strong case of what characterizes  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\eta$ .

So verse 6: the character of the ministry; and  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$  is not the Holy Ghost as a person, but the  $\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$  he is speaking of, as an objective abstraction contrasted with  $\gamma\rho\mu\mu\alpha$ .

Verse 17 is the same, but in the close of the verse he changes to the power which gives it that character.

Chapter 6: 6. Rightly, I judge, translated " by the Holy Ghost." It has no article, as being the manner of approving himself as a minister of God. Compare the note to page 75.

Chapter 7: 1 is evidently the manner of defilement-not contrast as objects, but two ways of doing it.  $\text{Μολυσμο}$  is distributive, " every defilement," and so cannot have the article.

Gal. 3:2 demands notice, because after  $\lambda\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  it has  $\tau\omicron$ , which we have seen often wanting. But here it is not merely the characteristic of the gift, and a possession marking their state. It became important to mark out a well-known and all-distinctive object which was then amongst them, and therefore  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$  alone could be properly used.

In verse 3 we have  $\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ , characteristic of the manner of their beginning.

Verse 5 is governed by the evident reason already given.

Verse 14, it is a given promise of the Spirit-not receive " a promise," but " the promise " already made. So Eph. 1:13.

Chapter 4: 29 follows the common rule. Chapter 5: 17,18, afford illustrations which confirm the proofs already given.

Verse 25, " in the Spirit," hardly renders it. It is the character of our walk.

Eph. 1:17. The condition of the man characterizes the gift.

Chapter 2: 22,  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ , the manner of God's dwelling there; but it is the Holy Ghost Himself as in chapter 3: 5.

Chapter 4: 3. Rightly, " the unity of the Spirit," not " of spirit."

Verse 4 is really an impersonal use of the verb substantive.

Phil. 2:1. Rightly, I believe, " of the Spirit."  $\text{Ε}\tau\iota\varsigma$  necessarily precludes the article pointing to an object.

Col. 2:5, I should translate " in spirit "; the article contrasts it with  $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa$ .

1 Thess. 1:5. Rightly " the Holy Ghost." It is the manner of the gospel's presence.

So, verse 6, of the joy.

Chapter 4: 8. Here Πνεύμα ἅγιον has the article, however connected with δέντα, both as linked with αὐτό, and as necessarily presented in the argument as an object personally there, showing the gravity of the fault referred to.

1 Tim. 3:16. " In the Spirit" is difficult to understand: ἐν πνεύματι, the manner or character of the justification. ἐν has constantly the force of the virtue, efficacy, power of; and ἐν πνεύματι would be the power of the Holy Ghost.

Heb. 1:7. The translation is clearly right: τὸς ἁγγέλους is in sense equivalent to a subject; and " being made spirits " is affirmed about them.

Chapter 2:4 is a clear case of the manner of witness.

Chapter 6:4, μετῶν Πνεύματος ἁγίου. Here too I judge it characterizes their condition, like the cases of " filled with the Spirit "; not the directing the mind to the person of the Holy Ghost as a complete object. In passing, we may draw the attention of the reader to another noticeable case in this verse: γεύσασθαι with the genitive has the article τῶν. The heavenly gift, being to be tasted of, is necessarily presented as a definite object in itself; and this was the object of the apostle, contrasting the heavenly gift with what the Jews had had as such. It is not merely of such a thing, but of this as contrasted with the earthly. Whereas, when in the subsequent words they are nouns, qualifying with the verb their actual condition, they have it not, as γεύσασθαι καλὸν Θεοῦμα.

1 Peter 3:4. We have two adjectives with an article, as forming one character of spirit. The τὸ is at any rate necessary from the ἵσταν which follows.

Verse 18. I doubt not the reading which omits τὸ is the right. Σὰρκα and πνεύματι are not two distinct parts of one being contrasted as σῶμα and πνεύμα, but the manner respectively of putting to death and being quickened, that in respect of, or as to, which it so took place. Were the τὸ πνεύματι to be read, it would then speak of the person of the Holy Ghost, as the one by whom the resurrection took place. It is, at any rate, the Holy Ghost; but without the article it is the manner of the quickening, and does not draw attention to the personal power. Were it τὸ σὰρκα, τὸ πνεύματι, I should look at it as the spirit of Christ as a man which was quickened, which is quite foreign to the testimony of God: σὰρκα, τὸ πνεύματι would have looked at the Holy Ghost as an extrinsic agent. Σὰρκα, πνεύματι are flesh and spirit, as we have said, as the character of the two acts; although the divine character of the latter is undoubted in its power. Compare chapter 4: 6.

2 Peter 1:21. It is evidently the manner of their being borne along, though we know it to be the Holy Ghost.

1 John 4:6, I notice merely as giving an example of the transition (from undoubted example of the Holy Ghost and evil spirits personally) to the general idea of its effect or power in operation. Yet we have τὸ πνεύμα induced by the definiteness afforded by the genitives added, forming definite distinctive contrast.

And yet when the Spirit is spoken of by itself, then the article points out the Holy Ghost, because it is to the mind the well-known object whose presence in power distinguished the saints. So chapter 5: 6, where I apprehend the τ is added to δατι and αματι, not as reference to these words previously used without it as the manner of the coming, but in an abstract sense, as definitely presenting the thing in its nature to the mind. Verse 6 also shows how completely the Spirit so spoken of-if a multitude of other passages had not shown it to us- is in the mind of the church, then the Spirit known, dwelling, and acting among them down on earth. Thus, it can be said, " the Spirit is truth." No flesh, or fleshly communication, or wisdom, ever was such-only what the Spirit said or did. Truth and the Spirit were absolutely coincident terms. So John 7: " The Holy Spirit was not yet [given], because that Jesus was not yet glorified." And Acts 19, " We have not so much as heard whether the Holy Spirit is," that is, the one promised by John.

I have now noticed every case, having only not cited those evidently based on the principles explained and confirmed by other examples. I felt it worth while, on a point so important, and where the article so eminently affects the interpretation, to go through all the cases in the New Testament. The Revelation affords us no case which presents a difficulty, unless chapter 11:11, where it is not τ πνεμα τς ζως, as if it were some particular or well-known thing, but merely that which was such, had this character in its work in them (not exactly " a " spirit of life, which would imply there were several, nor " the," though that is better), " from God " giving it in English a general character: a certain power so to be characterized, acting in them from God.

I return to examine the cases occurring in the Epistle to the Romans.

Rom. 8:23, υοθεσαν characterizes their expectation, awaiting adoption; πολτωσιν the definite object fulfilled then, μν making this even necessary.

Verse 24, λπς βλεπομνη is the kind of hope, or characterizes such a hope as is no hope. It is one of many kinds, and thus characterizes the abstract idea. This is often the effect of an adjective or participle.

Verse 33. Against such as are this-κλεκτν.

Verse 35. Θλψις, etc., any of this kind of thing, such things as these; ς, as in verse 36, makes this use constantly very plain.

Chapter 9:4. All these are well-known particular things, presented as objects.

Verse 5. I do not doubt Θες applies to Christ. The only question is if there be not two designations: ν π πντων, and Θες ελογητς.

Verse 8, τατα τκνα. Τκνα is a regular predicate; το Θεο is a personal Being, and an object contrasted with σαρκς.

Verse 9. I have already remarked that this should be, " for this word is of promise."

Verse 22. Endured vessels of wrath, that kind of persons.

Verse 24. " Not only of Jews" (such kind of persons); so " of Gentiles."

Verse 30. " Gentiles," not " the Gentiles."

Verse 31. "A law of righteousness "-such a thing, not " the." So they did not attain to any.

Verse 32. " The stumbling-stone," not " that."

Chapter 10: 4. All this is descriptive of Christ; Χριστός all through is an historical name.

Chapter 11: 11, 12. A somewhat striking example: τοῦς ἠθνεσι is simple enough, but verse 12 πλοῦτος κέρμου and ἠθν is a strong example of characterizing the fall and loss.

Verse 13, τοῦς ἠθνεσι, ἠθν, the first, the actual people; the second characterizes the apostleship, that of Gentiles.

Verse 19. κλάδοι, Ψ branches," not ο, which would have been all or some mentioned before; κατὰ φύσιν, itself characteristic, marks these particular ones out, as objects, with τῶν (ver. 21).

Verse 22, χρηστῆτα καὶ ἰστομοχῶν, not abstractedly these qualities, but cases of it; divine goodness and severity; τῆ χρηστῆτι, the goodness spoken of.

Verse 24, τῆς κατὰ φύσιν... ἰγριελαίου; here again κατὰ φύσιν leads to the pointing out that olive tree, which, according to nature, was grafted into καλλιλαίον, a good olive; παρὰ φύσιν being here connected with ἠνεκεντρῆσης.

Verse 33, ἡ βῆθος I judge to be spoken of this example not abstractedly, though the ἡ may affect it. Τῆ κριματά... ἀῆδο " all his judgments and ways."

Chapter 12: 8, τῆ παρακλῆσει, that spoken of in παρακαλῶν: ἡν ἡπλήτητι the manner of giving. Verse 7 explains this clearly in διακονῆα and ἡ διδῆσκων.

Verse 17, κακῶν, any evil act, such a thing.

Verse 21, ἡπὶ τοῦ κακοῦ, the abstract thing; evil as contrasted with τῆ ἡγαθῆ.

Chapter 13: I, ἡξουσῆαις, things of this character, higher powers, not the higher.

Verse 3, οἱ ἡρχοντες, these rulers, whose existence he now supposes, so that he can point them out, or all rulers.

Verse 4, ἐκ τῆ ἡργῶν, " for wrath "; this character of dealing; but (ver. 5) διτῶν ἡργῶν, the wrath just spoken of, or abstractedly.

Verse 5, διτῶν συνεδησιν, an express object here, because in contrast with τῶν ἡργῶν.

Verse 8, ἡμὸν πεπλήρωκε, " has accomplished law," that is, whatever law can demand.

Verse 10, πλῆρωμα ἡμῶν is a regular predicate; τῆ πλῆρωμα would have made it reciprocal.

Verse 12, τῆ ἡργα τοῦ σκῆτους, all the works which belong to the darkness which the night implies. Rather it is abstract, as opposed to φωτῆς here, and not to be taken alone.

Chapter 14: 9, " Both of dead and living "; these two kinds of persons. I note in passing, that I little doubt chapter 16: 25 -27 comes in at the end of this chapter, as some affirm.

Chapter 15:2, ἐκ τῆ ἡγαθῶν is emphatic as abstract good contrasted with mere self-pleasing, and specially set before the mind as an object; for good, ἡγαθῶν, being abstract, οἱ κοδομῶν

merely characterizes the conduct by the actual thing sought: that which was good was in his mind; he should act for edification. Compare Eph. 4:12.

Verse 7, ε■ζ δ■ξαν Θεο■, the manner of reception.

Verse 8, περιτομ■ς, not of the Jewish people as a body, but on this principle.

Verse 12, ■θν■ν, ■θνη, are remarkable; but it is over this class of persons, not Jews. It is a quotation from the LXX.

Verse 18 gives a notable example of anarthrous words, describing the manner of Paul's work.

Chapter 16: 1, τ■ν ■δελφ■ν ημ■ν points out the person and is objective: as in every analogous case, ημ■ν requires it. They would not know which Phoebe else; it points her out as contrasted with other Phoebes: the ο■σαν itself gives a mere quality to δι■κονον. But τ■ν δι■κονον, if indeed admissible, or

τ■ν δι■κονον, would distinguish her by this quality from others at Cenchrea, and make her the only δι■κονον there. Ο■σαν δι■κονον is a quality and character she had (there might be others), and hence has no article. So verse 3, το■ς συνεργο■ς μου.

In verse 7 we have το■ς συγγενε■ς μου κα■ συναιχμαλ■τους μου, two common qualifications of these persons which marked them out. Hence the first has the article, as in every other case, the second not, according to the rule amply discussed, as making up with the other the complete amount included in το■ς.

Verse 17, τ■ς διχοστασ■ας κα■ τ■ σκ■νδαλα, all the divisions and offenses that might be. The article gives completeness and extent to the idea. Without the article it would have merely characterized. The men cause divisions; any, be they what they may.

Verse 26, δι■ τε γραφ■ν προφητικ■ν, "by prophetic writings." That character of writings was the means of making it known, not "the scriptures of the prophets."

Here I close. Enough has now been given to show the use and application of the article, which is in itself perfectly simple. To my mind it is fully confirmed and proved. I trust it may be the means of throwing light upon, and giving the full force and character to, many passages of the blessed word. The importance of the subject of the Spirit, and specialty of that case, will render the full examination of every instance, I hope, useful.

## PROVERBIAL EXPRESSIONS

There is a class of expressions to which it may be well to allude-short, pithy, or proverbial sayings, which, in many languages, make exception to ordinary grammar, and only claim a metaphysical explanation. It would be said in French, " Chat echaude craint l'eau froide"; "force lui fut"; in German, " Unwissenheit und Unschuldigkeit sind Schwestern." It is not merely, I judge, the rapidity of expression which give occasion to it, or not always, but a peculiar state of mind which takes up the thought characteristically, but neither abstractedly nor objectively; and it becomes, though an appellative noun, a kind of proper name. It is a way of putting it stronger than a mere descriptive statement. The object is so present to the mind that it does not require an article of any kind. Hence in prophetic oracles we have it, φων■ βο■ντος. As in English, if the Queen were coming,

the cry would be, " Queen! Queen!" it characterizes what produces the impression, gives a reason for the effect produced or intended to be produced: so in 1 Thess. 2:5, Θεός μάρτυς, which stated historically, Phil. 1:8, is μάρτυς γὰρ μοῦσιν Θεός. This is not perceived so much in English, all abstract nouns being without the article in whatever way they are used, and names never having it. The definite article is allusive or distinctive. But proverbs are in their nature characteristic.

## Sanctification and Justification

---

The main point is met completely by the expression in 1 Peter 1, " Sanctified unto... the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." We are born again to have a share in the value of Christ's blood and work. When the things are named together in scripture, sanctification is before justification. Ordinary language is very different. Righteousness is not so put, because it is the foundation of God's dealing in blessing with us, and bringing us, by that regeneration which sets us apart for Him, into the full acceptance of Christ. Grace reigns through righteousness. There is practical progress then in holiness.

The use of John 6 goes somewhat farther and differently into the matter. Chapter 5 had presented the Son of God as quickening whom He would. In the latter, it is sovereign life-giving; in the former, it is appropriation by faith, and this of the Son of man (that is, the Lord come in flesh). Hence He is the bread that cometh down from heaven. But it is not the Christ to the Jews, received as born on earth, but the Son of man (the Word made flesh) giving life to the world. He must be received in this character; and to receive Him in this character, in which alone is life, we cannot stop short of His death. We must eat His flesh and drink His blood. This is His death-the blood separate from the body. Incarnation is of no avail for life unless death comes in: otherwise there is no atonement, sin is not put away. " Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Eating the flesh comes first, because it is the first prominent point of incarnation-Christ come in flesh for man, for the world. Drinking the blood is added because this is available as a dead Christ-the blood out of the body. Hence the monstrous character of the refusal of the cup in Romanism, as well as the doctrine of concomitancy (that is, that the blood is in the bread or alleged body of Christ). The forbidding of blood in the Old Testament denoted that man in the flesh could not meddle with death. Life belongs to God. Our drinking Christ's blood shows that through His death we come in freed from flesh as dead; and that death thus is life and liberty to us, deliverance from the old man and its guilt too, to us who have received the quickening of John 5.

## The Force of "the Last Day" in John 6

---

As regards John 6 the Lord is, to me, evidently substituting a blessing in resurrection to any royal Jewish blessing. Owned the prophet, and refusing to be king carnally, He goes up alone on high, and the disciples are sent away alone, toiling on the sea (a Jewish remnant strictly), and arrive as soon as He rejoins them; but He is fed upon in humiliation and death, in the interval, and hence to such the blessing comes in resurrection: he (that is, the believer) will be raised up in the last day. Jesus will not bless him as come down here before giving him his portion where He is gone up in the power of everlasting life The last day is in contrast with their present blessing as king. The last day is never the day of the Lord, save in the vague sense that it embraces all the closing period, which is its true force. He does not come and set up the Jews, but the Father draws, and a man comes to Him, and the way He blesses him is in the power of eternal life, raising him up when the close of all this busy and rebellious scene arrives; that shall be his portion in the last day, not Messianic security now.

## John 15:7, 16

---

In speaking of abiding, it will be remarked that when final exclusion is spoken of, it is never " ye " but " a man; " when " ye," it is responsibility and privilege and not exclusion. The union is viewed as ostensible and fruit-bearing on earth. It is not the Church viewed as in heaven in its union with Christ. In that union as such we are perfect. There there is no pruning nor planting a vine to bring forth fruit nor casting fruit. The branches here spoken of may be so united; some are, no doubt; but it is not in this point of view they are looked at. The Lord speaks of Himself and of the branches of the vine already, when He and they were on earth. In Church-union the head is in heaven perfected there. We have to look then for responsibility, fruit-bearing, and privileges suited to that. Verse 5 speaks of one's abiding in Christ and Christ in him, but first of abiding in Him because it is responsibility. Christ then abides in him practically and he is fruitful. So Eph. 3:16, 17. Verse 5 addresses itself to the great fundamental principle and way of blessing; verse 7 to the connected means by which it is practically available. " If ye abide in me " remains always the ground-dependence, confidence, and intimacy, dependent connection with Christ in thought and will, the being attached to Christ and dwelling in Him as one from whom we draw all; but in practical realization of this there are two means-the words of Christ and prayer. This verse tells us the measure and way of blessing through these, assuming the fundamental ground of abiding in Him. If Christ's words abide in us-if the mind, and thoughts, and will be always directed by, and have their motive and spring in, the words of Christ, then we are met in everything we ask. All that is needed to make good that will, we ask as we see it to be so needed. We dispose of divine action in that case for asking. We are vessels of His will in dependence. His words forming our will and mind, whatever we ask is done. It is not merely that He meets us by His power Himself, but He would have us have intimate confidence in exercise; and, if we are dependent on Him, know that every request is met. I can, being set in the way of His will by His holy and perfect words, dispose of circumstances in that path, get the strength needed, difficulties removed-in a word, what I will. This last is very striking; for while it is indeed as formed by His words, yet as so formed, having His mind, I am in that liberty of action which thinks of all that suits the case and gets it. We are called by this phrase to a place of wonderful free power in service, though the will in that freedom be formed by Christ's words: but we are active agents under God as to all agencies and circumstances. Hence this is for the purpose of bearing much fruit. So are we His disciples, for He bore much fruit.

From verse 11 (indeed 9, 10, form a preface to this), the disciples are looked at in another point of view-not as abiding in Christ as branches in the vine, but as individual persons whom He has loved and was laying down His life for as His friends, whom He had chosen and sent forth. They were to be left, and, when He was gone, to love one another as He had loved them (that is, when amongst them and in dying for them). He has now chosen them and appointed them that they should go forth and bring forth fruit, and their fruit abide, as indeed it does to this day. In this position of fruit-bearing and service as His chosen ones, they would ask of the Father-being thus placed now where Christ had been in relationship with the Father whose name He had revealed

and with whom He was now placing them in direct relationship-and He would give it. This relationship with the Father, when He left them, is the groundwork of this part of the chapter. Hence He says not " my words," but whatsoever I have heard of my Father-so what they ask of the Father. Hence also it has the character of gift to the children; not a work being done and circumstances disposed of. Verses 17-20 fully show that, in the mind of the Spirit, there is the taking of Christ's place in service by the disciples here below; hence a putting them in direct relationship with the Father as He was, and so they would have His joy.

But the first thing was before even they were thus left, their connection with Christ Himself as the branches in the vine, His mind guiding them, and then all done that they asked for. Hence the person asked is not spoken of in verses 1-7. As abiding in Christ, and His words abiding in them, they disposed of all active agencies. It is this great fact which is before us. They might have asked Christ on earth; they might ask Him now, as having all power in heaven and earth, to act in the exercise of His lordship, and as Son over His own house for the good of that house. But in verse 16 they have to do with the Father, and look to a Father to give. The " that whatsoever " depends on " I have chosen you and established you that," etc. But the " that ye should go... that your fruit should remain " is an integral and essential part of the ground on which the privilege is founded. I have chosen you for this and that and this, that whatever ye ask. Having this place by My desire, such will be your relationship and privilege with the Father. The Father being now introduced, and they placed in relationship with Him, Christ being gone, their requests were necessarily in Christ's name or they were nothing. During His life, they had never done this. " Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name "-"Ask and ye shall receive that your joy may be full." So here verse 11. (Compare John 11:22.) The name of Christ was their whole title, and an effectual one.

## Greek Particles and Prepositions

---

### Preface

The following notes on particles and prepositions were the fruit of private research for private use in studying the New Testament, so that the reader must not expect anything of a complete treatise on the subject to which they apply; and, perhaps, he will find sometimes what may not satisfy his judgment as to the metaphysical connection of the literal with the moral sense of a word. But when it was merely the question of using one's labors, undertaken in and for his own New Testament studies, for the service of others who may profit by the labor without adopting all that is said, he could have no objection to their being printed. The reader may learn how many nice points of meaning there are in the use of these words, and may use these notes to come to a more just appreciation of the force of words and shades of meaning than the notes themselves can furnish. As a help to his further labors he may find them useful. They are in no sense offered as anything complete or final. They were formed in bond fide noting down the remarks and fruits of private research for private use. The reader can profit by them and draw his own conclusions. They will, at least, supply a pretty large index to the New Testament use of these words, and raise questions for inquiries which the paper itself may not solve. One only can guide us into truth and the mind of God in His word.

### GREEK PARTICLES

■ν expresses what is hypothetical possibility. When the ground of hypothesis is stated before, it is accompanied by the indicative; the consequence is asserted as a fact: it would so happen in that case, μετεν■ησαν ■α, Matt. 11:20, 21; so chap. 12:7, and often. When the possibility or hypothetical case is stated in the verb to which ■ν belongs, the verb is in the subjunctive, as ■ς ■ν πολ■ση, ■ως ■ν επω, ■πως ■ν φαν■σι, ■ς γ■ρ ■ν ποτ■στ■. As to time, 1 Cor. 11:25, ■σ■κις ■ν π■νητε, that is, whenever they did do it, the doing it being uncertain. So as to place, Mark 9:18, ■που ■ν καταλ■βη, wherever he did, but the taking him was occasional and uncertain; ■που ■ν κηρυχθ■ (Mark 14:9), the preaching was incidental.

■ν means, I think, in that case, ever, every, (immer). ■■ν is practically ε■ ■ν. Hence, when ■ν (if not to be read ■■ν, which always has the subjunctive, as uncertain) leaves the act uncertain or not accomplished (cases of time ■χρις ο■ ■υ θ■, 1 Cor. 15:25), it has the subjunctive. Where the act is assumed or done, ■ν is still ever, but the verb is in the indicative. Thus, Mark 6:56, ■ιτου ■ν ε■σεπορε■ετο ε■ς κ■μας, because it is an assumed fact. He went into the villages, had gone into them, when they wanted to touch Him; but κ■ν ■ψωνται, uncertain whether they could. Then ■σοι ■ν ■ποντο, where it is the fact; but Matt. 10:11, ε■ς ■ δ' ■ν π■λιν ε■σ■λθητε, because it was a future uncertain possibility. So Luke 9:57, James 3:4, Rev. 14:4, Mark 14:9, "wherever he went" may be ■ν, but indicative; "wherever he might go," ■ν, with subjunctive. The same rule applies to time as to other cases; if the hypothesis is stated previously, the verb with ■ν is in the indicative, as Matt. 11:23, "they would have remained" ■μειναν ■ν. Otherwise, as a future is not a fact, it is in the subjunctive, ■ως ■ν θ■, and a multitude of cases. Is not its real force ■ν■, each,

every one? As we say, whoever, whosoever, and, in German, immer. The fact and non-fact is more plain in cases of time than others, though the principle is identical. "Till it come," "it remains till." The first is non-fact, the second fact, though based on an hypothesis, but if-then the fact is so. Finally, if the hypothesis precedes, ■v has the indicative. So without an hypothesis (Mark 6:56), where it is connected with an assumed or actual fact. It answers to the English ever, and affects style: "as many as ever I could," that is, "every one I possibly could," it is possibility.

■παξ, ■φ■παξ, once, and once for all, or all at once, on once, auf einmal, at one time, as we say, at once. It is not merely that he did it, or it happened once, but that all that is in question is brought into that once; "Five hundred saw him at one time." "He entered in, ■φ■παξ, into the holy place." It is not that He once did it, ■παξ, but that, not like the high-priest, who repeated his entrances, the work not being finished, Christ did it once for all. It was all summed up and complete and enduring in effect on that one entrance to stay there. So "of His offering the same; so Rom. 6:10, it is not merely that He did it once, not twice, but that all His dying to sin was in that act, and that it was absolute, complete, and final; He had no more to do with it. It was all done then in that act and completely. We reckon ourselves to have died, and once for all too, have no more to do with it. ■παξ is simply once, not twice; only it is used (as in English) for a past time which has not continued. "You once knew this; "once delivered".

■πα is not o■v, a consequence drawn, but resumes what has been gone through and gives its real force, assuming its truth as a witness of something which follows. Hence, it is often accompanied by o■v, so then it always, I think, gives the idea of this being so; or if a question, is it indeed so that? Thus, Matt. 12:28. It was not o■v, therefore, but "then, this being so, the kingdom of God is come to you." So Matt. 7:20, ■ραγε, γε strengthening the consequence, thus then surely {also ja), Rom. 10:17. So in questions; only it often takes its force from what is passing in the mind, the tacit assumption of facts or statements, as Matt. 18:1, τ■ς ■ρα με■ζων, that is, "Seeing there is a kingdom, and you say it is going to be set up, and you say such and such things concerning it, Who is to be greatest in it?" So Luke 12:42, where it is given occasion to by Peter's question, which is not meant to be directly answered, and the ■ρα refers to the Lord's whole conception of the condition of the servant. Compare Matt. 24:45, where the Lord evidently answers what is passing in His own mind. In Luke 1:66 the antecedent circumstances are evident. So chapter 8:25. In Luke 22:23, "since some one would," "it being so- T■ς ■ρα?" It is less evident but the same sense in chapter 11: 48, "you being what you are, and doing what you are, ■ρα μαρτυρε■τε." With ε■ it is uncertain possibility under the circumstances; still "this being so:" hence it increases the improbability of ε■, Acts 8:22, 17: 27. Rom. 5:18, ■ρα o■v "therefore, this being so"; Rom. 8:1, "This being so, there is none "; and Rom. 14:19 is the same. In 1 Cor. 7:14 it is elliptical, "if it were as you say, and you had to leave the husband or wife "; but the force of ■ρα is the same. 1 Cor. 15:15, "if indeed it be so." Gal. 3:7, in the sense is the same. It is the application in proof of what has been said, "This being so," etc. The other cases are all simple, indeed all are, when once its proper force is seized.

Γ■ρ requires a little more mental attention. Its simple meaning is an illative for, a reason for what precedes, not a cause but a "because." But it is very often indeed a resuming of a series of thought in the writer's mind, and is no inference from what precedes, but a new statement of the case from facts or thoughts in the writer's mind. The same point is proved, but the yap or inference does not refer to what has been stated, but to what is in the writer's mind, and this confirming the

general thought. A singular case of this is in Matt. 1:18, where the matter is wholly in the writer's mind, and he has only said " thus ": so that all that follows with yap is the explanation of ο■τως. This is an extreme case perhaps; but this use of γαρ is very common with the apostle Paul, and we should not seize his meaning without seeing it. Thus Rom. 1:17 is a simple plain inference or reason: " he was not ashamed of the gospel, for it was the power of God unto salvation." But in verse 18, γαρ has not this direct force, but begins a long series of proofs of what made that gospel necessary; and the point laid down in verse 17 he returns only in chapter 3: 21. But it all bears on that, and is what his mind goes through to prove the point. It may be filled nominally by an ellipse, as " (and I have these thoughts and can show the value and necessity of this righteousness, and that this is the only possible righteousness), for the wrath of God is revealed," etc. This is very common with Paul. You have both again in Rom. 5:6, 7; the simple use in verse 10; the resumed new proof of what was in his mind in verse 13. So, I believe, in verses 16, 17, for the first part of these sentences is clearer as a question; so, in verse 19, he is proving his general point, not what precedes. So in chapter 7: 14, where, as in many cases, the connection is so obvious that it creates no difficulty. But in chapter 8:2, 3, we have two distinct new grounds of argument which prove the main point of what he is at, in connection with what precedes, but not the proof of it. You could not say, in verse 2, ■τι or δι■τι, which " for " in English often answers to. It aids in proving the general point, but by a collateral testimony. One is delivered from the whole condition and element to which condemnation applied, and is introduced into another to which no condemnation can apply; he is in Christ, not in the flesh. Verse 3 is another and additional point to prove it. Still chapter 6 had shown one, and the end of chapter 7 the ■δ■νατον of the law. These verses 2 and 3 resume the whole results, and describe the condition of the man in Christ which had not been spoken of in these chapters. The delivering power of life in Christ is the force of verse 2, and what Christ had done before we are in Him (or God in and by Him as to the flesh) in verse 3. The same reference to the result in his mind is in chapter 8:18, We are not glorified together because he reckoned. He illustrates the state of thought which expressed it by a new series of thoughts. This ground for the question in the thought of the speaker is common in interrogation. Matt. 27:23, τ■ γαρ κακ■ν ■πο■ησε: " I ought not to condemn him," or " why do you seek it? for," etc. Acts 19:35, " Who is there? " " Your judgment about Diana is incontrovertible, for who is there among men? " John 7:41, μ■ γαρ ■κ τ■ς Γαλιλα■ος ■ Χριστ■ς ■ρχεται, " it cannot be as you suppose, for does," etc. It is not that a positive thought is formed in the mind, to which the question refers, as I have filled up the ellipse. It is vague, but assumes to negative doubt, or reject some consequence, by the question which proves it cannot be. " Who then doubts that Diana is great? " His object is to prove them wrong in making an uproar, for, etc.; in demanding Christ's life, for, etc.; in pretending Jesus to be the Christ, for, etc.; and this is put as a question which by its certain answer settles it.

But γαρ has certainly the sense of indeed, even, immo, perhaps λι; as Acts 16:37, ο■ γαρ no indeed. The connection with its usual force may be seen perhaps in 1 Thess. 4:10.

In Acts 2:15, ο■ γαρ is not " for," I suspect, but " these indeed are not, as you suppose, drunk, for "- " these are in no way."

So with κα■ γαρ has the sense of even. It cannot have the sense of for, save very elliptically: "yet you may still do it, for even the dogs," etc., Matt. 15:27. In John 7:41, yap has the force of indeed, but with a question as above, denying it thus; but its force is indeed. Again, 1 Cor. 9:10, δι' ■μας γαρ, " indeed, surely, even, for us." James 4:14 again helps us to the connection of the two

sentences. We must say even, perhaps; but the reason is given why it is the weak thing which the question supposes-" it is as nothing, for it is a vapor ": but if we do not supply the ellipse, we must say "indeed," "even." Acts 8:31, "I cannot do so, for how should I be able," etc.; but again with the ellipse, we must say, " how indeed should I? " And in this use of it, I do not see, however unusual, it may not be **■ γ■ρ ■κε■νος**, Luke 18:14, " than surely that other one," yap being merely increased affirmation, as **λι** in Hebrew, or "ja " in German, or immo. It was left out as difficult in some mss.; rather, yea, than that other, for the other thought himself so. In Rom. 3:2, we have **πρ■τον γ■ρ**, first indeed, first surely, etc., chapter 15: 27, **ε■δ■κησαν γ■ρ**. Again, " they were pleased indeed "-the mind stops, says, " no doubt." It is the more striking here, for in verse 26 we have **ε■δ. γ■ρ** in the usual sense of for. If the force of **γ■ρ** be the mind stopping and affirming anything, inasmuch as, indeed, it being so that, which is the reason for what is spoken of, or what is in the mind, to which the previous part referred. Then **■ γ■ρ ■κε■νος**, Luke 18:14, would be, " than, whatever people may think, that [other] one " " than, yes surely, that other." So Acts 16:37, " Nay, whatever they may pretend to, let them come! " " Nay, surely not." So in 1 Cor. 9:10, Acts 4:16, **■τι μ■ν γ■ρ**, for then indeed, or for indeed, for that indeed, etc. Rom. 3:2, **πρ■τον μ■ν γ■ρ**, first then indeed, first indeed. In 2 Cor. 12:1, we have a special use of it: " Well (**δ■**) it is not expedient for me to glory, I will then now come," etc. 1 Cor. 11:22, " have ye not then? " **κα■ γ■ρ** has essentially the sense of since, literally for even. It gives a confirming proof, as **κα■ γ■ρ Γαλιλα■ος ■στιν**, Luke 22:59 Cor. 5:7 Cor. 13:8, since, or for, for even if, since if. Matt. 15:27, Mark 7:28, for even, or since.

**Γε** does not present much difficulty, though not easy sometimes to put in English. Its general idea is at least, at any rate, Luke 11:8; 18:5, where we may say yet, only it is feeble; so with **κα■**, Luke 19:42, even, at any rate, at least; 1 Cor. 9:2, " at any rate I am to you." Sometimes even is the best, in the same sense substantially. Acts 2:18, Rom. 8:32, the latter **■ς γε**, where (ja in German) even is right, but cold; not even better perhaps. Acts 2:18, **κα■ γε**, yea even, or yea by itself, or yea on the very. **■λλ■ γε** is more difficult, Luke 24:21. But then, he stops his account of what He was when alive, with " but then there is this," " in spite of all this," " too," " into the bargain," " this, at any rate, has taken place." Acts 8:30; "do you, at least then, understand as you are reading (**■ρα**), do you at least (**γε**) understand it." Acts 11:18, " then indeed," " these things being so, doubtless God has given the Gentiles life," " certainly without question," which is the force of " at any rate," affirming that, in spite of ail that might be alleged, it was so; or whatever might be of other cases. 1 Cor. 6:3, " but indeed things of this life," " not at least things of this life," such as these at any rate cannot be excluded if we are to judge angels. These are all the passages, found only in Luke or Paul's writings.

**■λλ■, πλ■ν, δ■**. The force of **πλ■ν** as a preposition is simple, besides, except, but only in Mark 12:32; John 8:10; Acts 8:1; 15:28; 27:22. These I believe are all we have; **πλ■ν ■τι**, Acts 20:23.

**Δ■** is distinction, not opposition, a second thing,-**■λλ■** is opposition. **Δ■** may be often translated " now," as Matt. 1:18. It supposes some thought to have been in the mind if not expressed, and goes on to what follows: **■λλ■**, as **sondern** after a negative in German, is in contrast. So Rom. 7:7, " no, I do not say that, but I do say that," etc. **Δ■** admits what precedes, but adds or modifies. There is difference but no opposition. It carries on the sentence to another element of thought, another, but carries it on. Mark 5:33, " but the woman being afraid." Mark 9:50, " Salt is good, but if," etc. Sometimes there is more contrast, but it is as if **μ■ν** were there. Acts 22:28, **■γ■ δ■**. But

you may generally translate " and " without altering the sense, as Rom. 2 We say, " I do one thing to one, and another thing to another "; if I say " but," it brings in mere opposition: but in English the opposition lies in the sense, even with " and "; in Greek it is expressed by δ. Δ is a continuation of the same reasoning, a completing it, though the subject matter may be opposed. So Matt. 12:26-28.

λλ negatives the thing it is in contrast with: δ connects them in reasoning, though it may be the converse, or distinct, " not in circumcision, λλ' in uncircumcision," Rom. 4:10, Mark 9:8, " they saw no man, λλ they saw Jesus "; chapter 14:29: Rom. 3:31, "λλ, on the contrary, we establish"; and chapter 5:14, " sin is not imputed,"-that is true-" but death reigned." So Rom. 8:37, referring to verse 35, " on the contrary ": 1 Cor. 3:2," not only do I say this, λλ' οδ, on the contrary ye are not even now." In 1 Cor. 9:12 we have it twice: the second is evident contrast, the first we have got the power but, etc., in contrast with the natural effect of having it. It is less evident in 2 Cor. 8:7, but is just a beauty of style. It is as much as to say, " It is as if I doubted of this, and therefore sent Titus. It is not that, but what I want is, that you," etc. Eph. 5:24, λλ is sometimes used when it is a setting aside a current of thought in the mind to substitute another; so it is used, I take t, here. So 2 Cor. 11:6. It gives force simply to style, as in 2 Cor. 7:11," yea " is well enough, "ay, not only that but."

Πλ is always an additional thought that comes into the mind: "Moreover," "but then I add." It is not "but" or " and," but " moreover ' though the sentence may not bear the word in English, Matt. 11:22, 24, " I add, moreover ": so chapter 18: 7. So Luke 22:21, 22, πλ, moreover, " the hand is there, and the Son of man goes indeed, κα μ, but then I add, woe to that man." Matt. 26:39, " but then I add."

Μενο is used only three times in New Testament. Phil. 3:8 is read λλα μ ο in the editions. Luke 11:28, Rom. 9:20, 10: 18. It has the sense of a kind of " ay, indeed, if you talk of that." So Luke 11:28, " If you talk of blessing, such and such are the really blessed." Rom. 9:20, "Ah, indeed, you talk of calling God in question; who are you then? " And chapter 10:18, " If you talk of not having heard, why their sound is gone out into all the world." In the first, " yea "; in the second, " nay but " is all well, in the third, " yea." Literally it is " now then indeed."

For Μηδ and Μτε, see 2 Thess. 2:2, in editions. Μησ adds a subject of negation: μτε contrasts different points into which the subject spoken of in the negative is divided, " not shaken nor troubled (μηδ)-by word, nor by letter (μτε)."

Τ by itself connects two things in a measure in one, κα leaves them two: but when τ is used with κα, it raises the subject of τ into prominence. It is not only what follows κα, but what precedes τ too; but still unites them: saying, not the two, but both, take place. So indeed μτε... μτε, both form part of one single subject. There is more bond in τ than in κα in the two things mentioned, as in 2 Thess. 2:2, both are connected with ποσθα. It is more also, or both, than and. It is found twice as often in Acts as in all the rest of the New Testament; then in Hebrews, Romans, Luke, rarely elsewhere: often it is a mere shade of different aspect of something from κα. James and John, both James and John; bad and good, both bad and good. The sense is the same, only " both " brings them together to the mind as one. The distinct commandments, Mark 10:19, are μ, not μτε.

Δ is only six times used. It arrests the mind on the noun or verb, impressing it on it, as the important point then in the mind. The passages are Matt. 13:23, Luke 2:15, Acts 13:2, 15:36, 1 Cor. 6:20, 2 Cor. 12:1. It is then, then now; also does well in Matt. 13:23: then now in Luke 2:15, 1 Cor. 6:20, 2 Cor. 12, "well it is not," would do.

Μντοι. In John always however, found elsewhere only in James 2:2, and Jude 8, yet, the sense is the same. It is also in 2 Tim. 2:19.

Μεν does little more than arrest the mind instead of simply stating the fact. With δ it contrasts the two members, but often hardly more than "these" and "those" in English, without "indeed" and "but," as Acts 27:44. The difference I believe to be this-when a common statement applies to both, "indeed" and "but" may be left out in English; when the subjects of μεν and δ are different, then they have their places; thus Matt. 22:5, "they went, -all, -some to one thing, some to another," but verse 8, "the wedding indeed is ready, but they that are bidden." In Luke 8:5, 6, it is μν and κ; in Matt. 13:4, 8, μν and δ. Luke 3:16, both, no doubt, are baptizers, but "γ μν δατι, ατς δ ν πνεματι." The contrast is full.

Μν ον, is always, I think, a fresh start of subject in the mind of the writer, assuming acquaintance with what precedes, and referring to it as the basis of some new statement, where some particular point, connected with what precedes, comes out into relief. The writer has some one or some thing in his mind, shut up in the previous part, which makes the prominent subject in some new statement. Ον, I think, connects; μν fixes the mind on the particular object. Once μν ον, but then ον has its own ordinary force. I think μν ον thus always begins a new sentence. It is chiefly found in the narrative of the Acts, as may be supposed. See ον.

μως, even, nevertheless, however, although, found only in John 12:42, 1 Cor. 14:7, and Gal. 3:15. In this last μως goes with νθρπου, and in 1 Cor. 14:7, with ψυχα, not φωνν διδντα.

πως is almost always the expression of object or purpose. Acts 3:19, in A. V. is a mere false translation. The only exception is Luke 24:20. It is not always so that or that, but always the object or intention, as Matt. 12:14, Mark 3:6, Matt. 26:59, Luke 11:37, Acts 23:23. But πως is the object in the result, not the intention as in the mind. I do a thing να, that is the intention in my mind. πως is the effect of the act, the aim of the act, not the intention of the mind, it is "so that," not essentially "in order that," it is the πς of the thing.

οδ, οτε, as with μηδ, μτε; οδ, an additional object of negation; οτε one of two contrasted: only οδ has also the sense of "not even," Matt. 8:10; 27:14; Luke 6:3; 23:40 Cor. 5:1; 6:5. Οτε is peculiar in John 4:11: it is opposed to κα, but the sense is the same.

Ον. Therefore (folgerung), sometimes however a mere consequence of facts in the mind, not a cause, then, and its proper sense is not cause but consequence, hence "therefore." I say in the mind, because it is the mind singling out some particular person and thing in a less open way in the mind, in what precedes, and bringing it out into relief and importance. See μν in connection with which it is thus used. With a question, and with ε, it has this force of consequence; for example, "these things being so." Matt. 13:27; 12:12. Ε ον, chapter 7:11; 22: 45, any hypothetical case is as the formal word ε: thus ταν, chapter 24:15; Mark 12:6, τι ον ννα υνν χων. "This being so," "if it be so." It has this force even in direct statement and command, as Mark 3:31; 13:35; Luke 3:7; 6:9, 36; John 4:28. The causative and antecedent grounds often

run into one another, John 2:20. But the antecedent occasion is as common as the sense of cause (see the discourses in John's Gospel throughout). " This being so, such and such follows " is the sense which rises up into " therefore." A strict cause is δι■ το■το, and can be used with ο■ν, " therefore " these things being so, John 5:18. Sometimes what is so is expressed, as is naturally the case with ε■, " if they are so "; ■ταυ, " when they were so,-then," etc.

Μ■, when used where we might suppose ο■ could be (for it has its own use besides), gives, I think, the state and character, not the fact; but it is only a shade of meaning. Thus Matt. 1:19, Joseph, δ■κατιος ■ν, he being a just man, μ■ θ■λων, "a just man, and unwilling "; ο■ θ■λων would be the fact. So Acts 27:7, 15; it was the state of things, " the wind not suffering." It is not the fact that the wind then and there did not suffer that the ship should easily make her way, but the wind being such that it could not, and (ver. 15) the ship was caught, and unable. So Acts 12:19; the shape it takes in the mind is the state of Herod, not the fact that he did not find. Compare 2 Cor. 4:18, 5: 21; Matt. 7:26; Luke 12:4; John 7:49; Rom. 4:17: so often. Hence it is commonly used with a participle, or future conditional, future at least in thought, as Luke 17:1; see John 12:47, 48, both cases. So of a state, in the infinitive with article, Luke 8:6, 22:34; Heb. 11:3; or without, as Luke 18:1, where the article is with δε■ν. In many cases, when it refers to a fact, the imperative, its very common use, is understood. In questions it is not merely, as usually stated, the expectation of a negative answer, but a present presentation of it as not so, or of circumstance which made it likely the inquiry would convey a doubt, or undesired, unpleasing possibility, one that can hardly be supposed true, and raises the question-not an inquiry for information. Thus John 18:17, 25; 6:67; Mark 2:19. In the last the negative answer meets it. John 7:47; Mark 12:14, 15, where ο■ is used for indicative negation of fact, μ■ for the moral propriety with subjunctive. For the contrast of affirming expected answer with ο■χ■, see John 7:41, 42.

Να■, though used for " yes," as Matt. 9:28, etc., is, however, something more, as " yea " (from the usus loquendi) is in English. It affirms positively when a matter might be supposed to be in doubt, or reiterates as a certainty that cannot fail, as Luke 11:51. Query, is it more than simply " yes " in Matt. 21:16, a reply, or in any way connected with what follows? But it is very commonly, at any rate, emphatic, as Luke 7:26; 12:5. In Matt. 15:27, Mark 7:28, it is simply " yea, Lord," that is, " yea, Lord, you can do it" even on your own ground, " for even," or "since." It calls in question any opposition.

■σ τε does not express an intention, but a means or instrument which brings about what follows: ■τι a fact which exists, when the ■τι is applied: ■ν α what is in view or intention, when what governs ■ν α is stated.

■ν α is the object and intention of the person or thing from its nature, and sometimes amounts to a telic infinitive [all modern Greek infinitives are formed, I learn, by it (va)]. Hence it is not merely in order that, as an indirect consequence; that is, I do one thing in order that, in its turn, another may follow; but in Greek it is immediate also. ■τι answers to what or why, meeting the τ■, the what or the why is so and so; hence that answering to " what," and for or because answering to " why." But when there is not cause or object but intention, or end of anything, it is ■ν α. Hence with words of request, command, or wish, desire, as 1 Cor. 14:1 (and in sense, 2 Cor. 8:7), it is common; Matt. 4:3; 12:10; 20:21, 31, 33; 26:63; Mark 7:32, 36; Rom. 15:31; Eph. 1:17, etc., etc. Some cases are less evident. Matt. 5:29, 30; 8:8; 10:25, and even chapter 26: 4, Mark 4:21 shows the connection,

the object and intention are there, not merely one act in order to another. Mark 6:12, "preached, **■να**"; chapter 6: 36, "let them go, **■να**." Thus we have the direct intention and object of the act, or will, or thing. Luke uses it quite as much (it is not used in an ecbatic sense) in chapter 7: 6, 36; 8: 31, 32; 9:40, 45; 16:27; 18: 39, 41, and others. I do not believe, for instance, John 9:2 is for **■στε**; it was not the will of the parents, of course, but the meaning and end of the act. A person may object to this, as contrary to his way of thinking; but so it is. **■κων■ς ■να** is not "so that," but the **τ■λος** of the **ικων■της** in the mind of the writer, and is powerful in style. It is intention, or something to be; **■τι** may be future, if it is a fact, not what is in view as an object. So in chapter 11:50, **συμφ■ρει ■να**. Is not the sense always future to that on which **■να** depends, **■τι** an existing fact? To state a cause you must have the caused fact; an intention looks to the future. In John 6:28 it is not "in order that," that is, doing one thing that another may come, but with this intention or object to fulfill it; the direct **τ■λος** of the will in doing, not a subsequent effect: hence **■να**. And this sentence also gives the clue to its use in chapter 9:22. It was the intention or object of their agreement. In chapter 4:34, "my meat is **■να ποι■**." **■τι** has no place here; it is an infinitive in sense, but it gives the intention. His meat was not having done it, but to do. "If any man **θ■λει** to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." Still John carries its use farther. We understand the intention in the works or speaker's mind of an **ικων■της**, fit for (propre a, not pour) that. But John 13:1, **■λ■λυθεν α■το■ ■ ■ρα, ■να** it was the intention and meaning of that hour, as the writer viewed it, and divinely so. Still it is a special use of it. So chapter 18: 39, a custom, **■να** the object or meaning of the custom; still it is carrying its use very far. So in 1 John 1:9, "faithful and just **■να** he might forgive"; again a telic infinitive **■τι** has no place. So chapter 4: 21, here it depends on **εντολ■**, "the intention of the **■ντολ■** was," etc. In chapter 5:3, I suppose it is the intention to keep, as in the passage, "my meat is"; but this carries its use very far, as it is evident John does (but **■τι** would have another sense), as before in his Gospel, chapter 4: 34. But in John 17:3, it is merely infinitive (not **■τι**, nor **■στε**). So indeed, practically, is 1 John 5:3 (see above). John 11:19, 31, shows how it connects "in order to" with infinitive. John 11:37, we have **ποι■σαι ■να**, "caused this man not to die"; not acted so that he had not, but acted to hinder him dying, only **■ποθ■ν■** so that it was effectual; after need, John 2:25, for any one to bear witness; chapter 5: 7, infinitive; chapter 8:56; 16: 2 (a strong case). 1 John 5:35; 2 John 6; 3 John 4. With the pronoun "this," John 6:29, 39, 40; 15:13; 17:3; Luke 1:43. The real point, I believe, is, besides the common use, "in order that," when it is future, a thing in posse, not in esse, an object in view; hence equivalent to "to" with an infinitive; whereas **■τι** is in esse, not merely in posse. In Matt. 26:34, **■τι** seems future, but it is "you will have done it before." In Mark 4:38, it is present, "we are perishing." **■τι** is used after speak or write in Greek, when in English it is left out, as John 4:42, and a multitude of cases. The only strong case as to **■να** is after **α■τ■ς**. Still, though peculiar and idiomatic, it is an object in view, the thought and will of the person who acts or speaks. Luke 1:43 is the strongest of all, but it is not the fact that she has come, but this, that she should come-should have the thought or mind of coming. So John 17:3, it is not the fact that a person who has known has life, but the thought that to know is or could be life to him that knew. It is the abstract idea, what life eternal is. It is to know, it is found in knowing, which thus stands as an object to be attained before the mind. This was the way of having it. **■τι** would be that they have known a fact about some people, **■να** is sollen, what is to be. So in Luke 1:43, "whence" refers to the mind or intention to come, the motive **■να** for coming. In the case of **α■τ■ς**, etc., the thought is, this must be to have the matter in question, a man must know to have; that is, the knowing is looked at as a

thing to be necessary, not existing. So with " greater love hath no one than this, that (■ν) life must be laid down to make this good "; that is, it is not the fact which (■τι), but viewed as needed and so to be, a moral consequence, not a fact; as I have said, ■τι always refers to a fact, ■ν to an intention. There may be a future with ■τι, but it is an assertion of the fact (which may be future), as Luke 19:26; 18:8, not an object in purpose or intention. Not " I command, request, that it should "; but " I say that it will,; that it should is in purpose; the other is an assertion of fact, though the fact be future. " That" or " because" are not really different as the meaning of δτι; when it means " because " it is practically δι■ το■το ■τι.

■ως, is as far as, hence can be with verbs, ■ως ■λ■λυσθεν, ■ως ■μερα ■στ■ν, John 9:4, John 12:35, 36, ■χετε. Hence with the sense of till or while, because both are " as long as." It is not objective; ■ως ■μ■ραν, if it were Greek, would be " up to day," " during night." Hence the genitive, which is a genitive absolute. So you can have (which shows its force) ■ως ε■ς, Luke 24:50, ■ως ■νω, John 2:7; and again, ■ως ■ξω, Acts 21:5; ■ως ■σω, Mark 14:54. There is always the sense of so far as; not merely to as an object, but " up to," " all the way there." It is not ε■ς, zu, but his zu ihm. Hence it is " whilst" with an indicative, as John 9:4 above, or with a conjunctive when it is intention, Mark 6:45, or future προσε■ξωμαι, as Matt. 26:36.

Μ■, μ■ποτε, etc., not, that not, but, as is known, intention of the mind, not fact, as Matt. 4:6; μ■ποτε " thou dash "; μηδ■ποτε, 2 Tim. 3:7. Ο■ποτε is not found replaced by ο■δ■τιποτε. Ο■ and ο■δ■ποτε are fact. Hence μ■ with imperative, and with an interrogative, meaning, " can you suppose that...? " when the intended answer is " not "; ο■, when " yes." So in moral reasons, μ■: δι■ τ■ μ■ ■χειν, Matt. 13:5, 6. Hence with participles, as verse 19, μ■ συνι■ντος; Luke 2:45, μ■ ε■ρντος. In Matt. 13:5, ο■κ ε■χε γ■ν, the fact. The participle is a supposed or assumed state on which the fact is based. So indeed μ■ in interrogation is a supposition that not. " Μ■ thou greater than our father Jacob? " John 4:12. It is a state of mind or of things on which something is based, when not the simple expression of a state of mind, as in the imperative. We have ο■ μ■, not only in assertion, where it is not at all, but in questions also, ο■ μ■ and μ■ ο■. But I do not think either a mere doubling of the negative ο■ μ■ is not, certainly not, but no in no case, under no supposition: the mind cannot entertain the negative. So μ■ ο■ is interrogation, as before, but with the sense " is it to be supposed...? " " are we to lay it down that...? " etc. Ο■ μ■ is used in an interrogative sense, but with a note of admiration, Luke 18:7. "And God would not avenge his own elect! "-" is that to be supposed? " In Heb. 10:1, 11 ο■δ■ποτε approaches the nearest to μηδ■ποτε, but it is the fact; μηδ■ποτε, in 2 Tim. 3:7, the character of γυναικ■ρια. Μηκ■τι and ο■κ■τι follow the same principle. Ο■κ■τι is fact; μηκ■τι, command, consequence, ■στε μηκ■τι, not ο■κ■τι, but they could not, ο■κ■τι. So μηδ■ Mark 2:2, μηκ■τι with infinitive. In 1 Thess. 3:1, 5, it is the participle as before with μ■. The same generally with ■στε, ■στε ο■κ ■τι ε■ δο■λος the fact: ■στε μ■ ■σχειν, the thought as a consequence, not the fact. So Mark 1:45; 2:2; 3:20. The strict sense of ■στε is " so as," Matt. 15:33; then " so that," " that," Matt. 12:22, Gal. 2:13, or with ο■τως, John 3:16, Acts 14:1, " but that" with "so" understood; that is, not intention (■ν) but result, even if in thought.

■λλα, when not a contrasted " but "; " not this, but that," is an arrest in the thought, in the sense of this. " Do I say this? nay, but," etc. It stops the mind on what was going before, and brings in something else. The ellipse depends on the passage, as Acts 10:20, " but arise "; or no ellipse really, but, turning to another point, it supposes some contradiction might be urged, or means " not

only "; but it is never, I think, copulative, as alleged. See with **■**, Luke 12:51, 2 Cor. 1:13 (this peculiar).

## GREEK PREPOSITIONS

Note that, as to its primitive force, the genitive is anything in its nature, origin, or character, " of."

The dative is immediate connection or proximity to.

The accusative is objective, towards. These senses are modified by the preposition, or, rather, the preposition borrows the sense of the case, and adds its own peculiar meaning to give a special form to the thought, as **παρ■**, **περ■**, **μετ■**, **■κ**: **παρ■** with a genitive, " from," but it is genus still; **περ■**, around or about you, is more remote from the radical sense, but still the circumstances draw their character from the relationship to the governed word; what they are is **περ■ ■μ■ν**, etc. With the accusative it is the object whom they do or will refer to, **περ■ ■μ■**. **■κ** is only source and characteristic source, hence has only the genitive. **Μετ■** is like **περ■**, the thing is characterized by its association, **μεθ' ■μ■ν**. They are thought of as associated with " us." This characterizes them: **μετ■ τα■τα**, they are separated, and they are a distinct object by themselves when **τα■τα** are complete, hence they come after. **Πρ■ς** and **παρ■** have genitive, dative, and accusative.

**■ν■**: besides the idea of respectively, each, we have only **■ν■ μ■σον**, Matt. 13:25, Mark 7:31, 1 Cor. 6:5, Rev. 7:17, among, between, in the midst of. 1 Cor. 14:27 shows connection of prepositional and adverbial use, **■ν■ μ■ρος** [each] for [his] part, in his turn, by course; so, by fifties, or fifty each, man by man, each man. **■ν■** has the accusative from its objective force, up to, reaching up to, in all cases, even when it means each respectively. The translation of it may be various. **■ν■ μ■σον** is not **■ν μ■σω**, which may be a point unconnected with the rest. **■ν■** connects the thing which is **■ν■** with that **■ν■** (up to) which it is, so as to have to say to all. He fills up that to which **■ν■** applies. It is not *mittelpunkt* but *mitten unter*. Not in the middle but in the midst.

**■ντ■**, in the place of, and so for, sometimes because; the force being, I apprehend, " you get this as a recompense," **■ντ■**, " answering to." So Luke 1:20; 12:3; 19:44 Thess. 2:10, and Eph. 5:31, it passes, by use, into the more general sense of because. The rest are correspondence, or instead of, James 4:15, the last, John 1:16, " grace upon grace," one grace taking the place of another in succession—a beautiful idea.

**■μα** is used for a preposition instead of **σ■ν**, Matt. 13:29.

**■π■**, genitive: point of departure. Hence, by reason of, occasioned by, Matt. 13:44; 14:26; Luke 22:45, Acts 11:19; Heb. 5:7; Matt. 18:7. On the part of, not simply by but of, away from, Luke 9:22; 17:25; but here, after **■ποδοκιμ■ζω**. So Acts 2:22, where **■π■** is in the verb, not in 2 Cor. 7:13. It is not for **■π■**. The cases are after **■π■** in the verb, or after **■ναπ■πονται**, which supposes toil, and ceasing to have it; not the present effect of an agent (**■π■**) under whose power and influence the matter happens, or the person is. In a good state, Titus might have been received and cheered **■π■**; though scarcely this last, but not **■ναπ■παυται** when they had been going wrong before. His refreshment now proceeded from them: "peace from" is simple, "delivered from," also; so with **παρ■λθη**, Mark 14:35. The point of departure is clear in **■φ' ■αυτο■**, **■φ' ■αυτ■ν**, etc., Luke 12:57; John 5:19; 10:18; 16:13. It is used of material, of clothes, or food. A mass is supposed, and

the part is taken " from " it; as we say, " made from wool." So, choice from, Matt. 7:16, **■π■**, point of departure of the judgment: it is a con-elusion drawn " from," not by means of,, instrumentally; in the same verse materially " from." Luke 14:18, **■π■** μιαις is idiomatic; said to be, " one point of view left out as understood "; if so, it is simple. Their minds started from one point to the common conclusion.

**■κ**, genitive: out of, a place, set of people, or what any one is sunk in, or the like. Hence it is a moral source, and goes deeper than **■π■**: **■π■** is a motive; this a principle. English uses it so too. He did it " out of fear," " from fear." Both are English. There is a shade of difference in the sense. Fear in the latter case is a motive, the point of departure of the mind. **■κ** supposes one more in the state referred to. I can say, **■π■** το **■δ**ατος; one leaves the water to be on land; **■κ** το **■δ**ατος, out of the water in which one was. What answers to **■π■** is " at," to **■κ** is " in." Hence **■κ** is more abstract; **■κ** **π**οτεως, on that principle. **■π■** ε**λ**βειας, that was the actual governing and producing motive. **■κ** is sometimes merely a shade of meaning different from **■π■**, but there is the difference noticed. Hence **■κ** has the force of the character of anything: **■κ** το **κ**οσμο**■**, **■κ** το **δ**ι**β**ολο**■**, **■κ** το **π**ατρ**■**ς. And this tone of thought is found even where place is in question and the article is used. " New Jerusalem descended **■κ** το **ο**ρανο**■** **■π■** το **Θ**εο**■**." It came out of, no doubt, but it stamps its character in revealing its source. **■π■** is the point of departure. It came from God Himself. It was heavenly but it came from God-was not merely divine. Speaking of time, it differs little practically from **■π■**, though the ideal difference remains: **■π■** πολλ**ν** ετ**ν** since many years, **■κ** χρ**ν**ων **■κ**αν**ν** a long while, beginning from many years ago, and taking its rise in a period which still lasted. The first is a date, the last a characterized period; so **■κ** νε**τ**ητος. But characterizing, as marking origin out of which anything is, is the common use, where not materially used. " The baptism of John, was it **■ξ** ο **ο**ρανο**■** **Ψ**: hence, Matt. 1:20," is of the Holy Ghost"; John 1:13, " born of God." Hence characteristic of the state or thing which causes the action of the verb, as one " lives by (**■κ**) faith." It is not **δ**ι**■**, the means of living, but the character of the life. "A tree is known **■κ** το **κ**αρπο**■**," Matt. 12:33 and Luke 6:44. In Matt. 7:16, 20, it is **■π■**. The former is characteristic in the thing, the latter is a conclusion in knowledge, " from." " **Ο** **■κ** περιτομ**■**ς:" **■** **■ξ** ο **ο**ρανο**■**:" " **■** **■κ** τ**■**ς γ**■**ς:" **■κ** το **κ**οσμο**■** λαλε**ν**:" **Ψ** ο **■ξ** **■**ριθε**■**ας." In a multitude of shapes it is used for characterizing, as the source of anything does, only that its use to express character goes far, as in **■κ** μ**■**ρους, partly, in part, **■ξ** **■σ**τητος. It becomes thus adverbial. Thus, he agreed with the laborers **■κ** δηναρ**■**ου: we say, at a penny, Matt. 20:2. **■κ** is commonly used where we have the genitive, where it is one or more from among a set of objects whether left or not.

**■ν** governs the dative. It means properly "in": then, with plurals, "amongst." Where it is connected with words of motion, it indicates the result in which that motion places and leaves them, **■ν**ελ**■**φθη **■ν** δ**■**ξη. It is used to mean what accompanies and characterizes, where we should say, " with," " in the power of," **■ν** **■β**δ**■** " with a rod." It is not the origin of the character as a source, but characterizes the power by which we act; see Col. 1:8, **■ν** πνε**■**ματι. A strong case of this instrumental character is in Luke 14:31; if **■ν** δ**■**κα χιλ**■**σι..." with ten thousand." So Heb. 9:25, **■ν** α**■**ματι **■λλο**τρ**■**ς: Matt. 6:7, **■ν** πολυλογ**■**ς. Hence it is not the effective instrument of activity, that is **δ**ι**■**, but what characterizes: πολυλογ**■**α is not looked at as the means, but as the character of the prayer which will be heard. Hence the state or occasion, 1 Cor. 15:52, **■ν** σ**■**λιγγι **■σ**χατη; at or during, within, when referring to time, John 2:19, 20, **■ν** τρι**σ** **■ν** μ**■**ραις.

So (here more literally used) Matt. 11:25; 12:1, **■ν ■κε■ν■ τ■** κair■ John 5:16, **■ν σαββ■τ■**. It has thus the force of the " means by which," **■ν το■τ■ γν■**σονται, John 13:35. We have a peculiar case in **■ν ■μ■ν κρ■**νεται **■ κ■**σμος, 1 Cor. 6:2-" If the judgment of the world shall be characterized by your doing it, surely," etc.: " if **■ν ■μ■ν**-if such be the case with the judgment of the world." It is not simply as instruments; but if such a judgment be found to be in the hands of the saints, and so characterized as to be " by us,; if that be the case with that judgment. So in Heb. 10:10, **■ν ■** θελ■ματι. Christ comes to do God's will. That is what sanctifies us; that will (that is, God's) which Christ was to do is what sanctifies us. One must in English say " by," but the emphasis is on " which." But it is not the δι■ of an instrument, but the **■ν** or character of what does it. So, he came, Luke 2:27, " **■ν τ■** πνε■ματι into the temple." It is not the instrument, but what characterized His coming: only τ■ personifies the Spirit, that is, gives personality to the thought, " the Spirit," as one acting not merely **■ν πνε■ματι**, which is the state of the person. He casts out devils, Matt. 12:24, **■ν τ■** ρχοντι τ■ν δαιμον■ων. It was what characterized His power (personally again) or miracle. Acts 20:19, **■ν τα■ς** ■πιβουλα■ς, that was the state of things in which he found himself, and which causes his tears. It was not δι■, simply instrumentally, but what characterized the situation.

Heb. 11:2, **■ν τα■τ■**; Col. 1:16, **■ν α■τ■** ■κτ■σβη (δι■ in the same verse), and compare verse 20, and Heb. 1:1, 2; compare **■ν ■μ■ν**, 1 Cor. 6:2; Matt. 12:24, 27, 28; and see use of **■ν** and δι■ in Rom. 5:9 (comp. ver. 10).

Is not δι■ an historical word when the fact that took place is looked at as taking place at a given time? Whereas **■ν** is the abiding character and being of him or it, by which the work is wrought, **■ν ■** ■κτ■σθη, δι' α■το■ ■κτισται, Col. 1:16, 17. So Rom. 5:9, 10, justified **■ν τ■** α■ματι, reconciled δι■ το■ θαν■του. Then when any one is looked at as a distinct agent or means, it is δι■, Rom. 5:9, δι' α■το■; so Col. 1:20, δι' α■το■, because Christ is looked at as such, as a distinct person, as a man, though **■ν α■τ■** is applied to the fullness of the Godhead. Heb. 1:1, 2, God spoke **■ν υ■**. There they are not separated, but δι' ο■ ■πο■ησε, a particular historical act, and God is looked at as distinct; see John 1:3, δι' α■το■ ■γ■νετο. There He is looked at as a distinct person, verse 2, πρ■ς τ■ν Θε■ν, and it is an historical fact. Col. 1:16, **■ν α■τ■** ■κτ■σθη, its literal ordinary cause and abiding characteristic, δι' α■το■ in verse 20, historical (see the cases farther on). Δι■ is the instrument of a fact, **■ν** an abiding cause or state (δι■ may be used as a state through which we pass, but it is then also only temporary, what characterizes a state which produces a consequence. Thus 2 Cor. 6:5, **■ν πληγα■ς** would be in that state of things he proved himself a minister: δι■ πληγ■ν would have been the means of proving himself so. Hence 2 Cor. 6:7, δι' ■πλων, because that was the proof. It might be thought that verse 8 δι■ δυσφημα■ς κα■ ε■φημα■ς was in going through it, but I doubt it.

In 2 Cor. 6 we have a string of examples, of different shades of meaning, still showing that in which he approved himself a minister of God; that in which the characterizing power came out in which he was shown to be suitably such. It was not merely that in those states his conduct proved it, nor simply Jby these things as a means: all concurred in giving evidence. This case is the more remarkable because he changes it after a while to δι■. This is only a change of style occasioned by ■πλων, which were clearly instruments, and not merely characteristic as to the state he was in; and δι■ goes on rightly because there is contrast: the most opposite things were the means of showing it. The " yet " inserted in English (ver. 8) is wrong. So " the unbelieving husband is

sanctified by (■v) the wife "-not " by means of" (δι■). Then it would be more real; but just as a Jew was profaned in the Gentile wife-was so characterized in respect of the wife, as qua husband of the Gentile woman, the marriage giving him this character-so the converse held good in Christianity: the other stood, as wife, sanctified by the husband; or, vice versa. This characteristic force is plain in many cases, ■v ■ληθε■, ■v δ■λ■, ■v κρ■πτ■, ■v προσ■π■, λ■γος ■v ■ξουσ■-where it does not mean being really in Christ, it is the same with " Christ," or " the Lord." " Receive her in the Lord," " only in the Lord "; that is, the sense of the Lord, and what He is in the soul, and what the person is as respects His will and claims, is to characterize the reception, the marrying, etc. So of " children, obey your parents in the Lord." " Ye are not in flesh but in Spirit." This characterizes your state, if the Spirit of God dwells in you. So Christ was declared to be Son of God " in power," ■v δυν■μει, this characterizing the state of sons hip of which the proof was given. On the whole, when it is not used in a material or local sense, ■v characterizes (not in its source, that is ■κ, but) what accompanies it; very commonly in English it must be rendered with or by. So in English, " He did it out of hatred " to me: that was its source, cause. " He did it in hatred " or " with hatred "; this characterizes the act when he was doing it. " He did it in self-will." It is the description of the state or condition in which he who acts is.

Δι■, genitive and accusative. Its sense is through: with a genitive, simply so, physically and morally, or figuratively: with the accusative more remotely so. It is then a motive or reason for a thing of which the thing is not independent, but not the effective instrument by which an effect is wrought; that is, this is not the sense of δι■ with an accusative. There are some important passages connected with this distinction: as to time, the literal " through," δι■ τρι■ν ■μερ■v, " in the course of" (Matt. 26:61); δι' ■λης τ■ς νυκτ■ς, δι■ πυρ■ς, 1 Cor. 3:15 So, I doubt not, δι' ■δατος, 1 Peter 3:20. Hence, for " in a state of," δι' ■κροβυστ■ας, and analogously δι■ τ■ς τεκνογον■ας, 1 Tim. 2:15; the article denotes the childbirth she was to undergo. Rom. 4:10, we have ■v ■κροβυστ■, the state as noticed in " ■v "; that characterized his state. In verse 11, we have ■v τ■ ■κροβυστ■ and δι' ■κροβυστ■ας. Δι■ I apprehend to be more vague and general. That condition specifically and contrastedly characterized Abraham. He was ■v ■κροβυστ■. For Gentile believers it was merely de facto they were in that state. So of τεκνογον■ας, so of νυκτ■ς. It is a time, state, or period, not a characteristic. For the rest the application of " through " to time, place, and circumstance, is very simple. It then comes to mean the instrument or means by which, or through which, a thing happens, " through " being still the radical thought. It is an intermediate instrument; " all things were made by him." (John 1:3). " By whom also he made the worlds." (Heb. 1:2.) It is not that the same Being may not be the author; but that His action in that case, where δι■ is used, is looked at as the intermediate instrument of His will, or, it may be, an actually intermediate agency if divine-" without him was not anything made." Thus 1 Cor. 8:6, ε■ς Θε■ς ■ πατρ■ ■ξ ο■---

Ε■ς Κ■ριος δι' ο■. Christ is the divine Creator, but He is in this case viewed as an agent of a divine will. So Heb. 1:2. The use of δι■ does not hinder the source of action and the primary agent to be the same person. We read in the chapter, δι' ■αυτο■ καθαρισμ■v ποιησ■μενος. So in Col. 1:16 we see He was the end and object, τ■ π■vτα... ε■ς αυτ■v εκτισται, which is said, as to us at least, distinctively of God the Father, 1 Cor. 8:6; δΓ α■το■ being applied to Christ. And in Colossians we have ■v α■τ■ ■κτ■σβη (compare ■v) and δι' α■του. Creation was characterized by His action, as the world's judgment by ours (■v ■μ■v): but there He was the one by whom all

thing? were created. So," spoken by the prophets," here they were intermediate to the Holy Ghost (δι■), it was not αφ' α■τ■ν, but δι' α■τ■ν, Luke 1:70, more fully and absolutely.

The accusative is still through, but a cause or motive, and so more remotely " through "; not the means or instrument. " They had delivered him through envy "; this was the moving cause; their hearts and minds did it; but the medium, intermediate passion, through which they acted, was envy. Matt. 13:58, " because of their unbelief," still " through," but it was not indeed a motive, but a cause, what occasioned it, because. Here we may notice John 6:57, κ■γ■ ζ■ δι■ τ■ν πατ■ρα κα■ τρ■γων με, κ■κε■νος ζ■σεται δι' ■μ■: Ψ ' because ' of the Father, he that eats me even he shall live ι because' of me ": again not as motive, but cause or reason why (chap. 14: 19, ■τι ■γ■ ζ■ κα■ ■με■ς ζ■σεσθε). There was such connection between Him and the Father, that because the Father lived, He lived. The Lord only states the fact: we know they were one. What the Lord states is that it was not an independent life, but that, inasmuch as the Father lived, He lived. The two things could not be separated, and He, speaking as on earth, takes the dependent side, yet the connection was such that if His Father did, He did. So, he that eats Him will live by reason of His living. There was an indissoluble connection. Yet our life is dependent on His, but therefore cannot fail. So Rev. 12:11, " through," " by reason of." The use of δι■ with an accusative for a motive is common: thus, John 7:13, Matt. 12:27; so with τ■ and an infinitive, Luke 2:4; both genitive and accusative, Rom. 5:12: so, διατ■, δι■.

There is another point to be mentioned in connection with the intermediate character of δι■. When the instrument is the proper cause or instrument, the immediate instrument, the noun is in the dative (the δι' ■αυτο■ of Heb. 1:3 only confirming it). The genitive with δι■ is viewed as another agent from the one who uses it-as a distinct agent. Thus Rom. 5:15, 17, τ■ το■ ■ν■ς παρορηπ■ματι; then verse 16, δι' ■ν■ς ■μαρτ■σαντος, τ■ δ■ρημα, by the offense of one, it was the act of the offender himself which brought ruin on all that belonged to him; it was not merely through it as a distinct means, but that act of the one brought the evil in on the many; but God's free gift was by the means of a person brought before us distinctly. So verse 17, τ■ το■ ■ν■ς παραπτ■ματι ■ θ■νατος ■βασ■λευσε δι■ το■ ■ν■ς; here the one Adam is viewed as a distinct person from death personified, but " by the offense of one " was his act; so at the end of verse 17, δι■ το■ ■ν■ς ■ησο■ Χριστο■. In verse 18, we have it as a distinct act, δι' ■ν■ς παραπτ■ματος, ε■ς π■ντας, in and by itself as a means, " and so by one righteousness." Compare the use of " ■ν " in this same passage. The dative is a mere means identified with the agent, the δι■ makes a distinct object to the mind.

In Heb. 13:20, " the God of peace brought Christ from the dead, ■ν α■ματι," in that way and character; but in Heb. 9, " He entered in once, δι■ το■ ■δ■ου α■ματος." (Verse 12.) This refers to ο■ χωρ■ς α■ματος of verse 7.. I do not think it means that that was the means of His entering in simply. As to Himself, His person, we all know it was not so: He says, " the Son of man who is in heaven," and could, as to the external fact, have had twelve legions of angels. This is not the question. But even as to us it is not simply that it was needed, but that was the way and state in which He entered in: not He got in by that means even as to us, but He went in in that way. The glorious work, according to the importance and character of the place, would not otherwise have been suitably done, but He did so enter in δι■, for it is the force of δι■ I inquire into here. Χωρ■ς α■ματος, there could have been no fitting association, however small, between Israel and the most holy place, and He entered in thus offering it (προσφ■ρει). Christ as our High Priest, and

representing us, could not enter thus without blood, or, as regards us, God would not have been glorified: so He entered δι' His own, showing indeed His own worth and perfectness, not only to be there Himself, but to obtain the entrance of others and (before that) guilty ones; and as priest He enters in with this to present in its power and efficacy for others. It was the witness that He had put away their sins, so that they could come to God, and God was fully glorified. The holiness of the place required this blood-shedding, seeing sin had come in, but according to a holy redemption, in which the innocent never would have been. So He entered in δι' His own blood. Man could have had that place in no other way. And He had taken up man's cause. (Christ's personal place is more in the cloud of incense, which is not in question here.) This is a little obscure, but right. It was His act, not His necessity; He entered in with that in its power, and not (as I have said) got in by it.

Εἰς is in general simple-the direction towards; reaching, if not hindered. " I am going to Rome." It is well known that, where it is used with verbs of rest, it implies arrival there by motion. " Thou wilt not leave my soul εἰς ἄδου," where it had gone on leaving the body. (See 2 Thess. 2:4, where it depends on the active force of καθίστασι, sets himself down there.) What is said (Acts 8:23) of Simon, that he was εἰς χολῆν πικρῶς is different in sense from ἐν. ἐν would have been a mere state; here there was will, and the bent of his own mind. " Given up to " would not express it. That implies another, possibly final, possession by it. But his mind was gone that way; " your heart is gone into the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity ": ἐνταῦθα is its state, but its then state was to have given itself to that. Mark 8:19 is plain enough, being the direction of the act: He broke it to them, giving it to them; the act was towards them. So ἐμαρτῶν εἰς, Matt. 18:15, " against thee" as to thee; that was the direction his sin took. So Luke 12:10, speak a word " against," as to. It is used also for time, verse 19, " laid up for many years "; as we say against winter, as provisions, or for. So for an object, aim, or purpose, Matt. 26:8, εἰς τὸ πλεῖστα (Mark 14:4; 15:34); "To what purpose is this waste?" (Where it is a contact of violence, ἐπὶ is used; nation shall rise ἐπὶ nation.) This use of as to as an object is common. " She has wrought a good work εἰς ἑμὲ," and in several forms, as the baptism of repentance εἰς ἄφεσιν ἐμαρτίων, Mark 1:4, 38, εἰς τοῦτο ἕξει λυθῶτα.

In connection with the object to which the mind or faith is directed, we have πιστεῖω εἰς. So ἐλπίζω εἰς, 2 Cor. 1:10; as in John 6:47; 7:38; 12:44, and frequently. When it is the believing simply what a man says, it is the dative, as chapter 10:37, 38, and elsewhere. 1 John 5:13, πιστεῖουσιν εἰς τὸ νόμον; and to the same purport, βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ νόμον,\* εἰς Μωσῆν,\*\* εἰς τὸ βπτισμα ἠωνίου,\*\*\* εἰς Χριστῶν\*\*\*\*. It is that at which they arrived, to which they were attached by the baptism, as they went to Christ: here morally, as to Rome materially. See 1 Cor. 12:13, Matt. 28:19. With Jesus it is ἐπὶ τὸ ἐμαρτί in Acts 2:38, εἰς τὸ in Acts 19:4; so 1 Cor. 1:13, etc. A singular use of this is in Matt. 10:41, in the name of a prophet, εἰς νόμον. ἐν ἐμαρτί would, it seems to me, be in another's name (ἐπὶ, Matt. 18:5, Mark 9:37, as the condition of reception), as John 5:43, where the end of the verse has the same force, pleading, presenting himself, his name, as warrant for reception, as Jesus did the Father's; whereas here εἰς νόμον is not the warrant for receiving, but that to which they were received (that is, according to the honor due to a prophet he was received into that place). ἐν ἐμαρτί is bearing it as a character and warrant of reception, εἰς the place and title (into) which he is received. Where we have εἰς τὸ γένεσθαι (Rom. 4:18), it is no purpose in the person, nor so that it so resulted, but

the bearing of the act; " he believed in hope to the becoming." So ε■ς τ■ ε■νοι δ■καιον, Rom. 3:26: also 1:20, Acts 3:19, 1 Cor. 8:10, 2 Cor. 7:3, Eph. 1:18. See 1 Thess. 4:9. This idea of an effect or the bearing of any act takes sometimes a very peculiar form. " The Ninevites repented ε■ς τ■ κ■ρυγμα." They met the preaching by repentance, Matt. 12:41. So chapter 14:31, ε■ς τ■ δ■στασας; " to what [end] or to what [purpose]?" In the first passage it takes the form of a cause, but having an effect characteristic of the cause. In the second, cause is supposed, " wherefore," for the question " why " supposes a cause, here the want of one. What was the good of it? But it never loses its etymological sense.

The idea of "towards" requires little notice: in the sense of for, in favor of, διακον■ας ε■ς η■γ■ους, 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:1: so λογ■ας, 1 Cor. 16:1. The use of it in chapter 15: 54 is striking; " death is swallowed up ε■ς ν■κος," not " in," as if it were lost in a sea which subsisted, but absorbed " into " a victorious power and gone. The end and object is apparent in Phil. 1:5, " your fellowship," ε■ς τ■ ε■αγγ■λιον; so chapter 2: 22, δο■λευσεν ε■ς τ■ ε■αγγ■λιον. Chapter 4: 15, 17, ε■ς λ■γον; verse 17 is " to put to the account." Col. 3:10, νακαινο■μενον ε■ς π■γνωσιν. (Comp. 1: 10, αξαν■μενοι τ■ ■.) So verse 12, καν■σαντι μ■ς ε■ς τ■ν μερ■δα, where the force of ε■ς is the same. It is the goal reached, or to be reached, by νακαινο■μενοι and κ■νωσεν. Remark on Gal. 3:17, that it is to Christ, not in. The covenant was confirmed to Him, the Seed (according to Gen. 22); and then we have an example of ε■ς τ■, as the bearing, ο■κ κ■κυροι, ε■ς τ■ καταργ■σαι τ■ν παγγελ■αν to the making of no effect. In 2 Cor. 10:16, besides ε■ς τ■ περ■κεινα, we have, ε■ς τ■ τοιμα; so in verses 13, 15, ε■ς τ■ μετρα (see Gal. 6:4); 2 Cor. 2:9, " obedient ε■ς π■ντα Ψ; Phil. 2:16, ε■ς μ■ραν.

All these and other like cases which present the same difficulty, I apprehend, flow all from the idea of reaching to the object looked forward to, so as to be up to or fail in this. See a peculiar case in Luke 13:9. As to time this is common: so I suppose " the law a schoolmaster ε■ς Χριστ■ν," reaching unto Him as its object (compare Eph. 1:14), ε■ς τ■ μετρα, ε■ς τ■ περ■κεινα, and ε■ς τ■ τοιμα, with some irony; 2 Cor. 11:3, ε■ς τ■ν Χριστ■ν. But it has the general sense of as to, concerning, as the object of thought: thus 1 Thess. 5:18, Eph. 5:32; but in both with " you," with " Christ," with " the church," as the object in view. See Gal. 5:10. So, above, 2 Cor. 2:9, Luke 16:8, 1 Thessalonians and Ephesians are the strongest, for the mere sense of " concerning," " as to," but they have the force of application to, as applying to.

Γεν■σθαι ε■ς is simple in structure,-to become anything, what is produced. Λογ■ζεσθαι ε■ς, " esteemed such," is pretty nearly as plain. See the difference of λλογε■ται and λογ■σθη: the former is putting so much to account, Rom. 5:13, Philem. 1:18 (only, I believe, in these two places); λογ■ζομαι is " to esteem, or account as such."

π■, with genitive, dative, and accusative. The first two mean upon; the last, to, towards, to direct oneself; π■ anything (as usual with the accusative), motion, not rest. I state here generally that the genitive is the fact; the dative is more characteristic or permanent connection. With the genitive it signifies on, or before (as " before magistrates," etc.); π■ Τ■του, 2 Cor. 7:14, aupres de. Most cases where the sense is not physical still have the sense of on: miracles on the sick; π'■σχ■του τ■ν μερων, on the last of the days. It is always " at," or " approximation," but as added or upon.

It is used for time, hence Matt. 1:11, **π** τς μετοιχεσας; so Luke 3:2, Acts 11:28. I doubt as to Mark 2:26, and 12:26, whether it does not mean the section of Jewish scripture. The general sense is adjunctive apposition, without fixed relationship, with the general thought of super-induced. This connects it with the sense of " before." Hence we have over anything, in the genitive, or upon, as, **ν π π**των Θες, Rom. 9:5. But here peculiarities have to be noticed, and shades of thought in the writer. Eph. 4:6, we have again Θες: **π π**των so with βασιλει **π**. Matt. 2:22. Καθστημι in Acts 6:3, ους καταστσομεν **π** της χρεας τατης; Acts 8:27; 12:20. We may add Rev. 9:11; 11:6. In Matt. 24:45, the genitive (καταστσω), but in verse 47 the dative. So in Luke 12:42 the genitive, and verse 44 the dative. Matt. 25:21, 23, genitive with καταστσω (**π** πολλν). The general sense of **π** is at, and so upon, before, at, over, against. All these are forms of juxtaposition. But the dative gives more closeness of connection, as in a relative place of charge, when used in the literal sense. As to over, the fact is expressed in the genitive, it is mere place (so of before); " over many things," " over his household," the fact of being, living, or placed above, suffices. With the dative it is not the fact, but the relation conferred. One was over the θεραπεα, in a place of course, but in a superior one. So " over many things." That is in the genitive. So where God is spoken of, it is the genitive. Of course He is above or over all things. But " set him over all his goods " is a distinct, relative, permanent place, definitely given. There it is the dative. Locality is genitive, " before magistrates," " on a hill"; but **π** with the dative characterizes a state, and in such cases without an article, and denotes the state or character, not merely the locality, **π π**νακι, Matt. 14:8. Acts 9:33, κατακεμενον **π** κραββτ (comp. Mark 2:4), that was his state. In Mark 6:55, we have carrying about the sick, **π** τοις κραββτοις, the dative; it was their state, but the article shows the beds the sick were lying habitually on. In chapter 7: 30, we have βεβλημνην **π** τς κλνης; it was the fact. " Sitting on horseback," Rev. 6:2, 4, 5, is the dative. It was a fixed characteristic relationship, given as such. Chapter 4:2: on the throne, genitive; it was a fact, a locality. Often sitting has the accusative, as if the act of him who sits; he set himself on. One must not press the grammar as to language in Revelation, but so it is in chapter 4: 4.

The constant use of the dative is to present the condition, occasion, cause, circumstance, which gives its occasion to the existence of what it refers to: this in a multitude of shapes, but always that by reason or occasion of which the act takes place; sometimes a formal condition, sometimes a mere occasion. The cases are vary frequent. Matt. 4:4," man lives **π** παντ **μ**ατι Ψ; it is the condition or occasion of his living: chapter 7: 28, " they were astonished **π** τ διδαχ Ψ; it was the occasion, what led to their astonishment; as we say, "at." This is often found. I add a considerable list: Matt. 19:9, " by reason of"; chapter 22:33; Mark 1:22; 3:5, " He was grieved **π** τ πωρσει." Chapter 9: 37, **π** τ **ν**ματ μου; his name was the occasion and motive for receiving: so verse 39, and chapter 10:22; Luke 1:14; 5:5; 9:48; 13:17; Acts 3:12, 16, the second a case worthy of remark, **π** τ **π**στει (see Phil. 3:9), "on faith," we might say; Acts 4:2i; 5: 35, is also a special case," take heed " **π** τος **ν**θρποις τοτοις, it was the occasion or object which was the occasion, what they were was a motive. It is a more unusual case, Acts 8:2, I suppose," by his occasion," "by reason of him." So we should say in English "over him." It is almost literal. It is not **π**ρ ατ. Chapter 14:3 (see Heb. 8:1, Acts 5:35, 2 Cor. 9:14), as to the last the Lord being the occasion and motive, the moving object. "As to " is the nearly resulting sense, but weak. Acts 15:31; 20:38; 26:6, Rom. 5:2; 10:19 Cor. 1:4; 9:10, moved, sustained by hope. Chapter 13:6; 16: 17, 2 Cor. 1:4; 3:14, the occasion, but the force of occasioning is small:

still it is " at, on that occasion." Chapter 7: 4, 7, 13, the first is again " occasion " (" as to ") without motive; second, its common use; third, the same again, **π** **τ**του (verse 14) is *aupris de*, analogous to " before " a magistrate. The sense is very general, " my boasting in the case of Titus, my Titus-boasting." Chapter 9: 13, 15, are simple cases: as to 14, it is more doubtful; but I believe it to be " in your case": see 1 Thess. 3:7. I doubt its being " upon." Eph. 2:10, " with that in view," " under that condition "-I do not mean as a condition to be fulfilled,-but He so created us, that being the state and character which entered into the conditions of the creation in God's mind (see 1 Thess. 4:7). Phil. 1:3, 5; 3:9; again **π** **τ** **π**σται, *moyetmant*. Acts 3:16, 1 Thess. 3:7, 9; 4:7. These are " as to," " by occasion of," " by reason of," what comes in as an occasion or ground, Titus 1:2, **π**' **λ**πδιδι; this calls for attention. It is " in view of having that as his object." As the good works or holiness, so this hope was in God's mind (now revealed) one of the conditions of existence of this gospel scheme. Philem. 1:7, Heb. 7:11, " under that condition and order of things." The law being the condition of their existence with God, their *raison d'etre*. So Heb. 9:10, 15, 17, 26 (8:1 seems to me a case we have had, amounting in sense to " in respect of," taking these into view: " as to these this is the sum," the summing up to be attached to them; see Acts 5:35, 2 Cor. 9:14, Acts 14:3), Heb. 10:28 (this connects with another branch of the same general meaning, but the two or three were the condition of conviction), James 5:1, Rev. 18:9 (this is," as to her," " on her occasion "); so verse 11.

I have dwelt on this, because the general idea of the condition of existence of that which is expressed in the verb is (where it is not physical) the main use of **π** with the dative. The accusative, as ever, puts the object farther off, and supposes or states movement towards it. Some cases may appear singular, and, as with **ε** **ς**, verbs of rest are so put, if movement has led to it: and the difference depends on what is in the writer's mind. Some cases remain; duration of time, " till," has **π** with an accusative; it looks forward to it as a point for time to move on to; as Acts 17:2; 19:8, 10; 20:9, 11, Rom. 7:1, Gal. 4:1, Acts 18:20, and doubtless others. When it is a given point attained, we have the genitive, as Heb. 1:1, 2 Peter 3:3 (comp. Luke 3:2, Acts 11:28). As to falling and sitting, genitive and accusative will be found, I apprehend, as the writer looks at the act of falling (accusative), or to the result and to the ground (there genitive). One would be fell " to," the other " on "; compare Matt. 26:7, the act, with accusative: verse 12, the result when on the body (genitive); Luke 22:44, accusative. In Acts 10:11, we have both: the sheet was **κα**τοβα **ν** **π**' **α** **τ** **ν**, and **κα**θι **μ** **ε** **ν** **π** **τ** **ς** **γ** **ς**, there it was actually on it. In Rev. 4:2, 4, you have both with **κα**θι **μ** **ε** **ν**. In Luke 22:30, it is genitive (so as to eating at table). In Rev. 20:4, accusative: " salt" is more active here. Acts 12:21, genitive: " being set down " **π** **τ** **ο** **β** **μ** **α** **τ** **ο** **ς**. Matt. 23:2, genitive: " sit on Moses' seat." Chapter 25:31, genitive, " on the throne of his glory." In Matt. 24:3, we have the genitive; Luke 21:35, accusative. Then with **κ** **θ** **η** **μ** **α** **ι**, Acts 8:28, genitive, John 12:15, accusative. Perhaps we might say, "seated on" for genitive, " sitting on " for accusative. The genitive is the fact of locality, the accusative more the activity of the person. (In Rev. 6:2, 4, 5, **α** **τ** **ν** of the received text, should be **α** **τ** **ν**, accusative, according to the best copies). Matt. 9:9, accusative. In chapter 28:2, **α** **τ** **ο** **π** **ν** **ω**, being locality always, has always the genitive. The only apparent exception is 1 Cor. 15:6; but this is attractively governed by **φ** **θ** **η**. There are a few other cases to notice: John 8:7, **π**' **α** **τ** **ν**; verse 59, **π**' **α** **τ** **ν**. The latter is simple and physical, " cast stones at him ": in verse 7 " let him first cast the stone in respect of her, with her in view, as to her." In Matt. 16:18, " on this rock" is dative. 1 Cor. 3:12," build on this foundation," **π** (accusative). The former, I apprehend, is fixed relationship, as we have seen. It

is the object to which His activity tends in the actual fact of building. The rock is there; He builds on it. In the second he actively adds materials to the foundation.

Heb. 10:21; 3:6; 7:13, and 8:8, are all accusative, which may be noted. "Over the house," etc., is always the accusative. There are other passages, as Acts 7:10, Luke 1:33. It is not locality, not proper relationship as connected with it, but "set over." In the case of superiority necessarily and permanently abiding over various things or persons, it is genitive, as we have seen (Matt. 24:45, Luke 12:42), and, when set over in formed determinate relationship, dative (Matt. 24:47, Luke 12:44). Here with "setting over a house or people," it is accusative. "He is at the head of the house"; I could not say "at the head of all his goods," but "over them." You could not have the immediate relationship with a house, and it falls into the government of what has set him there. (I doubt the word "own" in Heb. 3:6; it does not affect this question).

There remains πιστεω π, λπζω π, etc. Thus we have 1 Tim. 4:10, λπκαμεν π Θε; chapter 5:5, π Θε; 1 Peter 3:5 λπζουσαι π τν Θε; 1 John 3:3 λπδα χειν π' ατ; Heb. 2:13, σομαι πεποιθ ζπ' ατ; Rom. 15:12, π' ατ λπιοσι. In these "counting, reckoning, leaning on Him," as in English. 1 Tim. 6:17, dative, riches. The difference is the same; the accusative looks out at the object of trust (often ες), the dative rests in Him on whom we lean. The difference of idea with the same fact is seen in Matt. 26:7, 12, the act and the result, when it was on His body, the first accusative, the second genitive.

The general idea of adding with a dative is frequent, π πασι, π τοτοις. "Besides these I have gained ten, or five, talents more," Matt. 25:20, 22. "Besides all this, shut up John in prison," Luke 3:20, and in many ordinary cases, as Eph. 6:16. What is Rom. 4:18? The condition or state of his mind in believing, as in 1 Cor. 9:10, and Rom. 8:20. (The first, Rom. 4:18, is only doubtful because of πιστεω). We say "on trust," or "credit," in the same way (not on hope). It characterizes the state or condition.

Κατ, save in a few isolated cases, does not present any difficulty in its application. It means literally down with a genitive; and with the accusative, down along, primarily; but it seems to me to have more the sense of going through the governed object; even in the genitive it is not "down" to an object, but "down along," as a hill. Its secondary meaning in the genitive, and more frequent in New Testament, is against. In the accusative it has more distinctly the sense of along, through, amongst, throughout, when literally used. Its secondary meaning is the object governed by it measuring the action which is connected with it by κατ, according to the sense of the word governed by it, as καθ' μραν, day by day, or every day: κατ' οκον. It is much oftener used in the accusative than in the genitive, and in most cases can be translated according to. It has always the same sense, though it cannot be rendered the same in English; but the action of the sentence is measured or estimated by the word governed by κατ whatever comes under that category: thus καθ' δν, κατ πσαν αταν, "so far as for every cause." Here the very cause measures the action. So κατ' παγγελαν ζως, this measured the apostleship and gave it its character. He was an apostle by the will of God in a service morally measured and characterized by that Περιπατεν κατ' ηπην, ζν κατ τν αρεσιν: according to love, and the principle of that sect were the measure and character of his walk and life. It is always the same fundamentally, as κατ τς πλατεας his walk was measured and characterized by the streets of the city, or λην τν χραν, "all the region." Hence it has the sense implicitly of through or thorough, and

this is the origin of its use in composition, κρνω, κατακρνω, καταχρμενος (where the sense is not "abusing," but "using" it as ours).

A few questions arise. What is 1 Cor. 15:15, "borne witness κατα Θεο"? We find also swearing by God, Matt. 26:63, and Heb. 6:13, 16. But I believe the sense to be "reaching to and embracing all through" its object. When the swearing is merely the fact of bringing a person in, it is ν, not κατα, as in all New Testament examples, I, believe; but Matt. 26 and Heb. 6, where the solemnity of the case gives κατα, and "against" has the same radical force. The connection of the two is seen in 1 Cor. 15:15, we have testified of God, κατα το Θεο. It reached to and embraced even God, so as to comprise Him in the matter: we have said that God raised Him. Hence we can have καθ' λης της περιχρου, and λην τν πλιν; the general idea being the same, "reaching to and embracing," "going through": only the genitive being more of local rest, "throughout," and the accusative connected with motion, or objective, his walk reached to the whole city and took it in. The καθ' λης is more complete and absolute, more pervading, than καθ' λην, but this, though seemingly a nice difference, is distinct enough when the mind expresses it. "A fame went throughout the whole region" gives the idea of pervading; "he went through all Galilee," the country he traversed as a general fact, going to different parts of the whole country. Yet these things form the power and beauty of style. I could hardly say "he went καθ' λης της πολεις." It fills the place too much, unless he went to every house in it, and then there is too much the object of activity. But "reaching to," "embracing," and so measured by it materially or morally, is always the leading idea, taking in that and measured by it in the sentence in which it is used, against, according to, down, are the general English translation. Hence we have καθ' μς with the sense of apud: see Rom. 16:5, 1 Cor. 16:19, Col. 4:15, "church in his house." In English, "your" being the sense, "a poet of yours," Acts 17; 28 Again in Col. 4:7, Eph. 3:20, Phil. 1:12; Ephesians 1:15, "your faith," "faith found with you." It is still carrying the mind on to them and taking them in; what precedes is found there, it singles him out as belonging to them, the measure of his character was that it was theirs. See 1 Peter 4:14; here "measure," (we say in English, "as far as they are concerned"), Rom. 11:21, 24, κατα φσιν κλδοι "natural branches, or according to nature," it was their measure, estimate, and character: other branches were not that, but παρ φσιν. Hence κατα τν δν, Acts 8:36, journeying characterized the place of the water, it was not κατα οκον, but κατα τν δν.

Μετ is simple enough, it is juxtaposition; σν is connection. Hence μετ with the genitive is among, with; but in the accusative, still juxtaposition; but what is μετ is removed on, and at the end of, what is placed in juxtaposition to. Practically it is always with when the noun is in the genitive, and often when in the accusative. I know but one sentence where the sense is doubtful--Luke 1:72. The English can hardly be borne out. The fathers are looked at as those with whom mercy was in exercise, but in the blessing confirmed in their children, according to the promise made to them.

Παρ is always by, by the side of, and, in genitive and dative, as far as I am aware, "near a person." In the genitive it is "from with a person"; in the dative, with or near him. In the accusative, having the force of movement withal, it refers also to places, but still with the force of beside: but hence may mean beyond, outside of, out of the way, along, besides, but always with the same radical force: πειν παρ τν δν, "by the way side"; περιπατεν παρ τν θλασσαν, μαρτωλο παρ πντας "beyond all"; μερα παρ' μρας, beyond, that is, as better, παρ

φυσιν, "unnatural," Ψ not according to nature," something "beside and beyond it"; παρ' ἔλπίδα, "beyond hope παρὰ τὴν κτισσάντα, "more than," "besides, and beyond." 1 Cor. 12:15 is the only difficult passage I am aware of. I do not think it can be "on account of." Παρὰ has also thus the force of comparison, excellent; παρὰ, because it is beyond the thing compared with. Παρὰ τοῦτο is, I apprehend, assuming this to be so, if I set this by the side of the other, supposing it is not a foot, is it therefore not of the body?

Περὶ is simply about, the accusative, giving as usual more the idea of activity as to the object, even where the sense is substantially the same, οὐ καθήμενοι περὶ αὐτῶν: περὶ μῦθου, Phil. 2:23; ἀπερὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πιθυμῶν, Mark 4:19.

The only thing to remark further is Acts 25:18, where it may be a question whether it is to be connected with σταθόντες, which is hardly the case, and so used physically (compare ver. 7), or with ἀπερὶ, concerning him. It runs into the sense of in reference to. It answers to about in English pretty exactly. There is the well-known peculiarity of οὐ περὶ τινὰ being used for the person himself, as Acts 13:13, "including"; περὶ τῶν περὶ (M. Καὶ M.), John 11:19, where it is the persons themselves, and hence τῶν. If Acts 25:18 be not so, there is no example of περὶ governing the genitive in the New Testament in a material sense. With the noun in the accusative it is frequent. The different shade of meaning may be noticed in Phil. 2:19, 20, 23, περὶ μῦθου. In verses 19, 20, it was the actual circumstances that surrounded them, the state they were in. In verse 23, it was what related to him, what was going to happen to him, what referred to him, not what he was then in. But these are mere shades of thought, yet sensible ones, and give beauty and tone to speech. As regards things and places, to which the things which are περὶ refer, we have seen that in the New Testament, if it be not the one exception, the word after περὶ is always in the accusative.

Πρὸς, genitive only; before, as to time, place, and hence in front of, as in English. It calls for no particular remark.

Πρὸς, genitive, dative, accusative. Its common use is the accusative with (as ever) the thought of motion toward a remote object, or rather an object not in connection already with that which acts by the preposition. There are in the New Testament but six exceptions (two, new readings) to the objective case, in die Richtung hin. Five have the dative, where it is at, connection, proximity. Thus Luke 19:37, ἀγγιζόντος πρὸς τὴν καταβῆσιν would be "drawing near the descent," but τὴν καταβῆσιν, "as he drew near (that is, Jerusalem) at the descent," etc.

The only case that requires any notice is the one instance of the genitive, Acts 27:34, in which the genitive force is remote at first sight, but it was towards the side of, connected with, their safety that their eating took place. With the genitive, it seems to me, there is an ellipse; πρὸς τινος, by some one, that is, "by," at his side. The text is the same; it was on the side of, associated with their safety. It was πρὸς, in the direction of, the accomplishment of their safety. Hence "for" is quite right in sense. Πρὸς always directs the thought to; hence the accusative is its natural case, but it may show me something directing me toward another as its cause or source, and then it is genitive. If directing my thoughts to it, as at, it is dative; if as towards, the accusative, πρὸς τὸ ὄρος, "towards the mountain"; πρὸς τὸ ἕρει still so, but at it, an der, an die. We have πρὸς ἀλλήλους, πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαλογίζεσθε, because it was in addressing, speaking to, each other. So Acts 28:25, a more striking case. The objectivity is less sensible in some cases, but still is

there, as in  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ . "Are not his sisters all  $\pi\rho$   $\mu$   $\Psi$ ; Mark 6:3: so 9: 19,  $\pi\rho$   $\mu$  (so John 1:2, Mark 2:2; 4:1, 1 Cor. 16:6, 7, 10, 2 Cor. 12:21) " with you," not  $\mu\epsilon\tau$  associated, but apud, not cum. So  $\pi\rho$   $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho$   $\nu$   $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$   $\nu$   $\sigma\iota$ , " up to a certain time." A more unusual case is Luke 12:47,  $\pi\rho\varsigma$   $\tau$   $\theta$   $\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ , not  $\kappa\alpha\tau$  taking it as the rule or measure, but up to it, reaching it, acting with a view to it, as an object to be attained; he had it as his object. It was not failure in measure merely, but in purpose, and taking it as his measure, the object of his mind and will; and this sense (practically " according to ") goes far in its use: 2 Cor. 5:10, " received according to what he has done,"  $\pi\rho$   $\nu$ . Gal. 2:14,  $\pi\rho$   $\nu$   $\lambda$   $\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ , " according to the truth," keeping it in view as an object; Eph. 3:4, 2 Cor. 3:4: so " we have peace towards God," Rom. 5:1, looking at Him as the object; Acts 24:16, conscience, and Rom. 15:17, a more peculiar case, but the same. Hence it may be comparative, as the object to which we refer, Rom. 8:18. Hence Matt. 19:8, " Moses in view of the hardness of your heart." " So  $\pi\rho\varsigma$   $\tau\upsilon\varsigma$   $\alpha\gamma$   $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ , Heb. 1:7, 8, as to speaking, with them in view in His mind. As to time, we have  $\pi\rho$   $\nu$ , towards,  $\pi\rho$   $\nu$   $\iota\sigma\pi$   $\rho\alpha\nu$ , Luke 24:29, 1 Cor. 7:5,  $\pi\rho\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho$   $\nu$  " up to a certain time," " for a season." It is used as to swearing to any one. Mark 9:10, some " kept it to themselves/" Mark 13:22, note, " in order to seduce " the object; in Matthew we find  $\nu$   $\sigma\tau\epsilon$   $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu$   $\nu$   $\sigma\alpha\iota$ .

It practically has the sense of against with certain verbs. They " murmured against the disciples," Luke 5:30, they were the objects of their murmur; Luke 20:19, " with them in view." "At " would do in English. Acts 19:38; 23:30; 24:19; 26:14, 1 Cor. 6:1: so Eph. 6:12, but still as the object in view. Thus in Col. 3:19, towards would do as well as against, or better. Another use of it, still with the sense of having the other as an objective view, is found 2 Corinthians

6: 14, 15, " fellowship of light with darkness," " concord of Christ with Belial." If I bring one to the other, there is no concord or fellowship, nothing in common. In Eph. 4:12, the object is the perfecting of the saints: a result to be attained as a second consequence was ministry and the body. It is to be noted that the individual saint comes first in Ephesians, though the epistle be full of the church. Eph. 5:31 is somewhat peculiar, " joined to," not " with." He was " to leave father and mother and be joined to her."

The object is distinctly seen in 1 Tim. 4:7, 8, 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, 2 Peter 1:3. In Heb. 1:13, it may be doubtful if to or as to be best, on account of its common use after " speaking," see verse 7, 8. See 1 John 5:16, 17; we see that object does not mean always mental intention, but  $\pi\rho$   $\nu$  in fact, and here James 4:5 comes in.

$\Sigma$   $\nu$  needs no comment. It is with governing a dative. It is different from  $\mu\epsilon\tau$  in that it is not only accompanying as to being together or near so as to mean after, as we have seen, with the accusative; but association, connection. There is no passage requiring observation. It naturally governs the dative, which is the case of close connection or relationship, as the accusative is of object in view. I add, it is together in something common to both, not mere proximity as  $\mu\epsilon\tau$ .

$\pi$   $\rho$  requires more attention: over is its natural meaning; only over, not on-that would be  $\pi$ . Then with the accusative, which always gives an object or motion, " over in place," that is, beyond;  $\pi$   $\rho$  with the genitive in the moral sense, in which alone it is used in the New Testament, has the sense of for, in favor of, and as " for " also has in English, in the place of, in that place in which another would have been if the one who is there for him had not, or at any rate taking that place when he cannot. Thus, " to pray for, or in favor of," it takes hence the sense of for in general in



which acts δι is viewed actively: a man is baptized π John, tempted π Satan, loved π το Πατρς, surnamed π the apostles, and hence it is so constantly used with the passive. The most peculiar use in this respect is Rev. 6:8, v till you come to the beasts; these being distinct agents, it is π as to them under which men suffer. It may be said of its use in the New Testament that when the sense is passive (when another thing is acted on by what is governed by π), the word governed is in the genitive: where the sense is active (that is, when the word governed by π is that under which something is placed or set; and even with the verb substantive, when the sense is being placed there, or no verb of the sense be such), the governed noun is in the accusative. A man set under authority, who is under authority, not acted on by it, but so placed under heaven, that is, when the subject of the sentence is referred to it objectively, then it is the accusative, and it signifies under. When it is acted on by the word governed by π, the genitive is used, and it signifies by, of, or with, in the same sense as "loved of the Father," "delivered to me of my Father," "vexed with the conversation." The accusative is the relative position towards the governed word (the universal force of the accusative); the genitive a subjected or receptive condition to or from the action of the governed word. The subject of the sentence is the object of the governed word's action. "I am set under authority"; authority would be accusative. It is my relationship to it. So Matt. 8:9, "I am directed by authority"; authority would be in the genitive, because I am subjected to its action. Generally, therefore, with the genitive the sentence is passive in form, always in sense. If the governed word be that towards which the subject is in relationship, the form is immaterial; as, "ye are under the law," "under sin." It is accusative. It may be expressed thus-when the subject which is π is referred to that π which it is objectively, this latter is in the accusative; when the former is passively under the effect of this latter, this is in the genitive. One is π τν νμον, τν κατρων. It is his position towards the law, the curse destroyed. In π τν φων, the destruction is the effect of this latter.

Χωρς, genitive: without, apart from, "wholly unconnected with," as not in relationship, so as that, as to the subject, it is the same as if it did not exist. But there is no case requiring any particular notice. Compare νευ.

### Scriptural Criticisms

I.

DEAR SIR,

I would renew my purpose to take notice of any passages in which it would appear to me more light might be thrown on the word, as read in English; which I conceive would be a valuable thing to many interested in the study of the scriptures. Often on an isolated expression much chain of argument depends; and again, a single expression often contains a head of argument which clears and satisfies the mind as to its bearings. I do not attach any extraordinary importance to the observations; only I feel that whatever clears scripture to the ordinary reader is of importance-I will add, of importance to God in His loving-kindness to us. I will, trusting to the Lord's guidance, advert to one or two passages in the epistle to the Romans.

First, Rom. 1:18: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." It appears to me, that the ordinary punctuation here mars the sense. Its force I apprehend is this, "all ungodliness, and

unrighteousness of men that hold the truth in unrighteousness "; and this is a most important distinction, for it brings in the whole Gentile world guilty; as the apostle afterward proves. God having been revealed in Christ, wrath is revealed against all ungodliness without exception, because it is such, and as ungodliness, **■σ■βειαν**. Your Greek readers will remember that worshipping Gentiles are called by the opposite word to this, that is, **σεβομ■νους**, or "devout." Hence we have two great classes-ungodliness universal; and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness.

I would add another remarkably beautiful circumstance of the most accurate word of God in this passage: wrath is not revealed in Him. In Him, or therein, the righteousness of God is revealed; but there is no "therein" or "in him," when the wrath is spoken of. It is universally revealed. What we have revealed in Christ is, "that he died for the ungodly" (the same word), and of God, that in and by the gospel He justifies the ungodly.

There is another expression which often puzzles the reader, which seems to me very plain by attention to the use of the words of the original-"revealed from faith to faith"; **■κ π■στεως ε■ς π■στιν**. Now I believe that **■κ** (the word here translated "from") always, when thus used with an abstract word, means the character, or order, or manner, of the thing which is spoken of. Thus salvation is **■κ π■στεως** here, "from faith," as we should say, "faithwise" (a form retained in many common words). This is its manner, order, the dispensation according to which salvation comes. The literal meaning is its source, "out of," which very readily in an abstract word is used in the sense of its order or dispensation. Even in English the expression is not unusual; for example, "It is out of kindness he does it," as we might in a similar sense add, "not through severity." Now I believe this to be the uniform sense of the preposition **■κ** used abstractedly, or in its moral sense, and hence also especially when it is used without the definite article in Greek following it. Applying this to this sentence, of which I will give further instances explanatory of passages in this book, "The righteousness of God is revealed from faith"; that is, according to the principle of faith, or a dispensation of faith, in this order or manner-"to faith," therefore, which is the recipient power consequently in man. The statement is a most perfect abstract of the character of the dispensation: a revelation; the subject of that, "the righteousness of God"; the character of the dispensation by which it is revealed, **■κ π■στεως**, and, consequently, that to which it is so revealed, "faith."

The following may be taken as instances: **■κροβυστ■α ■κ φ■σεως**, "uncircumcision by nature"; and in Rom. 2:29 we have an instance of the remark as to the leaving out of the article, **■παιωος ■ξ ■νθρ■πων**, that is, "human praise"; that is, the character of their praise: expressions, in this instance, adequately represented by the English of them.

Again, chapter 3: 20, **δι■τι ■ξ ■ργων ν■μου**, "by the works of the law," that is, in this way. And hence we have the plain sense of another passage in this book, which has perplexed English readers: "justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith"; **■κ π■στεως... δι■ τ■ς π■στεως**. The circumcision had been seeking justification, but they had been seeking it **■ξ ■ργων ν■μου**, in that way, the wrong way-by works of law. God would now justify them, not in that way but in another way, that is, **■κ π■στεως**, "by faith," according to that principle or dispensation. But, inasmuch as it was upon this principle, the same God would justify, must justify, him who had the principle; and therefore a Gentile who had this faith (God's gift) would be justified

through or by it, δι τς πστεως. The former being the principle of the dispensation, which involved justification, when the thing existed, the person who had it was justified necessarily upon this principle; and therefore by the same God the believing Gentile was necessarily admitted. It was therefore ες πακο ν πστεως, for the obedience of faith to all nations for His (Christ's) name, the object and subject matter of faith, in whom the Lord requiring the obedience was revealed.

So, in chapter 4: 2, ξ ργων δικαιοθη, "justified by works," that is, in that way. So ο κ περιτομς--ο κ ν μου--ξ ριθεας. I have given instances sufficient, I believe, to explain what I mean; were I to adduce all the proofs, I should quote every place where κ is used without the article. I would only remark, sir, that it is not a hasty observation, though of course liable to correction, for I have held it in the use of scriptures these nine years, but had not the opportunity of your journal to express it thus.

I have alluded to the use of the article or its omission; and it seems to me a most important point in the use of the Greek Testament. My observation has led me (and in these things we are as dependent on the Lord's guidance, and as much debtors to His mercy as in anything) to this conclusion that, whenever the article is used, it denotes a or the substantive object of the sentence; and where it is not used, the word is always characteristic; and that this rule holds good in all circumstances, though more difficult of discovery, to a mind not accustomed to abstract, in some cases than in others. Granville Sharp and Bishop Middleton have elaborately treated the article, and with great value in many respects; but I believe the above simple rule involves the true decision of every case. Bishop Middleton makes all prepositions an exception; I believe them none. The principle is recognized distinctly in a formal proposition: that is, the subject has, the predicate has not the article; so much so, that if it has, the proposition becomes what is called reciprocal: that is, the terms are so identical in extent, that either could be affirmed of the other. I would note, before I pass on, an instance of this, the mistranslation of which I believe to have been a cause of as much error in the Church as any one thing: μαρτα στ ν νομ, " sin is the transgression of the law." The apostle states no such thing. Sin is lawlessness; or lawlessness, that is insubordination, is sin. Disobedience is sin. This may be proved in breaking the law in a given instance: that is, transgression of the law is sin; but sin is not the transgression of the law, for, ρχι γ ρ ν μου μαρτα ν ω κσμ. Yet I suppose upon this false translation half the formal judgment of the Church upon what sin is has been founded; but it is not my business to reason upon this here. It is exceedingly interesting from its connection with 2 Thess. 2:3, 7, 8, where we have the man τς μαρτας of sin; and then the mystery τς νομς of iniquity (the two terms of the reciprocal proposition above), concluding with νομος the wicked one; and I believe it to assist much in the solution or understanding of that passage. I believe there is a much higher characteristic of sin than the breach of a commandment-the spirit of disobedience.

The rule destroys the folly of many Socinian comments, easily else destroyed, such as Wakefield's and the like. " In the beginning was the word," &c.; κα Θες ν λογος. Θες here is the predicate of λογος, and if it had had the article, it would have proved that there was naught else at all God but the Word- that the extent of Godhead was equivalent to λογος. It has nothing whatever to do with any emphatic sense of Θες, a sense which I believe Θες never can be proved to have.

Take another illustrative instance; Rom. 1:21: δι■τι γν■ωτες τ■ν Θε■ν, ο■χ ■ς Θε■ν ■δ■ξασαν-not clearly as a subordinate God: the apostle's argument is directly the other way. But when they knew God, the Person, the one God, the object of reverence, they glorified Him not in that character. Had the other notion been right or in any instance true, this passage would have no force, unless it were ■ς τ■ν Θε■ν. I believe then, in every instance where the article is omitted, the noun is characteristic, adjectival in its character; where inserted, it presents the substantive object of thought.

The observations of Granville Sharp quite fall in with this, but are only an instance of it. Thus in τ■ν μ■νον δεσπ■την Θε■ν κα■ Κ■ριον ■μ■ν ■ησο■ν Χριστ■ν, the τ■ν belongs to ■ησο■ν Χριστ■ν-all the rest is characteristic of Jesus Christ, " the only [master] God and our Lord Jesus Christ." The rule has been drawn of old from the reading of the New Testament. If any student of it would take the first seven verses of the epistle to the Romans-a book in which the observation has peculiar value from the character of the reasoning-I think he will find the light it throws on the subject, and be recompensed through the whole of the rest of scripture for his trouble. I am aware it may be found to militate against many reasonings of individuals, with whose results at the same time I may fully agree. I have no doubt myself of its universal applicability and use.

The undoubted truth of it in the case of a preposition is a strong argument for the truth of the principle. To take a single example, Rom. 1:3, περ■ το■ υ■ο■ α■το■, this is the substantive object of that sentence. In the next, His identification as Jesus (whom we have known as man) is so. Hence we have το■, that is, ■ησο■ Χριστο■ το■ Κθρ■ου ■μ■ν--■ρισθ■ντος υ■ο■ ■ν δυν■μει, this is what He is. Again, ■ξ ■ναστ■σεως νεκρ■ν. Now this might perhaps, with almost equal (I do not say equal) force, be δι■ τ■ς, though it would then be α■το■; but it states here the manner of the determination, not the fact by which it is declared, therefore it is simply ■κ ■ναστ■σεως νεκρ■ν. So in English we might say " by resurrection," or again, " by the resurrection "; both would be true, their force would be different.

The application of this rule is of most extensive, and consequently immense importance, remembering it is applicable to scripture. I have myself no doubt of its universal truth, but I should feel obliged by any of your correspondents suggesting any passage, if there be any, which falsifies it.

One instance destroys a principle, not a human custom; where there is only one distinct act, the insertion or omission makes no difference in sense, only in force; and hence some apparent difficulty, which for this reason alone I notice.

Thus, in an instance I take casually, πολλ■κις παθε■ν ■π■ καταβολ■ς κ■σμου ν■ν δ■ ■παξ ■π■ συντελε■ τ■ν α■■νων. (Heb. 9:26.) The point was His often suffering; the other was a necessary, not the substantive part of the sentence. On the matter it would have been equally true ■π■ τ■ς καταβολ■ς το■ κ■σμου, but the sentence would not have carried the same quantity of moral truth. It gives the characteristic of the period, not the period itself. As in vulgar English, often more pregnant with force than what is accounted refined grammatical language, we say " in kingdom come," it would be much less expressive to say, which is all I am now concerned in, " the kingdom to come "; it would state the same fact, but would not in the same way apply the character of it to the subject of conversation. So again, ■π■ συντελε■. Here again the whole force of it arose from this being one of the characteristics of the suffering (indeed that suffering had



His servant, one able to sustain all the attributes of Jehovah, spoken of before as the medium of, and making them all, mercy towards His people. It is the same word in verses 24, 28, 33. The whole seems to be the presenting Christ as the sustaining person of Chesed, and the consequences towards those with whom He is united. The same word is used in Psa. 16, when the resurrection of our Lord is spoken of.

I have a strong conviction that the words abstractedly might be applied to either; yet that, when they have a definite formal application, Chasidim applies to the Jewish, Kedoshim to the Gentile or Church saints; but the thing cannot be taken as a simple general rule without more understanding of the subject.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

D.

## The Bearing of Romans 5:12-21

My dear Brother,

The division in the doctrinal teaching of the Epistle in Rom. 5 at the beginning of verse 12, the verse you point out, has been already noticed in tracts which are in print. The former part deals with what we have done, as God's question to Cain; the second with what and where we are, as God's question to Adam, the state of Adam being confirmed and made plain by the judgment pronounced on him. "He drove out the man." Rom. 1:19 to 5:11 deals with what we have done, and Christ's propitiation as the remedy, adding His resurrection as the great seal of it. From verse 12 it deals with what we are. He speaks of state, not guilt, though of course guilt is there.

The "wherefore" (δι■ το■το), of which you first ask, is a gathering up of the whole teaching of the previous part of the epistle, which taught, not Judaism and a called people, but wrath from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of them who hold the truth in unrighteousness, Jew and Gentile. All were under sin under different circumstances, but alike come short of the glory of God; and every mouth stopped, those that had law, as well as reckless Gentiles sunk in evident depravity. It was the condition of the whole race of man, as man, before a revealed God, holy in His nature. There is, however, an additional special ground of the "wherefore," which will not be fully apprehended till that is introduced: a living Christ securing blessing where a man is justified from the old sins, and reconciled, having been an enemy. Christ's death would secure him through, and save him from wrath. This so far brought in, not only the clearing the guilty by the work Christ had wrought, but a new standing in life. By the righteousness of one the free gift came to all for justification of life. This was a new position of man, not indeed yet the glory or resurrection with Christ and union with Him, but a new position and standing; not merely the clearing away the sins a man was guilty of in connection with his old standing, but a new standing in life, a justification of life.

This clearly brought in a new state, not mere justification from the evil he was guilty of, but a condition into which he was brought; hence too, though recognizing it, it reached out beyond the whole nature of Judaism. This the apostle sums up in chapter 5: 12-21 with the connecting word "wherefore/" taking the whole scope of thought which precedes, and resuming it in his own mind, as is his custom, as a causative point of departure in his reasoning, as he often does too with the word "for" (γap). The sense of what had been said led to this, "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." This brings us to ■φ' ■.

■π■ with a dative is primarily "upon," as ■π■ πιν■κι, "on a dish"; hence is used for "besides," something added, ■π■ π■σι, in addition to all this, or above. Hence also as ■π■ τ■ προδοτικ■, ■π■ θ■ραϊς, but with the idea of actually touching. It is then used morally for a ground, motive, object, what characterizes an act. We use "upon" so, but with express words: I did it upon this ground, upon this condition. Greek uses it by itself, something which is, not the cause, but is supposed; without which the thing would not so be as we say it is. We are called not ■π■ ■καθαρο■ under a supposition of being unclean persons when so called. ■π■ τρισ■

μ■ρτυσιν, three witnesses were the condition of carrying out the judgment. Any necessary or true condition: " man shall not live by bread ■π' ■ρω." It was not the cause of life, but his life was involved in it; so ■π■ παντ■ ρ■ματι. We say "to live upon." This use of ■π■ is very common; ■π' ■λπ■δι ■ροτρι■ν. It was no cause of plowing; still the plowing was not to be without it. ■π■ τ■ ν■ματ■ μου, the reception of the child is characterized by that as a motive. In English we must translate it variously, but it is easy to understand in Greek something supposed and viewed as involved in a thing happening, without which it would not be what it is, but not its cause.

Thus here, the origin of death amongst men, or cause of its entrance into man's world, was Adam's sin; but if we could suppose (what could not be save by this acting of God, as in the miraculous birth of Christ) a man born without sin, he would not be brought under death. Hence each person's sinning is supposed in its passing upon all: it is vorausgesetzt; death comes moyennant. It is ■φ' ■, " inasmuch as," or " for that " as in Authorized Version, not " because." A man was condemned because of his sin, or an elder judged; but it was ■π■ τρισ■ μ■ρτυσιν, that was a regular condition of his being condemned. The sinning exists as a fact connected with the dying: they do not die without it. The origin of death in the world was Adam's sin. It is not a condition set out a priori, as if it was uncertain whether they would, but a fact which comes in for those involved in death.

I do not think children enter into the question here-no more than when the apostle says, " all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." They really begin to sin as soon as they begin to live: though it be undeveloped, their will works. I do not doubt they go to heaven: Matt. 18, I think, shows it, and the ground; but the apostle is looking at man manifested as man, that is, what he is and does. Children are saved, not by innocence, though practically an expression of it, but because Christ came to save what was lost. This question then I dismiss; I refer to it merely as an objection which might be made.

I do not think ■φ' ■ has the sense " whereunto,": if it were the object in its extent, it would be, I conceive, the accusative, if so used at all. What follows, to the end of verse 17, is a parenthesis, bringing in the question of law's place and bearing, and insisting that grace which met sin could not be narrowed up to law, though it met transgressions under it. And first it is asserted that sin was in the world when the law was not. True, a sin could not be reckoned as so much to an account; but death proved its reign over those who were not in the case of Hos. 6:7. Israel, like Adam, had transgressed a positive covenant; but sin was reigning in death over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. And Adam was a figure of the second Adam come in grace. Now though transgressions or offenses, as verse 16, had to be met, yet the condition and state was the great point here, the many connected with him had been constituted sinners by Adam's disobedience; so the many connected with Christ were constituted righteous by Christ's obedience; but this was state and standing, not properly guilt as to things done. Sin was in the world before the law came.

As to ■λλογε■ται, it is not ■λογ■ζετο, " was accounted " (as righteous). The word is only used elsewhere in Philemon. It is not a person accounted righteous on whatever account, but a particular act or debt owing-put into an account. When there was no specific prohibition, there was no specific transgression. Sin was there, but there was no transgression. This requires a law to transgress. But the evil tree bears its fruits and proves what the tree is, and men are judged

according to their works. But there was not as under the law positive transgression, which the government of God could deal with as so much to be reckoned to a man in that government. When God judges the secrets of men's hearts, their works will come out in the books, a witness of what the state of their hearts was, and all will see the light. The apostle speaks here as of the present condition of the world: you could not say you have transgressed here, broken the law there; but the reign of death proved that sin was there. But Adam was the figure of Him to come.

Shall the bearing of man's offense be greater than that of God's gift? Death was reigning outside the law; but by the offense of one many were dead: should not the grace of God much more abound to the many who labor under it, and not be confined to the Jews who claimed it? The state of sin was universal through Adam, the grace must be as wide in its address. Again, as by one's sinning came the charge or guilt leading to condemnation, should not the free gift be thus too? Yea, more, the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift, with many offenses to meet, to justification; vs.16. The first phrase is by one having sinned; the second " by one " is abstract, **■ξ ■v■ζ**, of one [thing or person]: of one-that is its general character; then the free gift is **■κ πολλ■v**-had that as its character. The first statement in verse 15 declares that as to the objects the sphere must extend to the many, since by the offense of one the many died. Grace must go out as far and brings in the man Christ Jesus, the last Adam, of whom the first was a figure, the thought necessarily involving it. The comparison to prove the extent in verse 16 is between the acts, as 15 between the objects. The guilt which led to condemnation was **■ξ εν■ζ**, a unity; the free gift being of God was of many offenses. So as to the effect: by the offense of one, death reigned by one; much more the grace would triumph on the other hand, and they that received it would reign in life. In these three aspects grace in God triumphed over sin in man, and that by one man, not by every man for himself, the principle of law and individual judgment. As far as offenses went, they had been multiplied, and grace could meet them.

Verse 18 resumes the general principle from verse 12, and is as abstract as possible. As by one offense towards all for condemnation, the direction and tendency of the one offense, so by one righteousness or righteous act accomplished towards all for justification of life; for it was in the risen Jesus they got it, from having been under death, and now justified if they had Him in life. For as by the disobedience of one the many connected with him were constituted sinners, put into that place; so by the obedience of one the many connected with Him were constituted righteous. The **■πακο■** is looked at as the whole principle of Christ's life, including as to its character, and proved by, obedience unto death. There was a disobedient man, proved in eating the forbidden fruit: he disobeyed God's will. There was an obedient man: He obeyed God's will. The character and measure of the obedience all through, as proved by it, was obedience unto death, the death of the cross. This had nothing to do with law.

There are, as the whole passage teaches and has for its object to teach, two heads of races, natural and spiritual: two persons, one in whom sin, the other in whom grace, came; and, further, that the law was a " moreover " (**πλ■v**), which came in by the bye, **παρεισ■λθεν**, but that you could not shut the grace up to that, but must go to the two heads of sin and grace. The law merely came in that the offense might abound, but it was not only when offense, but when sin, abounded that grace abounded over it. Had righteousness replaced the reign of sin, judgment and condemnation only could have been the effect. But grace reigned, yet through righteousness, (on the principle of divine righteousness, fully established), and that to eternal life, through Jesus

Christ our Lord: a complete summary of the whole ways of God. Death is looked at as death here reigning by sin; condemnation was out beyond that.

I turn to look at some of the words inquired of.

Παρ■βασις is positive transgression of a law which exists. Παρ■πτωμα, though applicable to transgressions, is a more general word and with a different sense.

Παρ■βασις goes beyond and transgresses an actual law or barrier set us by God. Hence there must be a law. Παρ■πτωμα fails or falls from the right condition in which we should hold ourselves. Transgressions do this, but every fault and failure does. This can be without a law. A Concordance will easily show this. I am not aware of any case where παρ■βασις is used without direct reference to law (or tradition), unless the verb in Acts 1:25. (Judas παρ■βη), and a case where another reading is preferred.

Δ■ρημα, χ■ρισμα, δωρε■ require a keener, finer sense of shades of meaning to distinguish.

Δ■ρημα is the gift, χ■ρισμα the fruit of grace in the person giving. So far there is a shade in the way the same thing is given. I say such a thing was a gift, a free gift; I did not earn it. How came you to have it? It was pure grace (a χ■ρισμα) in the person who gave it me. One leads me to think of it as freely given, not earned, and given without condition or price, the others to what moved the person to give. The gift of righteousness is not by working or labor, or acquired fitness, or anything on my part. It is a free gift, δωρε■, but the δωρε■ is ■ν χ■ριτι. God's divine favor and grace were the origin of this gift; so in verse 16 his mind goes up to God as a source; it is therefore χ■ρισμα in the beginning of the verse. And it is a gift-the fact simply; but is it not to be as large as the evil? It is a χ■ρισμα of God; this cannot but be. Whereas in verse 15 he is contrasting abstractedly man's fall and offense with God's giving: hence it is χ■ρισμα.

As to the difference of δ■ρημα and δωρε■, the former word is used but twice, here and in James 1:17, where the mind rests in the thing given, in δωρε■ in its quality. In English we use "gift" for both. "What did you give for that?" "Nothing; it is a gift. I have it as a δωρε■." "What is your gift?" "It is a beautiful Bible, a δ■ρημα." So we use "hope" for the thing hoped for and the quality. That δωρε■ is the quality we see when adverbially used, δωρε■ν ■λ■βετε, δωρε■ν δ■τε. Δωρε■ then is the general word which characterizes what I get. You may remark that all the words in verse 16 have this form, that is, are objectively looked at as a complete subsisting thing: δ■ρημα, κρ■μα, κατ■-κρ■μα, χ■ρισμα. In James 1:17 we have δ■σις and δ■ρημα.

As to these forms, and so in δ■και-, many of your readers may be, but perhaps all are not, aware that the ordinary rule is, that words derived from the perfect passive have their force according to the person. The first person is the objective thing or act, the second the doing, the third the doer, -μα, -σις, -της; as κρ■μα the judgment pronounced, the thing itself imputed; κρ■σις judging as an act; κριτ■ς the judge. So δ■σις is properly giving, δ■της a giver.

It may be added here that κατ■ compounded with a word gives intenseness to it, as ■χω to have, κατ■χω, to hold, hold fast, take and keep fast; χρ■ω, καταχρ■ω, to use as a possession what belongs to me. These become modified in use. Κρ■μα is the thing of which I am accused and for which I am judged. Christ's κρ■μα was put on the cross, what He was condemned for; it is the thing imputed to me. Κατ■κριμα is actual condemnation.

Thus also δικα<sup>ω</sup>μα would be the objective sum total, which being accomplished gives me righteousness as far as that sum total goes: hence an ordinance, or such a fulfillment of required righteousness as makes my righteousness complete as to that. If it is before God, it must be according to God and absolute. Hence we have the δικα<sup>ι</sup>μα<sup>τ</sup>α of the saints. Zacharias kept the δικα<sup>ι</sup>μα<sup>τ</sup>α of the law blameless. It is the sum total of what is required. Δικαιοσ<sup>ν</sup>η is the abstract idea or the quality, the thing righteousness. Δ<sup>κ</sup>αιος is what any one is; δ<sup>κ</sup>αιο-σ<sup>ν</sup>η is that thing which having he is δ<sup>κ</sup>αιος. Christ is made unto us δικαιοσ<sup>ν</sup>η. I have this character before God; but the δικα<sup>ω</sup>μα of the law is to be fulfilled in us, the full requirement of the law. So verse 16 speaks " of many offenses, ι to δικα<sup>ω</sup>μα, to the full requirement of what must be for me to be δ<sup>κ</sup>αιος before God. It is not to justify me (however true before God), but the full sum of that needed for my being accounted just. Justification of life is δικα<sup>ω</sup>σις, the act of justifying, but being in the new place or state beyond death, it is in life as Christ is risen. In verse 17 I have the gift of δικαιοσ<sup>ν</sup>ης, that is, the state God sees me in or has given to me in Christ. But the one δικα<sup>ω</sup>μα is the full required total, the act which met the whole requirement.

I believe I have answered, I hope rightly, all the questions you have put to me. The English mind is little used to the niceties of Greek language; still they are often of value to one that studies, and result in greater general clearness of statement. Some of the verses of this passage are as badly translated as any in the New Testament, or worse, as especially verse 18. Those in the parenthesis (15, 16, 17) are all much clearer, I think, if put as a question.

#### Scriptural Criticisms

2.

DEAR SIR,

I would renew my attempt to clear the interpretation of the New Testament by some very simple criticisms.

I would here first take notice of the difference of ε<sup>ς</sup> and π<sup>■</sup>, the use of either of which distinctly is intimately connected with the question of God's love to the world, and the absolute salvation of the Church: to which, important as it is, I refer here only in connection with the texts I take notice of.

Rom. 3:22: " The righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe "; not unto and upon all them that believe, but the righteousness of God is unto all, and upon all them that believe; δικαιοσ<sup>ν</sup>η Θεο<sup>■</sup> ε<sup>ς</sup> π<sup>■</sup>ν<sup>τ</sup>ας το<sup>■</sup>ς πιστε<sup>■</sup>ον<sup>τ</sup>ας. The Jews had been convinced of sin; the Gentiles had been convinced of sin; they had no righteousness in which to stand with God. Whether Jew or Gentile, they had no hope in themselves; but the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ was not towards Jew or Gentile, but towards all, ε<sup>ς</sup> π<sup>■</sup>ν<sup>τ</sup>ας. Moreover it was upon all (π<sup>■</sup> το<sup>■</sup>ς πιστε<sup>■</sup>ον<sup>τ</sup>ας) those that believe; they stood in that righteousness.

We have another most important instance in verse 18 of chapter 5. " Therefore as by one offense towards (ε<sup>ς</sup>) all men, to (ε<sup>ς</sup>) condemnation." This was the aspect of the result of the offense (intercepted, as regards them that believe, by the death of Christ); " so by one righteousness towards (ε<sup>ς</sup>) all men, to (ε<sup>ς</sup>) justification of life "; if, as in the English translation, it had been "

upon," for which the scriptures use  $\pi$ , all would have been justified. We know it is not so, nor does the scripture say so. The aspect of the act is as wide as the aspect of the act of the first Adam; the effect is quite another and a distinct question. We have, in the former passage, seen it to be pronounced upon them that believe. These remarks make, I believe, quite clear what the English translation renders very difficult to comprehend. The word translated (Rom. 5:18) " upon all" is the same as " unto all " in Rom. 3:22, not as " upon all" them that believe. It shows that the free gift was unto (that is, towards) all in its aspect; but that its effect, and the acceptance of people under it, is quite a distinct question. The accuracy and perfectness of scripture is additionally illustrated.  $\epsilon$  seems to exhibit the natural consequence, the effect of anything looked at in itself: it may or may not involve the coming to the result; taken in itself it has the effect, for the tendency of anything is that which per se, or left to itself, it would produce or arrive at. The word may be seen in many passages of chapter 6 so used.

I would add a few words on Rom. 7

The expression  $\gamma$  $\nu$  $\eta$  $\tau$  $\alpha$   $\nu$  $\delta$  $\rho$   $\tau$  $\rho$  is translated " married to," which seems to be more than its force; as in verse 3, " if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man." It seems a more general phrase, though in an honest sense it may of course have this force. But while it may be said in a certain way that the soul is married to the risen Christ, the Church, I believe, as such, is never said to be married to Christ. It is said, as to a particular body, that " I have espoused you as a chaste virgin unto Christ."

In Rev. 19 we have the joyful celebration, " Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth; let us be glad and rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." This is after the judgment of Babylon. And again, in chapter z1: 9, " I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." Here we have then the Church confessedly not married to the Lamb; and I believe this to be a most important difference: error as to which has produced as much mistake as any other at all concerning scripture. It may be said to be espoused or destined for him, but the marriage is not yet come. This takes place on being united to Him in that day when He shall appear in His glory, when He calls them up into the air; then shall He " present it to himself a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing."

The Jewish body was so married, " for I am married unto you, saith Jehovah." (Jer. 3:14; Isa. 54:4-6.) " Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed; neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame; for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more: for thy Maker is thy husband; for Jehovah hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth when thou wast refused, saith thy God." And we shall find this remarkably maintained throughout. Thus the Jewish body is ever called an adulteress, as in Hos. 3; the Church as corrupt, but not breaking covenant. " Thou hast judged the great whore," and fornication is the sin of the Church.

Now this difference affects the whole position we are set in. The Church has, never yet been brought into the position with God, in which the whole argument of the great body of comments on scripture supposes it to be placed (and this is another instance of the evil of applying Old Testament statements to New Testament subjects as if they belonged to them), though faith, by the Spirit, sees that place to belong to it, and therefore keeps itself for it. It is the part of Babylon to corrupt itself with all the kings of the earth; but we, though with long protracted affections, know the

faithfulness of the Redeemer's love, and remain in solitude till He who has loved us shall appear. For we are " espoused to one husband," and this shall be in the resurrection, for the second Adam is known to us in the resurrection. We were taken out of Him in death: He is dead to all but faith now, and the Church is therefore still taken out of Him; and in resurrection we shall be one with Him, married unto Him. We are indeed one spirit with Him now, and therefore know the blessing; but the whole body of the Church shall be finally united to Him in the joy of its Lord.

I think it will be found that all the scriptures will bear out this difference; and, clearly, it strongly affects our position, while we learn distinctly the aspect of faithfulness which the Church should present; its utter separation from the world and all secular help; in its character, a chaste virgin unto Christ: γεμουνη νδρ τρ, it has lost all its character as well as relationship. When the spirit of the risen Savior is in me, I am so far united unto Him, and so ought I to keep myself: I am vitally and everlastingly one with Him; but the Church corporate is not so married unto Him, for indeed it is not yet formed. To assume the privileges of a wife does not become her position; not to have more than the modesty of one in her deportment as ill suits her state. She shall reign queen over all her Lord's goods, and rule in His house with Him: fidelity of hope to one long absent from His pledged love-as a stranger therefore in the midst of all that knows Him not-her present portion. Whether receiving the tokens of His love to her from on high or not, faithfulness to Him is her clear part. The world may count her case foolish and hopeless; but she knows in whom she has believed, and she may be content to abide the jest of those who know it not, because she has the secret of His love by His Spirit dwelling in her, and will rejoice in that day when He makes good His faithfulness, and celebrates hers, before those that have despised her. (Compare Rev. 3:8, 9.)

I am daily more and more convinced that this is the real, the only, position of the Church. It may have the desolateness of widowhood, but the keenness and poignancy of affection of one a widow before she was a wife. Babylon has no need to be sorrowfully and separatedly waiting; she has wasted her affections upon ten thousand lovers, who shall hate her in the end. But the true-hearted believer, as partaker of the spirit of the Church, will, as separated from the world, wait for Him in whom his hope is, in the spirit of holy separation.

I would also add, that we find I think a remarkably beautiful association of the act of God and of man in the person of the Lord, in the connection of Gen. 2:22 and Eph. 5:27.

Let me add another suggestion here: the force of δσει τοζ or ταζ in the Revelation appears to me to have the force of making effectual the thing spoken of, making them to be what they are as, but could not be effectually without this interference. We have instances of this in chapter 8: 3 and chapter 11: 3.

I would desire to make some use of the remarks I made on the Greek article in your last number, as they intimately open out the proper deity of our Lord, connected both with His relationship as the incarnate Son with the Father, and with us therein: points which, with that presence of the Spirit by which they are known, form the great scope of Christianity; and it is of great importance in the present day to give the full scope of Christianity. For occupation in the fullness of this is that which preserves the mind under grace, and meets that wandering into things not taught of God-questions of no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers, to which the mere reasoning of the mind is the complete slave, the creatures of intellectual reasonings or imaginings-things which, if not our hands, our intellects have made. No one not acquainted with the extent to which the

Gnostic heretics went, could imagine how far subtle creations of the human intellect misled could go, and from which it can find no retreat but utter humbling. May we be led of the Spirit, and kept fast by the word! There is intellectual idolatry as well as physical, quite as subtle, quite as dangerous, and (if the imagination be less vivid in our days or regions in external or mental objects) there is not the less departure in its duller movements from God, wherever anything but Himself, as taught by the Spirit, is the object of our minds, instead of our being subject to Him thus known in Christ.

But to turn to my criticisms.

Substantially they made the article the person of the sentence, and the words without it the character of that person, or what he was when it is used. This often gives much blessed instruction; thus we have in

Gal. 1:4, το Θεο πατρ μν He who is God and our Father.

Phil. 4:20, τ δ Θε κα πατρ μν, to Him who is God and our Father.

Col. 3:17, τ θε κα πατρ who is God and Father: showing here Father to be a distinct characteristic, just as Son might be.

1 Thess. 1:3, το Θεο κα πατρ μν, both again denominations of το. 1 Thess. 3:2, α τ δ Θε κα πατρ μν, that very one who is God and Father.

James 1:27, τ Θε κα πατρ, Him who is God and Father.

We have a remarkable instance of this construction, in which it was not possible to give this in English from an ordinary participle intervening,

Jude 24, τ δ δυναμ μν σοφ Θε, &c. The

structure is just the same as the former; if translated as the others it ought, in sense, to read if the English could bear it; " To him who is able the only wise God "; the particle to, in verse 25, alone mars the English.

We have another remarkable instance in which it is not rightly given in English,

1 Tim. 1:17, Τ δ βασιλε τν ανων, φθρ, ορτ, μν σοφ Θε, " to him who is the king eternal, incorruptible, invisible, only wise God, honor and glory," &c.

I would now mention some others which have been noticed before, but I bring them in juxta-position with those previously mentioned, as showing the usage of the language; passages in which our Lord is spoken of as God, in the same way, adding some other characteristic than Father.

Titus 2:13, το μεγλου Θεο κα σωτρος μν ησο Χριστο, " Him who is the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ "; compare το Θεο κα πατρ μν. Gal. 1:4.

Jude 4, τν μνον δεσπτην [Θεν], κα κριον μν ησον Χριστον. The structure here is the same, " Him who is the only Lord [God] and our Lord Jesus Christ." I will not adduce other passages to this point; as I stated, it has already been done. These show the identity of

construction of both, while God is the common or one name of both, and the other titles distinctive to each, or common as Savior. We have another instance in 1 Tim. 5:21 of distinctive title annexed.

I now advert to some other passages, which further illustrate the principle and show this unity with us, so as to magnify our blessing, by the same uniform construction. There is an intermediate form in Rev. 1:6; kings and priests τ<sup>■</sup> Θε<sup>■</sup> κα<sup>■</sup> πατρ<sup>■</sup> α<sup>■</sup>το<sup>■</sup>-" to him who is God and his Father." This is the Person to whom He has made us priests.

In Eph. 1:2 God is called our Father. Then, because all fullness dwelt in Him, fullness of relationship as the incarnate object of love, in verse 3 we have this blessed association: ■ Θε<sup>■</sup>ς κα<sup>■</sup> πατ<sup>■</sup>ρ το<sup>■</sup> Κυρ<sup>■</sup>ου ■ μ<sup>■</sup>ν ■ ησο<sup>■</sup> Χριστο<sup>■</sup>, " He who is God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The great object of this epistle specially here is to show the identity in sonship given us in Jesus. So, precisely, in Col. 1:2, 3, we have first, our Father, verse 2, then, -τ<sup>■</sup> Θε<sup>■</sup> κα<sup>■</sup> πατρ<sup>■</sup> το<sup>■</sup> Κυρ<sup>■</sup>ου.

In 1 Peter 1:3, we have the same title given to the holy One, ■ Θε<sup>■</sup>ς κα<sup>■</sup> πατ<sup>■</sup>ρ το<sup>■</sup> κυρ<sup>■</sup>ου. Thus we have on one hand the use of it as to the Father, identifying that name with God; then with the Lord, identifying His name with God; and then identifying Him with us, so as to give us all the blessing which He held with God as man, His God and our God, His Father and our Father. ■ Θε<sup>■</sup>ς κα<sup>■</sup> πατ<sup>■</sup>ρ. Θε<sup>■</sup>ς κα<sup>■</sup> σωτ<sup>■</sup>ρ ■ ησο<sup>■</sup>ς Χριστ<sup>■</sup>ς. Θε<sup>■</sup>ς κα<sup>■</sup> πατ<sup>■</sup>ρ το<sup>■</sup> κυρ<sup>■</sup>ου ■ μ<sup>■</sup>ν ■ ησο<sup>■</sup> Χριστο<sup>■</sup>. ■ Θε<sup>■</sup>ς κα<sup>■</sup> πατ<sup>■</sup>ρ ■ μ<sup>■</sup>ν. Kings and priests τ<sup>■</sup> Θε<sup>■</sup> κα<sup>■</sup> πατρ<sup>■</sup> α<sup>■</sup>το<sup>■</sup>. What a blessed chain! It is extremely sweet to see the blessed truths, in which our whole hope stands, shining out in all their gracious beauty, combined into their places by the same hand which has given the same link of assurance (wonderful mystery!) to one and the other, and the closest criticism, as it appears to me, alike establishing both on the same ground, instead of invalidating them, which superficial assertion would sometimes say that it did.

There are two other passages the force of which is opened out by these remarks. " This is the true God and eternal life." ο<sup>■</sup>τος He (that is, υ<sup>■</sup>ς α<sup>■</sup>το<sup>■</sup> ■ ησο<sup>■</sup>ς Χριστ<sup>■</sup>ς) is the true God, ■ ληθιν<sup>■</sup>ς Θε<sup>■</sup>ς, κα<sup>■</sup> [■] ζω<sup>■</sup> α<sup>■</sup>νιος. Now this, placed as an affirmation concerning ο<sup>■</sup>τος, is affirming the identity of predicate and subject in extent.

Now if we compare John 17:3, we shall see the amazing force of that expression, and the meaning of this: " This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God [that is the Father], and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." That they may know thee, τ<sup>■</sup>ν-that one, or Him, who is the only true God, contrasted with gods many and false gods, and Him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ. How does He give them this eternal life, this knowledge? I answer, By their being planted in Himself: " he that hath the Son hath life ": but they are thus in Him that is true, and consequently, being in Him that is true-that is, in His Son-they dwell in God and God in them. They know the Father, who Himself is the only true God; and they know Jesus Christ whom the Father hath sent, and none else can know Him. Being in Christ and knowing His love, we are in the true God, and so know the Father as being in the Son, and we know Jesus Christ.

I would remark that this passage (John 17:3) seems to me to embrace true religion as referable to Jews and Gentiles. Unless known as the Father, there was no knowing Him at all; and this by knowing Him in the Son; if they knew not Jesus Christ whom He had sent, they knew nothing of

that ministration in which, as Messiah, He had fulfilled the purposes of God, and manifested eternal life in sonship. This was eternal life, for He was the living God. Therefore He says " power over all flesh." The Epistle was written, as the Gospel, to show them what eternal life was, to prove to them that they had it already. He sums up all from first to last (against all the ramifications of intellectual imaginations, in which men, creating trouble for their own minds, were apt to wander) in the person of Jesus Christ, putting everything in its place in and round that center. Whoever studies the three closing οὐδὲν of John's Epistle will at once see the amazing and stern comprehensiveness of the passages, and in the last especially; the closing of all cavil in the person of Jesus Christ-" Him that is true "-" the true God and eternal life." If the object of the two books, as stated, John 20:31, and 1 John 5:13, be observed, the meaning and combined power of these passages will be most apparent. Simplicity of faith is the real secret-the kernel of all knowledge.

I would make further a few remarks on 1 Cor. 15:24, et seq. I do not think it is sufficiently observed that there are two very distinct though closely connected passages referred to there; and I think a little attention will make it plain. The two distinct things are, His " putting his enemies," and putting " all things under his feet." There is also a direct distinction between putting them under Him, and His subjecting them.

I would first remark that the supremacy of man is the point in question-man in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ; as a little farther on, verse 47, " the second man, out of heaven." The whole chapter is the power of the resurrection: the progressive steps of this resurrection occupy the apostle's attention. The putting all things under man's feet is the express subject on which the apostle dwells from Psa. 8 The union of the other with it, being Lord as well as Son of David, is that which must always puzzle the unbeliever, as the Lord did the Jews with it; it is the strength and comfort of faith. It is the same Jesus who was made Lord and Christ, whose coming to take His kingdom is here celebrated.

The whole subject then is the kingdom of man (in resurrection) as a given kingdom, contrasted with God. Hence, the Father never becoming incarnate and remaining in office (I speak after the manner of men) Supreme Deity, the kingdom is delivered up to Him, to God, even the Father, τὸ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς -that God (as contrasted with man) may be all and in all, instead of Christ the Man being all in all. This is clearly the subject: the contrast of God and the given kingdom of the risen Man, the Head of the new world.

With this personal supremacy of Christ, the Lord from heaven, there are two things connected; " the putting his enemies " and putting all things under His feet being quotations from Psa. 110 and 8.

Now under the risen Man, as entitled in every sense thereto by glorifying God, by purchase at His life's cost back again, by overcoming all His enemies personally, God on His resurrection and glorifying put all things under Him, not in actual subjugation, but title of subjection; they were His by victory, by purchase, by worth, in the purpose of the divine glory: so Psa. 8

It is quite otherwise as to the other. There Jehovah says, " Sit thou at my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool."

He is to sit there till it is done. Ruling " in his enemies " and " over all," are quite distinct things; as to both, the gift of dominion by the Father is distinct from subjugation by the Son. In this latter (that is, subjugation by the Son) the two become coincident. The reign of verse 25 I take to be the direct assertion of what is consequent upon His receiving the power of ruling among His enemies till the time when He delivers it up (the last enemy being destroyed, which is death). Further, " sit thou at my right hand till I make "-here is the Father making Christ's enemies His footstool, consequent on which He rules in the midst of His enemies.

Now this act of the Father's the apostle does not speak of; because, after speaking of the resurrection of Christ's people at His coming, the time of this kingdom, he goes on to the end when He delivers up the kingdom; " for," says the apostle, " he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." This is the Son's by His actings in power, as the risen Man. The Father having put His enemies under His feet, or made them His footstool when He comes, having till then sat at God's right hand; " for he hath put all things under his feet." This is another great truth; and here the general act of the Father is spoken of (namely, putting all things under Christ's feet); but as a thing already done-God hath put all things under His feet. This is His enjoyed power-a power the results of which we by no means see accomplished. When they are, when all things are subjected, then He, the Man, will deliver up the kingdom, that God may be all in all.

The same truth as to all things being not subjected by Christ, when all things are put under His feet by the Father, is stated in Heb. 2, where, quoting the same Psa. 8, the Spirit of God adds for us, " Howbeit we see not yet all things put under him, but we see Jesus," exalted.

Here then we find the title of all in inheritance (in Christ determined the Son of God with power) in the resurrection. He waits for the time when the subjugation of His enemies shall make all things His, His enemies not yet being made His footstool. The saints are gathered out, meanwhile, to reign with Him; He acting by His Spirit and controlling also thereby through the world, they are raised at His coming. For His enemies are now put under His feet, and He takes the inheritance, subjecting His enemies; and they having been destroying the inheritance, as well as injuring the heirs in it, He vindicates the inheritance, and we see all things put under Him. For the putting His enemies, and all things under His feet, are two distinct acts; yet the subjugation of the one is the vindication of the other. But we by faith must own that all things are put under Him-glory and honor, power and title His, though we do not see it here; for He sits at God's right hand till His enemies are made His footstool-we being tried therefore meanwhile. We believe therefore that His enemies are not made His footstool, for He yet sits; we waiting longingly, delighting in His glory at the right hand of Jehovah. When He comes, His enemies being made His footstool, we, coming with Him or meeting Him, shall know this also and see all things put under His feet. All things are put under Him because of His title there. His enemies are made His footstool when He leaves it and comes here into these lower regions of earth and heaven, where His enemies are. There He has none: all adore Him. Oh, for the time when it shall be so, and the Father's will be done on earth as it is in heaven, all men honoring Him as they honor the Father! We see the same thing taught us in Rev. 2:17, 18; but I here dwell upon the passage rather than teach or interpret the doctrine. The distinction between the Father's act in putting under, and the fact of their subjection by, the Lord Christ, is manifest in verses 27, 28, as it is also in Heb. 2

The end of Christ's given kingdom is stated in verse 24: the way in which the subjection of His enemies by Him is connected with His power in verse 25: in verse 27 the extent and character of the dominion is given, but not the state of things under it, because resurrection is the subject, and they, though under it in blessing, are not in it; so neither the intermediate state of Psa. 110:1; for the apostle is speaking of the exhibited resurrection state in Christ and in us, and this in full, consequent upon His leaving the right hand of the majesty on high, His enemies now made His footstool.

## Breaking of Bread

---

I regard all pretense in any to priesthood, save that which can be attributed, and which in scripture is attributed to all saints, as the principle of the apostasy in its present form of development and the denial of Christianity. Judaism had priests, because the people could not themselves go directly to God where He revealed Himself; Christianity has none between God's people and Himself in their worship, because Christians are brought to God and have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. To set a priest to go for them as one nearer to God is to deny the effect of Christianity. Besides, priesthood has essentially to do with intercession, or sacrifice and offerings: and in the Lord's Supper there is no sacrifice, nor is it intercession. The whole idea of priesthood on earth is to be rejected, therefore, as utterly contradictory both to Christianity and the act of breaking the bread.

But, on the other hand, it is a mistake to think we partake by breaking the bread or that we break it. The whole force of the thing consists (as to this point) in our partaking of already broken bread. It is His body broken for us that we take and eat. We are not the breakers of His body, properly speaking. So that, I apprehend, the true partaking of the Lord's Supper is after the bread is broken. The breaking of the bread now is of course a necessary accident to such participation, but is no part of the communion at all. And every one acquainted with scripture on the point knows that " blessing " means simply giving thanks, and not consecrating the bread. See 1 Cor. 11:24, and compare Matt. 26:26, 27; Mark 14:22; and Luke 22:19. So in Luke 9:16, the miracle of the loaves and not the Eucharist, He blessed them and brake; in John 6:11, 23; Mark 8:6, 7 (also Mark 6:41), the terms are united; in Matt. 14:19 He blessed, and in chapter 15:36 gave thanks. In 1 Cor. 14:16 we find incontestable proof of what indeed the previous passages can leave no doubt on a reasonable mind. " Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" Blessing is blessing God, a giving of thanks. So the apostle says in chapter 11, " the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks," and in 1 Cor. 10 " the cup of blessing which we bless." Matthew and Mark, speaking of the bread, say, He blessed; and speaking of the cup, say, He gave thanks. In Luke it is simply, He gave thanks. Thus, the blessing which precedes the breaking of bread is a giving of thanks; and in this, of course, all join, as in every thanksgiving, though one may utter it. Every saint is essentially competent, though in a large congregation godly order of mind may leave, it to such as may have justly earned the respect of the body; yet, as the feeling of priesthood is readily slipped into, I should think it desirable that it were not always one. The breaking of the bread is in itself no religious act; it represents the putting of Christ to death, and, as an outward act, it was consummated by wicked men. But the Lord did break it in the last Supper, showing it was a dead Christ they had to feed on; and hence he who gives thanks breaks the bread. The communion comes after and is on a broken body. The breaking is the killing of Christ, and, though absolutely necessary as a figure, because His death was absolutely necessary and is the very point shown forth, yet the act of doing it is no religious part of the thing which one has a privilege in doing. And

as to pouring out the wine, it is done no doubt often, but is no part of the Lord's Supper at all. The wine is, in the institution, supposed to be already in the cup, still pointing to the great fact, that the communion refers to an already dead Savior. The blood is out of the body-" my blood which is shed for you." The act of pouring out would not represent death, because the body is not thus represented, and hence it is not referred to at all. The already shed blood is given thanks for or blessed, as already poured out: " the cup which we bless," etc. There is the breaking of the bread as significative of the breaking of His body; but this is preparatory to communion.

It is this consideration which shows the terrible import of the Roman Catholic doctrine as to the Eucharist, and how Satan has taken them in their own wisdom, and, so to speak, mocked them. The laity are deprived of the cup and are consoled by what is called the doctrine of concomitancy; namely, that the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus are in the bread (indeed in both species). But if the blood be in the body, and not shed and separate, there is no redemption. It is shed blood, not blood in the body, which is the power of redemption; without shedding of blood there is none. This confirms the view, taken above, that it is a body already broken, and blood already shed, of which we partake. Thus, though the bread must be broken, as it was by Christ, by him who gives thanks, this is but preparatory, and forms, strictly, no part of the communion; and, as representing the putting Christ to death, it is no part of the holy service itself, though needed to show that it is of a dead Christ we partake. It is of no living existing Christ, but of a dead Christ, and there is none such.

Remark further, how this sets aside transubstantiation and consubstantiation; for no such Christ exists as that celebrated in the Eucharist. As in the Passover a slain lamb, so a dead Christ is represented there and shed blood; but there is no dead Christ now. He is alive again for evermore. As risen with Him, we remember the sorrows and sufferings which gave us a place there. That atoning death is accomplished and passed, and sin is put away for us, and we are alive with Him for evermore. I would just add that the expression in 1 Cor. 10:16 has no reference to one or to many, but to what Christians do in contrast with Jews and Gentiles. The apostle is treating the question of idolatry. Jews were partakers of the altar, Gentiles drank the cup of demons. What we (Christians) partake of is communion with the sacrifice of Christ. We are identified with the sacrifice, we cannot be with the cup of demons too.

## The Allusion in "the Last Trump"

---

1 Cor. 15:52

After all the grave and wise speculations on the last trump, I strongly suspect it is merely an allusion to military matters. Somewhere in Josephus' War, and perhaps in other books, we have the order of the breaking up of a Roman camp. At the last trump they all break up and march forward. Now, I acknowledge that scripture interpretation is not to be borrowed from without; but I have seen only tortured linkings with other passages within. I am content to take the general idea of the last public call of God relating to the Church, and leave it there. But what suggested the image, I suspect, was what I say: just as κ■λευσμα, in 1 Thess. 4, beyond controversy, is a similar military term used to a similar purpose. Matt. 24:31 ("And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet"), I have not the smallest shadow of a doubt, applies to the assembling of the Jews (elect, as in Isa. 65) after Christ is come.

## **John 6:51 and 2 Corinthians 3:18**

---

By feeding on Christ in His humiliation the soul's affections enter into the preciousness of His path and death, His human path down here. We are touched, moved, softened: Christ has a place in the heart. We abide in Him according to this love, in the delight of this lowliness, and He in us.

In being changed, on the other hand, into the same image by contemplating God's glory in His face, we are drawn out energetically to that which is glorious, to God's glory as set before us; but in One who is a man, who has loved us and died for us, so that we are associated with this glory. The Holy Ghost, who reveals it, interests us in the glory of God, but this in man, and lifts above what is below it and everything connected with life in flesh. The result is that we are formed into the image of what Christ Himself was when on earth. Christ was the display of it practically on earth. Compare Acts 7:56-60, where all this is brightly realized.

## Ephesians 1:9

---

WHAT has all failed in the first Adam will all be accomplished in the last Adam, and much more, gloriously fulfilled. In Eph. 1 there are two things as the portion of the church: one is not entirely fulfilled, and the other we have nothing of yet, the calling of God, and God's inheritance. The calling we get in Eph. 1:4, 5. The first part of the calling is what is before God (v. 4), to be holy and without blame, etc. The second part of the calling is in connection with the Father (v. 5) as children. He has not only put us in a certain place, but has made known to us the mystery of His will, that is all His plan for Christ's glory, which is to gather together in one all things in Him. And the moment that comes I get the inheritance-not the calling only, but the the inheritance. Of this we have nothing now but the earnest of the Spirit. We have the calling. Colossians presents the same general truth, but more developed as to Christ.

In Col. 1:15-18 I get the two headships of Christ- Head over all things, and Head of the body. He takes as Man what He created as God; and, besides, He takes other men as fellow-heirs with Him. Thus we see in verse 21, that us who not only were in confusion and disorder, but were positively enemies, He reconciles. This consciousness has been lost by the professing church-that we are reconciled. The state of things is not reconciled; but we are reconciled. The inheritance we cannot have, till the true Heir take it. Christ is not sitting on His own throne now, but on His Father's throne. When He sits down on His own throne, He will have us there with Him. He sits on His Father's throne by His title of Son. " To him that overcometh will I give to sit down with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." Our present condition is to know that Christ is exalted, and we reconciled. But He has not taken the inheritance, nor, of course, have we. Our place before God is His calling-everything that is created will be our inheritance.

In Psa. 2 you have the counsels of God about Christ, to set Him on Zion as king. Adonai shall have them in derision -not Jehovah as such. These two points, Christ set as king on the holy hill of Zion, and owned to be the Son of God, you find in Psa. 2 In Psa. 8, you do not get Him as Son of God, but as Son of man, put over everything that God has created-that He has created, for He is God. In John 1:49 you hear the Lord applying these two things. There Nathaniel owns Him as King of Israel, according to Psa. 2 and He says as it were, " That is over: I am not going to be King of Israel now." But you shall see greater things, the Son of man according to Psa. 8, with every creature subject. The place the church gets is to be joint-heirs. We take the place of suffering now. We only see half of Psa. 8 fulfilled yet. We see Him at the right hand of God, but not with all things put under Him. He is gathering now the joint-heirs. Nothing is yet fulfilled. For the redemption of the purchased possession He must come again.

Yet in Him we have redemption. There is no such thing recognized in Scripture, as a Christian doubting he is saved. And it is all a totally false pretension of humility. If my Father forgives me, and I doubt His forgiveness, I am not trusting Him. It is doubting God's word, or not receiving the truths He gives us: we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear. Let a man fear

temptation-doubt his own heart, that is another thing; but not doubt God, or dread God. There is no such thing in scripture as a Christian without the Spirit of adoption, crying " Abba, Father." There is no such thing after Christ's death recognized in Scripture as a Christian not knowing he is saved. The thief on the cross was as fit to go to heaven as Paul, and he went there; and none went not fit. I know that there is growth, of course; but there is no meetness or fitness for heaven, except the work of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is not Christianity to doubt, though many a real honest Christian does doubt. It is Christianity to know we are reconciled. If you have not peace, you have not got what Christ left for you. He says,

Come unto me, and I will give you rest." If you have not rest, am I to say either you have not come? or Christ does not speak truth? It may be bad teaching. Many a one will cry " Abba, Father," most heartily in his prayers, who would not own, if you asked him, that he was a child of God. Of course, he has the Spirit of adoption, though he does not know it. It is just selfishness that makes him doubt. In Rom. 7, what is it he is talking about? Just self-not Christ at all. Is that humility? not a word about Christ and the Spirit! and I am told that is a Christian. There is nearly forty times " I " and " me," and not once Christ and the Spirit, just the law and me; and poor things those are to bring together! Very useful for plowing up, bringing down to self-knowledge. Then he sees there is no good in himself, and he gets set free, and it is all at an end. Rom. 7 is just a quickened man, without the knowledge of redemption.

In 2 Cor. 5:18 we are reconciled, but the state of things is not reconciled. After that we have the Spirit of God taking up our infirmities, and sympathizing with us, as we are-taking up our groans.

When the Lord Jesus comes, the first thing He does is to take us up to Himself. He cannot take His inheritance till He get His joint-heirs. The object of Christ's love is to take us into the enjoyment of all that He enjoys Himself. Is He a son? I am a son. Is it life? He is my life. Is it peace? He says, My peace I leave with you. Is it love? As Thou hast loved Me I have loved them. There is nothing He has not taken us into. Of course, I do not mean His incommunicable Godhead. But He takes us into the same place with Himself, and over everything. When He comes again, then, and then only, we get the full fruit, when " he shall see the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied."

Psa. 22 As soon as He is heard from the horns of the unicorns, He says, " I will declare thy name unto my brethren." So in John 20. " I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." He is alone in the work of atonement, but as soon as that is accomplished, He says, Now I am going to have others with Me. " In the midst of the church I will sing praise to thee." When all the joint-heirs are gathered, then He comes and takes them all; and after that He begins to take the inheritance. The wilderness is the the place in which we are tested and tried, not for fighting. When we get into heavenly places to possess spiritual privileges, then we must fight Satan. Supposing I can say I am of the Lord's host, I am dead, I have crossed Jordan-not merely redeemed or simply crossed the Red Sea; but if I am dead, crossed Jordan, and become one of the Lord's host, then I need all His armor to fight His enemies; and if I get a wedge of gold, or a Babylonish garment, it will be detected by my want of power, by my being conquered in the fight.

When Christ takes us up there to be with Him, He puts Satan out. We shall be taken up to God and His throne (not the Father's throne, that is the prerogative of Christ), then Satan is cast down. He will be in this world, then, in great rage, knowing his time is short; but we shall be above it all. Satan will never get up there again. When, those years being over, the Lord comes with us (when

He appears, we appear with Him), then Satan is put in the bottomless pit, and the kingdom is fulfilled. Satan then is not merely turned out of heaven, but out of earth too. Before judgment begins to be executed, we are in glory in Christ. He that believeth shall not come into judgment, John 5:24. There are two things in the chapter showing Christ's power: first, He quickeneth whom He will, this is, life-giving power; then judicial power, by which the wicked are obliged to own His power in spite of themselves. Christ will not have to make good His power in judgment where He has made it good in life. We are passed from death unto life. There is the resurrection of judgment in John 5. We are raised in glory when He changes our vile bodies, and fashions them like His glorious body. We shall ALL be conformed to the image of God's Son.

But there is another privilege we have now by grace, that of being workers together with Him. So when that time comes, as regards the blessing of Christ I shall have that as much as Paul, but as regards the activity of love and its results, Paul will have fifty thousand times more than I. For instance, Paul will have the Thessalonians for his crown, and I shall not. There comes in every man's little bit of service-in that you will have yours, and I mine. When He appears with us, then He sets up His kingdom. For Christ has a three-fold title. He created everything-that gives Him a title. He is the Son, and consequently the Heir; and He is the Man to whom God has determined to give everything- the title of redemption.

If I look for the worst power of Satan now, I must look for it in the so-called church. The responsible church has totally failed. In 1 Cor. 3 you get three cases: first, a wise master builder, who did his work well; then you get persons who build badly, but who are saved themselves, building with rubbish, as wood, hay, stubble; and lastly, if a man corrupt the church of God, him will God destroy. Think of men bringing in Gnosticism. I will not refer to modern times. This is not merely building badly (all do so) but it is antagonism to the church of God and even to Christ.

Not one of the fathers, so-called, saving Irenaeus, held the full deity of Christ, or held redemption as Irenaeus did, who was a saint. They were affected with Platonic philosophy, which brought out Arianism after. Justin Martyr positively declares that the supreme God could not become a man-that it was a certain inferior Logos who did. People say we must have what was at the beginning. Knowing of nothing more primitive than Peter and Paul, I will therefore have what was at the beginning; but I will not have what was one hundred and forty years after the beginning. Justin Martyr was about so long after.

In the four first of the seven churches we see the history of what is called the Apostolic succession; in the three last, the history of Protestantism. There are three things in the Revelation: " Things thou hast seen," that is, the glory of Christ; " things that are," that is, the seven churches; " things which shall be hereafter," when we are caught up into heaven, and the final judgment of God sets in. In the first four churches, is given the complete history of the church to the end, closing in popery. There are two ways God uses to judge the existing thing by. He contrasts our condition with what He set up at first, and with the readiness to meet the Lord when He comes. The previous churches were referred back to what had been. Thyatira is referred on to His coming; and hence His coming is here first mentioned.

In the last three churches the Lord's coming is already named, and is kept before them till Laodicea, which is spued out. First, we have the Protestant warning, " a name to live and are dead." To Sardis He threatens what in Thessalonians is spoken of as only belonging to the world,

His coming as a thief, that is, I will treat you just like the world. Philadelphia is a solemn word to us. It is the character of Christ which we are to suit ourselves to-" He that is holy, he that is true." After Thyatira we never get a reference to what he had seen walking among the golden candlesticks. There is no ecclesiastical position after that. What marks the thing the Lord owns now is, the absence of infidelity, or of ecclesiastical pretension: Christ's word against all such pretensions, and Christ's name against all infidelity. " Kept my word, and not denied my name ": the promise to these is complete identification with Himself-" a pillar in the temple of my God-the name of my God-the city of my God-my new name." To those who keep the word of His patience He says not now, " I will come to you as a thief, and ye shall not know when I come," but, " Ye have had patience: have a little more, I will soon be with you." Those who had a little strength are made pillars in the temple of His God.

We never get the direct work of God in the seven churches, because God cannot judge His own work. He walks through and sees how this thing has turned out and how that has; but you never get a direct intervention of God all through. Isaiah's prophecy, " the heart of this people is waxed fat," etc., was spoken nearly eight hundred years before the judgment was executed in nearly the last piece of New Testament history. Paul says in Acts 28, " Well did Isaiah say, the heart of this people is waxed fat "; " be it known unto you that the salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles," etc. It is more than eighteen hundred years since it was said of the church, judgment must begin at the house of God; and for all this time God has borne with it, but assuredly the judgment of the church will come.

## The Dispensation of the Fullness of Times

---

Pau, March, 1850.

My dear----,

I send you some lines on the paper you refer to. It has a character far more important than mere error as to a dispensational arrangement. The writer, whoever he may be, is evidently one of the semi-Irvingite school, who retain the foundation error which led to all poor Irving's heresies and wanderings; namely, making an incarnate Christ head, instead of a Christ who had accomplished redemption, and thus excluding redemption as the groundwork of the new accepted creation of God. It is quite true that the glorious person of the Lord Jesus gave Him the title and competency to hold all things, but then it was not His being a man that did so. That is expressly based, in Colossians, on His divine competency. He is the firstborn of every creature, for by Him were all things created. It is quite true that His being a man entered in the marvelous wisdom of God into the place of headship, but this was not His personal title *de jure*, but by the counsels of God. "Thou hast set him "-and then His death, and redemption accomplished by it, and His resurrection, enter necessarily into these counsels, as in Psa. 8 and Heb. 2 Further, when we take up the question of the elements of a dispensation, the principles on which it is carried on form part of the elements, as well as the person to whom it is confided.

But, having touched on the spring of deep-laid and deadly error which is the basis of this system, I will now speak of the statements it contains. First, where *οικονομια* is spoken of, what is said seems to me to be a dispute about words. I admit fully that there were two grand headships-as do all Christians with different degrees of light-the first and Second Adams', whether as heads of families or lords of the spheres put under them of God. The primary title of Christ, let us only remember, is paramount to that of having things put under Him. That refers to the Son of man. His primary title is His being Creator as Son: all things created by Him and for Him. But I am not aware that the first or Adamic state is ever called a dispensation, or *οικονομια*, or anything like it.

But there is another word which is employed in scripture, which does give distinct periods entirely overlooked in the paper, and which altogether overthrows its denial of divisional periods, which Christians in general call dispensations, as when the principles on which they are carried on are distinct; namely, the word *αιων* and *αιωνες*. Of these scripture does speak, but it never speaks of *οικονομια* as a period at all. This latter word is employed, says the writer, "only once in the New Testament, to denominate a distinct period of the world's history "; and, again, ' the dispensation of the fullness of times ' is just, in other terms, the delegated administration, or government, of the fullness of times; or, by an obvious and easy transition, the period during which that administration, or government, exists." But this is out of place in insisting on the accurate force of a word. The scripture, the Lord Himself there, does speak of periods carried on under God on different principles (which are very justly called dispensations), whereas, one of the writer's periods is never called *οικονομια*, nor is this word ever applied to, nor does it mean, a period at all. " So shall it be in the end of this age " (*το αιωνος τουτου*), says the Lord. (Matt. 13.) So He

appeared π συντελεσ τ αωνων. (Heb. 9.) Now, α clearly signifies, in such passages, a period or course of time in which certain principles have sway on God's part. Thus, until the end of the age, judgment, which plucks up out of this world, is not to be exercised by the Lord's servants; whereas, in the end of it, judgment will gather out of the kingdom of the Son of man all scandals. And hence it is also that this present time is called (not I judge a dispensation, but) a parenthesis, because the Lord Jesus speaks of "this age" when He was upon earth, as the same as that which will close by judgment at the end; but this was a period connected with His relationship with Jews, and which will not be closed till He again is present in person; whereas, in the interval, the Church of the first-born has been gathered for heaven. Another reason why it has been called so, and proof that it is so, is, that sixty-nine of Daniel's weeks are run out, and then there is an interval of ages, and the last week begins again to run on and be counted.

I need not say that I admit the headship of Christ, but I have shown briefly that scripture speaks of periods, and that in reference to the most important subjects possible, by words very justly, in substance, translated dispensations, and I am not here to discuss language, but things. But I add, on the other hand, that οκομοα does not mean headship of creation at all, but administration; and that it cannot mean it in the passage referred to, because there is another word (νακεφαλαισασθαι) which does precisely mean it, and which states that that is the particular form of the οκομοα, or administration, here ordained of God. Nor does it mean, by any transition, a period, for another word (καρ) is used to express that also. I give the passage literally: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself for the administration of the fullness of times, [namely] to head up all things in Christ, the things in heaven and the things on earth, in Him in whom also we have an inheritance," etc. Now, here οκομοα, administration, is as simple a word as possible. The particular kind of administration is heading up all things in Christ. The importance of this remark is this, that it overthrows absolutely all the reasoning on οκομοα, which seeks to identify the headship of Christ and the term οκομοα, and thereby exclude all other periods, this being in terms the only one. The whole reasoning is based on this, which is a total mistake.

" These remarks may seem foreign to the subject announced at the head of this article, but we have been led into them naturally enough by the course of our meditations on that very subject. We apprehend that dispensation, or economy, for the words are identical in meaning, is generally used as a theological term, with greater latitude than the scripture application of it warrants. A less arbitrary use of it, one more exactly conformed to scripture precedent, would afford a correct, as well as comprehensive, principle, for the classification of God's dealings with our world, and prevent much loose speculation, perhaps much barren controversy.

" The word referred to, is employed only once in the New Testament, to denominate a distinct period of the world's history; but an examination of the passage in which it occurs will enable us, without much difficulty, to ascertain the idea there attached to it, and the characteristic features of the period which it designates... The Greek word, here rendered dispensation, literally signifies stewardship, and in that signification it is repeatedly used in scripture—most frequently to denote the ministerial charge, etc.... In this its proper and more common scriptural acceptance, the word involves the ideas of delegated authority and responsible trust. These ideas are not excluded from the meaning of the word as it is employed in the passage before us. Indeed they constitute the essential and generic portion of its meaning, wheresoever it is used in the New Testament. ' The

dispensation of the fullness of the times τ is just, in other words, the delegated administration, or government, of the fullness of times; or, by an obvious and common transition, the period during which that administration, or government, exists. To determine the peculiar nature of the economy, or administration, referred to, we must consult the statement made by the apostle regarding it. ■νακεφαλαι■σασθβι τ■ π■ντα ■ν τ■ Χριστ■ is the explanatory language which he uses. It means, according to the English version, 'that he might gather together in one (i.e., concentrate under the rule or government of one head) all things in Christ.' " Then, after a quotation from Owen (Exp. Ephesians Hebrews cap. 1) to the same effect, the writer sums up: " Christ's government, then, or his headship over creation, is the grand characteristic feature which marks the dispensation of the fullness of times or, it may be termed, the Messianic economy." (Pages 412-414.)

But there are other grave errors in things, not in words. The writer has confounded the right flowing from the person of Christ with the state in which He exercises the right, and this with increase of error, because he has misstated the ground of the tide, declaring it to be the incarnation, and hence fixing the period at the time of that event; whereas scripture in terms founds it on His divine creatorship, which is clearly wholly independent of that. Hence the argument founded on incarnation wholly fails, because it is not at all the epoch of de jure tide. This is His being Creator. His incarnation gives us the Person who is to hold this power, and we have to search from the word when it is that God is pleased to set Christ over all things. The incarnation is the introduction or manifestation of the Person who is to possess, but is neither the epoch nor state in which the right begins, or possession is had, for as man Christ receives the headship. It is a matter of divine counsel, not inherent right, though this man as Creator had the right. So scripture always speaks, and we cannot depart from scripture. " Thou didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou has put all things in subjection under his feet." (Heb. 2.) " Whom he hath appointed heir of all things." (Heb. 1.) " God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth," etc. (Philippians '2.) Again: " He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality," etc., " and hath put all things under his feet," etc. (Eph. 1.)

But this brings out another and fatal error in the system. Though incarnation manifested the Person who was to be set over all things, it was not in incarnation at all that He was set over all things. This very grave error excludes redemption title altogether, than which nothing can be more grave. But let us see what scripture says. On earth Christ is sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (Matt. 15:24.) In John you will find His divine person brought out, but never supremacy or the time of glory: " My time is not yet come "; and, again: " The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." " I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." (John 12.)

Further, how is man to be set over all things? Being made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, then crowned with glory and honor. We see not yet all things put under Him, but we see the person and the work accomplished necessary for it, and the personal glory in which He is to take it, which is consequent on death. And the Lord Himself is most positive and explicit: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18.) But it is only after His resurrection

that He says so. Previously He had forbidden to go to the Gentiles. (Matt. 10.) Now as a consequence of that exaltation, He sends them to all nations. For He had a baptism to be baptized with, and how was He straitened till it was accomplished! (Luke 12.). For indeed it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. And note, that this is in immediate connection (Heb. 2) with putting all things under His feet. The passages I have already cited are positive on the subject that it is Christ as risen, and not before, who is set over all things. Phil. 2 gives further the contrast of His life here with His exaltation over all things, and the reason why it is so, in contrast with the first Adam. " Being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant" (not of headship), " and was made in the likeness of men " (this is incarnation, then, the opposite of what the writer makes it); " and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." The meritorious title of Christ is set aside by the imaginary system of the writer. The first Adam exalted himself and was abased; the Second humbled Himself and was exalted. It is not, remark further, that this is necessary to obtain the recognition of the government by man; it is the " wherefore " of His being there on the part of God.

But it is said, Christ was born a King. King of what? Is this His headship as Son of man? In no wise, but in contrast with it. He was born King of the Jews. On this footing He was presented to the Jews, as the prophets had been on the footing of the then dispensation (for dispensation it was), and if received would have crowned and glorified it. But that could not be; for, after sending many messengers to have the fruit of the vineyard, He said, I have yet one Son; it may be they will reverence my Son. That is, Christ was sent as having right there in God's name, and was presented as a stone to the builders, but in vain. As He says, " then have I labored in vain." Hence we find that, instead of Messianic being the same thing (though He be always the Christ), it is said, that He commanded them straitly not to tell any man that He was the Christ, for the Son of man must suffer many things, etc. And then He shows the glory. (Matt. 16, Mark 8, Luke 9.) So even in the Psalms: we have Psa. 1 and 2 the righteous man and anointed King of Zion, and then, in the intervening Psalms, His rejection, resulting (Psa. 8) in the fuller glory of Son of man -the Psalm quoted to show the testimony of infants when rejected as Messiah, and His exaltation to headship of all things. (Heb. 2, Eph. 1, 1 Cor. 15.)

That God had always in purpose to set man in Christ over all things, I freely admit, and that God never swerved from it, nor suspended it. The question is, What were His dealings with man in respect of it? Adam forfeited by the fall, as to conferred title, his headship of man; so that a Second and other Man needed to be introduced, and Christ was another Head set up in resurrection. The judgment to be executed was finally executory on Christ's rejection, not because Adam had not forfeited, but because it was proved there was no remedy for the forfeiture in the first Adam-not even by the presence of the incarnate Son of God, and a new man must be set up in resurrection, who had triumphed over all the consequences of the failure of the first man, and over the power of him who had brought it in, both in living temptation and in his power of death, and had borne also the consequences on the part of God, according to His holy counsels and righteous nature, in

expiation and for reconciliation. Such a new man, I say, set up in resurrection as Head, as so risen, of the new creation, was to be established Heir of all things. And hence Paul does not hesitate to say that, though he had known Christ after the flesh, he knew Him henceforth no more. Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God. (2 Cor. 5.)

But supposing then Adam's forfeiture, but that it was not, as to God's public dealings with man, held irreparable till he had rejected Christ, was all chaos? Did God do nothing meanwhile? He employed all the means which would prove whether it was reparable. He would leave man without law, though not without testimony, and then be obliged to destroy creation; He would place him under government in Noah; He would call him by promise in Abraham, make him a peculiar people, and put him under law, apart from all others in privilege. And as to this, with whatever discernment in detail, Christians speak of dispensations. But I deny entirely that the Adamic state is called an οἰκονομία, or that οἰκονομία signified period anywhere. On the other hand, when Adam had forfeited his title and was driven out from the place where God had set him, he then became, and not before, the head of a sinful race; and God did deal in new ways with man, as "do these things, and thou shalt live," to prove what his state was. And Christ becomes head of a new race when risen; for the grain of wheat otherwise remains alone. (John 12.)

Next, though Christ has now all power in heaven and on earth, and faith is to be exercised on that, He does not, as regards the government of the earth, exercise His power in judgment. He does not act in its public government, as He will act when He takes to Him His great power and reigns. He is hid in God, and hence He forbids His servants to root up the tares; whereas, He will root them up hereafter; that is, contrary to what is stated by the writer, the principles of action are distinct. What is forbidden now is executed then; and, unless grace and judgment be the same, the present time and the future are different. We suffer with Him while He is hidden in God; we reign with Him when manifested. Present things remain in his sense, that that by which I am called, that which I enjoy as a Christian, will remain. Now I have it in hope, and by the Spirit then actually in an incorruptible body. But the state of things does not remain; nor is the grace in which all is carried on now in the government of the world, so that judgment of the tares is forbidden, the same thing as judgment and righteousness according to which Christ will reign as Melchizedek in that day. The things that remain are in contrast with the Mosaic dispensation, but the things which remain are my heavenly portion in Christ, and as to this we are already in union with Christ, sitting in heavenly places.

Further, the writer says, "We ought to consider the Mosaic age, or system, not as a dispensation at all, but merely as a shadow of the dispensation that was approaching." The figures which accompanied it were types of various parts, or of the whole of what was to come, but in no sense was the Jewish order itself. There was no delegated head at all; and, as to its principle, was law the same as grace, or a figure of it? Was the ministry of death and condemnation a shadow of that of righteousness and of life? The Aaronic service (for the law had a shadow of good things to come in the parts of it) was a figure of what is now, but not of the millennial time: Melchizedek is that. The person of Christ is like His title to priesthood; but the figure of Aaron refers to Christ hid in heaven, not manifest on earth.

The economy of the fullness of times then was in no sense put in movement by the incarnation; nor could it be, because death, and resurrection, and redemption came in, and a new creation,

which changed everything in the very groundwork of our relation, and the relation of all things, with God. It is not in detail merely the writer is wrong, but in the foundations of truth. The incarnation manifested the person of the Head in the midst of the old creation; the resurrection and glorification set Him, according to the counsels of God, in the place of the Head of the new. Only that, as it was part of the counsels of God that He should have co-heirs, He does not take the power and reign until they are gathered; and all consequently is spoiled again here below.

Further, the writer is entirely ignorant of what the principle is which others have spoken of, when saying that what now is was hid. It is not the sufferings and glory of Christ which were hid: no absurdity could be greater than such an assertion. It is the Church-the union of Jews and Gentiles in one body, and the union of this one body to Christ-which was, according to the apostle, " hid in God." A member of Messiah would have been the most incongruous and absurd of expressions and ideas to an ancient saint. Messiah was a person. The whole doctrine of the body of Christ, and even its existence, was a hidden mystery, revealed now to apostles and prophets, and manifested now to angels. (Eph. 3.) Many truths, which render its reception easy to a Jew, were revealed in the prophets, but never the mystery itself. Some types perhaps can now be understood, but revealed nothing then.

In fine, Christ did not formally claim as His own the government of the world at His incarnation. His government and headship over creation are not to be confounded. The government laid on His shoulder is not His headship over creation. His being born a King is not His headship over creation either. And, though it be the Messiah who is set over all things, it is not as Messiah, but as Son of man; and as Son of man, it is not till after His death that all power in heaven and in earth is, by God's act of devolution, laid on Him. Till then, though the person was there who was to have it, man and the Jews were put to the test; and until Christ was rejected, the time was not come for Him to take this place. The firstborn son of a king is designated heir; but, till his father's death, the government is not in his hands. First, says the Lord, He must suffer many things and be rejected of this generation.

I have thus rapidly given you some words in reply to your analysis. You will see that I have taken, as I necessarily must take, your statements as accurate, and founded my arguments on them in reply, though the doctrine of the writer be evident, so that my reasoning is at any rate just. Still its form necessarily refers to the actual statement you have given.

Montpellier, April, 1850.

Dearest K----,

There are some points on which I could have shown more clearly, I think, how entirely without foundation the groundwork of the paper on ο■κονομ■α is, but nothing important that I am aware in principle. For instance, headship is not at all involved in ο■κονομ■α. That, I think, I have noticed. But when the writer says, " the administration of affairs was entrusted to the angels of heaven, and especially during the Mosaic period " (page 146), that is precisely ο■κονομ■α. The principal point is the entire absence of redemption and the resurrection state in the author's plan.

His reasoning about grace is all false. Grace from the beginning was, through the introduction of sin, the only means of remedy, and shall be to the end; but the reigning in righteousness is not now the principle of God's direct government in the earth. It will be in the millennium.

Another point is forgotten, that the Church is to be taken up to heaven, and forms part of the earthly system only so far as reigning over it. The Old Testament no doubt speaks of the millennial state on earth, and partially of principles now inactivity, which warrant the present state of things by the testimony of God, so as to close the mouth of a Jew; but it never speaks of the Church's condition in the millennium, more than of its state now. It does not enlarge on the Church's portion at that time, nor on its heavenly state more than on its present condition. It is not only that the Old Testament prophecies speak largely of the millennial glory, and little of this earlier age of the dispensation (adopting, for a moment, the writer's phraseology), but that they never speak of the Church at all. It was a hidden mystery. The total ignorance of this mystery makes all the writer's remarks a blank in spiritual intelligence to him who knows it.

The rest is, I believe, sufficiently noticed; but I would observe, as to the passage in Eph. 1 do not think  $\pi\lambda\upsilon\rho\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$  would have any just sense.  $\text{Α}\nu\epsilon\sigma$  form a series of which we can have a  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ , but not as it seems to me, a  $\pi\lambda\upsilon\rho\omega\mu\alpha$ . Whereas,  $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$  are seasons or opportunities, time in a moral character of suitableness according to God. There is a time of having all complete according to God, as to administration, and that will, I apprehend, be  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ . We have (Acts 1) the  $\chi\rho\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$  and the  $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ , the suited times which the Father has kept in His own power. If  $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omega$  is taken in the more material meaning of period, the sense is evident, as the accomplishment of a date known to divine wisdom, not of systematic  $\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma$  having each a specific character.

But another point struck me in reading the passage. I cannot doubt a moment that the apostle treats it as a thing yet future. We have redemption through His blood, says he, and God has made known to us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He has purposed in Himself for the administration of the fullness of times. We have part in this inheritance, and have the Spirit meanwhile as an earnest until the redemption of the purchased possession to the praise of His glory. Hence he speaks of the hope of His calling, and the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints. All this language is absolutely demonstrative to my mind that the apostle speaks of the fullness of times as a thing wholly to come.

The grand mistake as to reasoning already noticed is, that the existence of the person who is to govern is the epoch of that administration being committed to Him. It is not even the revelation of His person in the state in which it was to be committed to Him; nor were the circumstances such that He could hold it.

I have treated the de jure question in my letter. As to  $\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\alpha$ , administration, it is not a question of de jure, but of exercise of power in the actual ordering of what is administered. No one could have said that the period of Cromwell's power was the administration of Charles II, however royalist he might have been. When did Christ, while living, formally claim the government of the world? Even down here, of heaven He clearly did not while as man in a life of flesh and blood. But all is confusion in the tract between Messiah, Son of man, and Son of God. I have already noticed the comment of Heb. 2 on Psa. 8; but even the sure mercies of David proved, according to the apostle, the resurrection. (Acts 13.) And instead of claiming the world as His own, Christ repeatedly declared the contrary; and I think y/e may say in the most positive manner, that He has not asked as yet to have the heathen for His inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession. He prays for His elect; but when He takes the world, He will rule the nations with a

rod of iron, and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel. And, I repeat, the title of His person is not administration. Nor, though all saved are saved by grace, is ruling with a rod of iron the principles on which God's dealings are now carried on with the world....

Ever yours affectionately,

J. N. D.

## Brief Hints on the Greek Article

All my experience has confirmed the principle stated elsewhere, that the article is used when the object of the mind is spoken of, and is left out when the word or combination of words is characteristic. This does not at all conflict with its being the notion expressed by the substantive as viewed by the speaker as an individual, which, as another form of the thought, is correct enough, but gives no expression to the import of the absence of the article. All the particular cases and rules are but reducing expressions under the general principle, often multiplied (as in Middleton) by ignorance of it. I doubt altogether that his notion of the general rule not applying where there is a preposition, or with proper names, etc., has the least truth in it.

Thus, as to abstract nouns here, the rule only perplexes. I confess I do not understand particularizing an abstract idea: perhaps individualizing or personifying is meant.  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  may be abstract or not. If I have spoken of a particular  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  realizes that  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  as an individual; or, as I should say, presents it as a definite object to the mind. If I have no such law mentioned,  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  would be "the thing law," law viewed as an object before my mind as such. Abstract nouns are a kind of personification. "Law" does this, "law" does that. If I say  $\delta\iota\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon$ , it is something that happens on that principle; it is only characteristic.

Anarthrous nominatives (such as  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\gamma\omicron\rho$   $\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\rho'$   $\nu\delta\rho$   $\sigma\pi\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\phi$   $\chi\omicron\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\eta$ , Isocr. p. 8  $\beta$ :  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$   $\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ...  $\kappa\alpha$   $\delta\omicron\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$   $\psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma$   $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\alpha$   $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\epsilon\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\nu$   $\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ , Id. p. 28 a) express moral characteristics, beings or things that have a certain quality. It is what each is, anything that has this character. It is not an abstraction but a universal, that is, a species which is known by a predicate of each individual that has such a character. There may be many a  $\chi\omicron\rho\iota\varsigma$ , and all sorts of  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$  not such as these. So  $\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omega\nu$   $\chi\rho\eta\mu\omicron\tau\omega\nu$   $\mu\omicron\tau\rho\omicron\nu$   $\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$  (Plat. Theact. 8) is the character of the measure used.  $\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$  would point out an object, the race viewed as one whole, where some specified individual was not meant (that is, if you please, one individual, real or ideal); it is always a subsisting thing to the mind, about which something is affirmed. Hence, as an abstract noun is an objective personification of the idea, it has the article. But a universal, or species, as in these anarthrous instances, is the character of all the individuals composing it. If a characteristic universal be not seized, it is impossible to understand the omission of the article in Greek.

An abstract noun as such has always the article, because it is always the personification of the idea, its reduction to an objective individual. But in so intellectual (or if you please imaginative) a language as Greek, it requires keen perception to see why or why not an article is used. Just so in English: "The daylight came." I am thinking of daylight as a positive substantive thing. "It was already daylight." Here daylight characterizes the state of atmosphere, of surrounding nature, spoken of as day. "It" is the mind's object, "daylight" the state or character of it. I could perfectly well say "Daylight came," and I should think of the state of the scene around me, though the thing characterized is not expressed. We have a strong case in  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ .  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  would have been the Jewish law: here it would not do either, to say  $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  for the abstract idea. It was

merely the legal principle which characterized the dealings of God, the state of things; but, as "daylight," it means the state in which the world is. This explains εἰρηνή σὺ τῷγαθῷ. It is peace, a state of peace. You might have said εἰρηνή, and then it would have been the thing itself. But τῷγαθῷ is not a predicate characterizing εἰρηνή-does not affirm that peace is good, but that peace is the good thing, the one good thing. It is the abstract idea individualized. It would have been γαθῷ if it had been a predicate.

In Matt. 1:1, (βιβλος γενσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,) it is the common case of a title, and exceptional; as in English one might say, "Book of Wisdom; yet were I making a sentence, I should say, "The Book of Wisdom is so and so." It is elliptical. The name of what follows (not anything as to each) is τὸν Μσακ. The article is usually put with known persons, because they are definite objects before the mind. Were one never heard of before, it would be anarthrous; but with the article it would be "that Isaac which you know so well of in Genesis, the well-known Isaac."

The same remark applies to Matt. 7:25, 27. It is the well-known rain and floods; the rain came on. I should say in English, "The rain was very heavy on a particular day-the rain spoiled flowers." It is a well-known particular object in nature before the eyes. But it would be better to say, "The rain spoils the flowers," because both become objective. The rain did it. I could say, "Rain spoils flowers." This is aphoristic; which is always anarthrous, because essentially characteristic. If I say, "The rain spoiled," it is again objective -the rain on a given day in my mind. If I say, "It was not heat, it was rain spoiled them," rain becomes characteristic, in contrast with heat, of a state of the weather. It is something of a proper name, but a proper name has not an article when the person is not known or has not been mentioned.

I do not believe that there is any difference as to Κριος or Θες, save that they may be proper names. Compare, for Κριος, Matt. 1:20, 22, 24; 2:15, 19; 3:3; 4:7, 10; 21:9; 23:39; Mark 11:9; 13:20; Luke 1:16, 17, 32, 38, 45, 58, 66, 68, 76; 2:9, 23, 24, 26, 39; 3:4; 4:8; 5:17; 19:38; John 1:23; Acts 2:20, 39; 3:22; 5:9, 19; 7:31, 37; 8:26, 39; 12:7, 23; 13:10, 11. Κριος is often not a name but an office, as χριστς, unless they may have been mentioned before so as to make them a present object here. In Matt. 1:20, Κυριου is the character of the angel,γγελος is the simple way of saying one when there are many; γγγελος would not do if there were many, unless followed by a characteristic word, the angel of the Lord; then I think of one to the exclusion, at least then, of all others.

As to Matt. 13:6 (ἡλίου νάτελλαντος) I do not accept the ἡλίου being a proper name. It is at sunrise-a characteristic state. I might say "the rising of the sun," as in Mark 16:2; then I have an object. So with γ, θλασσα, κσμος, ορανς, μερα, νρ, γυν, πατρ, etc.

Again, τρος in Matt. 5:1 5 14: 23 5 Mark 3:13 (cf Luke 6:12, 17), does not mean some particular mountain well known by this name (as Wetstein and Rosenmiller think); nor "a mountain" (as in the Authorized Version, Campbell, Newcome, Schleusner); but "the mountain" in the sense of the hill-country or highlands, in contrast with "the plain." The same principle accounts for τν πτρων in Matt. 7:24, 25; only that this is made more obvious by the expressed contrast in verse 26, of τν μμων. Just so with τν οκων, Matt. 9:10; 10:12, 13, in contrast with "without" or "the open air," and τ γρ contrasted with "the city" or "town"; similarly ες τπλοον "on board ship" (Matt. 13:2, etc.) in contrast with being "ashore," unless in cases where

reference required the article, as perhaps in chapter 4: 21; 9:1. In Mark 1:45, εἰς πῶλιν is purposely characteristic (and not a license because of the preposition, as is commonly said) " into town," any town: so εἰς ἄγρην, in chapter 16: 12, and εἰς οἶκον in chapter 2:1, meaning " at home." The article might or might not be used in many cases; but the phrase or thought is never precisely the same.

With a proper name as such, one can hardly have an article, save as a reference, and this not immediate, I apprehend. If I say ὁ Ξενοφών, it is the well-known man, or the Xenophon I have been speaking about-always as a designated object of thought: why so, it may be a question which only appears afterward, and hence is anticipative. When the person is named historically, the article disappears; when spoken of as a direct object before the writer's mind, and meant to be so pointed out to the reader, the article is used (as in ordinary appellatives). When not thus referred to or presented, one cannot point out a name as a subject-matter of thought: it is a predicate then and anarthrous as usual.

So πῶσα ἑροσλυμα is not an exceptional case. ἑρ. is a name, and as such without an article; and the name is necessarily an individual. You cannot gather a name of a city into one as a country or province, like πῶσα ἰουδαία. By the article a country is brought before the mind as one whole. But if one thinks of a name simply, the article is excluded, a name being not a thing but something said about a thing. The sense in this case is πῶσα [ἡ πῶλις, which city is called] ἑροσλυμα. A river has the article; because from its nature, like a district, it needs this sign of unity as a whole.

Rom. 4:13 is a simple case of the general rule, to which I admit no exception for prepositions; διὰ νόμου was the character or way of his getting the promise. So διὰ δικαιοσύνης πιστεως " by righteousness of faith." It was not by law. The case is a very simple one. So in Rom. 1:17, ἡ πίστις characterizes the revelation, εἰς πίστιν the manner of its reception. God's righteousness is revealed (not merely διὰ but) ἡ πίστις, excluding claims of birth, ordinances, works, etc., by faith as the sole ground, εἰς πίστιν, and therefore open to faith wherever found.

The abstract noun is more abstract, if that could be said, with an article than without. It is in the essence of its nature, all things foreign to it apart; ἡ ἁμαρτία is " that thing called sin," as such in itself. A being is only what it is, or it is not that being, but another. Hence when it is said ἡ ἁμαρτία ἡστέν ἡ νόμος, they are identical: one of the things before my mind is itself and no more; but the other is the same with it, as itself and no more. This is the effect of an article with an abstract noun.

There are nouns, it may be remarked here, which are generalizations more than abstractions. Thus νόμος: in general, it is a certain particular rule, and becomes a general idea of acting on the principle of a rule. In such cases it is hard to use the article without returning to the particular form which one has generalized. Law gives the idea of an actual concrete thing. Hence I have a mental difficulty to decide in Rom. 4:15, whether it is abstract. It would be more naturally abstract law, " the thing law "; but with this word, which is first known as an actual existing objective code, it is difficult, when thus taken by itself, not to return to the particular. When ἡ ἁμαρτία is used, I should have no difficulty.

Objective is before the mind as an object, objective truths for instance. Subjective is the quality of mind by which opinions are formed. Thus I judge respecting God when I judge what He ought to be by what is in my own mind: objectively He is presented in revelation. Now what is objective has the article. It points out the object. (Logically it becomes the subject in a proposition, but this is another matter wholly.) The use of the article and all speech must depend on the view the mind takes of a thing; only where the speech is formed we have to judge what view has been taken.

Now the theory propounded is that the object of the mind has the article, the attributives or qualities have not, and that mentally. And here Middleton's theory (which indeed is merely the subject and predicate as to the metaphysical side of it) comes in. ■ is the object before the mind, that is, refers to it, explained by the word following in its nature or distinctive character. This forms the subject of a proposition; the predicate without the article (unless reciprocal) is affirmed about it. It is very simple, and has nothing to do with the view one's mind takes of the passage. It is a rule positive, that objects have, attributes or characteristics of objects have not, the article. When I find one, there is an object referred to; when none, it is qualification.

As after ε■χε, I have noticed in my paper (as Middleton also recognizes) verbs " to have " as taking an anarthrous noun. ■ γυν■ would be some particular woman, or woman kind: that thing, the individual before our eyes or mind; or that thing, woman.

In Greek plays the choruses are noted for leaving out the article, and (unless emphatic) the tragedians before names.

That predicates have the article as apposition seems to me want of critical discernment. The βο■v is some well-known ox, and then τ■v is necessary.

Reasoning from English to Greek, save as arriving at abstract principles, is beside the mark. All verbs of existence (as Middleton recognizes) are (save on some exceptional account) without the article; because I must have, if I say " was," something existing before my mind. To the question " what" (qualification) is answered ■vθρωπος. Now here ■γ■νετο or ■στ■ takes the same place as ■. I point out objectively, that is, affirm existence. I say what? ■vθρωπος. So ε■χε-what? ■ρνιν. Τ■v ■ρνιν is Greek equally, but it is a particular bird, already the object of the mind, that bird; not " what," but individual.

The first line of the Iliad, as Middleton remarks from Apollonius D., is not pure Greek. Μ■vιν ■ειδε, etc. In pure Attic it would be τ■v μ■vιν; but such things do not set aside the rule.

Again, with τ■v ■λ■ξανδρον κα■ Φ■λιππον, which I cannot now trace, I should expect to find a mental reference in the writer to the king of Macedonia, or some such object, both names being distinctive or characteristic examples. I do not believe mentally τ■v applies to either but may be mere freedom of style-using the article to the first and not for the second as in the same category; so in Acts 15:22. It is only where two agents come under one mental thought that this is the case. And I think in reference to it, Paul and Barnabas, or Alexander and Philip, become a single object to the mind. The idiom unites in the one article either two qualities of the same person or two persons under the same quality.

In the case of a proposition it is evident that the predicate is characteristic of the subject, its genus or category. Man is an animal. Where it is simply " there was," ■v or ■γ■νετο, what is this

proposition? The noun answers to " what," just as the predicate does. When I say " was," " something was," what was? A man. In the ordinary proposition I have ἄνθρωπος as a subject before me; when I say εστίν, I wait to know what. If I say ἄνθρωπος or ἄνθρωπος, I say What ἄνθρωπος or ἄνθρωπος? I answer ἄνθρωπος: it characterizes; it is the nature or category of the thing which exists, or an affirmation about it. Existence is the thing affirmed, or a something existing. " What " comes in the noun, and is anarthrous. If not, then ἄνθρωπος would be the subject, or the proposition reciprocal. If I say εστίν ἄνθρωπος, it is either man is something else, or it is reciprocal with a previous description and way expressed by οὗτος, σὺ, etc. There is an exception where the absolute existing One comes in. I can say ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος. But this distinctly shows that existence is formally included in the affirmation of the verb. This only confirms the principle. I could not say εστίν ἄνθρωπος. I could say ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, because there it is historical, not absolute; that category of being was, καὶ οὕτως εστίν. So I could say on the sixth day ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, because it is historical: here ἄνθρωπος is the subject, and existence is affirmed of him. So one might say ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος: only here ἄνθρωπος becomes predicate, and hence individual, because " was " is one thing that was, and that one thing was man-a man. And this gives such a clear force to ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος: ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος deprives it of created existence, giving ἄνθρωπος absolute existence, and ἄνθρωπος is necessarily an individual. No man takes it for a category of beings.

A noun is a mere name, the designation of " what" or character (not proper names of course). Thus house, man, cat, dog, in any language, names " what" a thing is, not an individual: ἄνθρωπος points out and individualizes. In certain styles (which raise a question), as fables, proverbs, these may in a measure merge, because particular care is there taken to paint a character. Latin is metaphysically special in this and uses all nouns so, as venit homo. Number, unless by special designation, gives individuality, but the genius of the language is to abstract into kind. Greek is more material for individualism as to what is external; that is, ἄνθρωπος is so. French is still more, which makes it the most exact and the most narrow language in the world, incapable of stating abstractions. It individualizes and materializes everything. ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος, γυνή, is " what." Man, or a man, is a question of the style of the language. We think it must be a man, that is, we make it precise by a number. Ein mensch, ein matin, un homme, un uomo, un hambre, etc.; but in such a sentence it is really what kind of being came, though I may add only one (ein, a, un). InX German, unity is secured by emphasis on ein; in French, when it is distinctive, you must add seul, pas un homme being characteristic. You must say pas un seul homme; but un is not less " one " for all that. ἄνθρωπος though singular, is not this (though εἷς is so used at any rate in New Testament); it is indicative of personal individuality, and, if an abstraction or a contrasted part, as ἄνθρωπος or τὸ σῆμα, is still this; it points out an individual in contrast with others. If there were only one man, I could not say ἄνθρωπος unless in contrast with what was not man, as ἄνθρωπος. Hence ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος is no diminution of the force of ἄνθρωπος, but only shows that it is not the whole individual Being in contrast with all others; ἄνθρωπος is. ἄνθρωπος, a particular known man, or ἄνθρωπος mankind, are both in contrast with others, that is, individualized or pointed out. So ἄνθρωπος does this, ἄνθρωπος does that. It is that quality or kind of thing that does it in contrast with others, as πῆλιξ, ἄνθρωπος. But when these things are names by themselves, existence being in μῆναι, it is πῆλιξ, ἄνθρωπος, ἄνθρωπος, but the greatest of these is ἄνθρωπος, here individually contrasted. I know not whether I have brought this out so clearly in my paper, though the principle is there; but so it is.

Shades of style may vary. I may say, the renard, a certain renard, or Maitre Renard; but this a question of poetry or descriptive fable.

Βασιλεῖς is constantly cited as the instance of an appellative passing into a name. It is not so. Thus, if I remember (why, I cannot say), it is used in the beginning of Homer without one - yap βασιλεῖς χολωθεῖς (I cite from memory), meaning Agamemnon. There were many such titles in the East (Tartan for general, and others) which may have led to the use of it in Greek similarly, βασιλεῖς being the word translated. Πᾶν ἀίμα is no difficulty. It is every case of blood shed, not all the blood as a whole. So πασα σφῆξ. The article gives always the entire of what is said, as it points out one object as one: hence πᾶσα σφῆξ would have been quite false. ἅπαντες χρόνῳ also distributes the time: it was not a continuous whole Peter would speak of, but " at every time."

Again, οἰκοδομῆ presents no difficulty. It does not mean " a building " but " building." I doubt that it is ever used for " a building "; if so, by accommodation, as in English. Thus πᾶσα οἰκοδομῆ would be everything added by an act of building. This being adapted it grows to an entire whole. Indeed it is difficult to say πᾶσα οἰκοδομῆ ἀξίζει, and perhaps to this answers καὶ μέγας συνοικοδομηθεῖ. I mean the idea-without deciding on the reading.

The other two seeming anomalies are proper names. Now with a proper name as such I doubt you can have an article save as a reference, and then it is not immediate, I apprehend. I say πᾶσα οὐδαμά, because I think of a country and bring it thus into one whole. But if I think of a name, I cannot use the article: a name is not a thing, but something said about a thing. If I say ἄνευ, it is the man well known, or that I have been speaking about, Xenophon. I cannot point out a name as a subject of thought, as it is a predicate of a thing. Hence πᾶσα ἑροσλυμα is not an exceptional case; it is a name, as always, without an article. And the name is necessarily an individual. And I cannot gather the name of a city into one as a country: the sense is πᾶσα πῆλις-which city is called ἑρ.

I apprehend that πῆλις οἶκος ἱσραήλ is similarly circumstanced. Πῆλις οἶκος would give one the idea of a material house. It is possible the figure might be so carried on; but the dropping of the article shows to me that the figure was dropped, and οἶκος ἱσραήλ is as one word. In English we say, "All the house of ": the force of the material thing is carried into the figure. But with a name, though we say " all," we have no article; it is " all Israel." We could not say " all the Israel "; we could say " the Israel of God," because we think of all the persons composing it, and assemble them by the "the" into one. Πῆλις οἶκος would arrest my mind at " house," and Israel be only its name-the name of the house. This is avoided, and οἶκος ἱσραήλ is viewed as a unity carried by the name itself. One of the main points of the article is the gathering a composite thing into unity, making one whole of it to the mind, a name being the name of an individual and allowing by its nature no composite idea. It is one person. This can have no place here. Middleton was right therefore in connecting οἶκος with ἱσραήλ. I judge that πῆλις οἶκος ἱσραήλ has a peculiar and exceptional reason, from οἶκος being used in opposition. In πῆλις οἶκος τοῦ ἱσραήλ Israel would not have been itself the house, but it would have been a house belonging to Israel distinct from Israel. Οἶκος would have been distinctly designated as an object, and so separated from Israel; it is πῆλις Israel, but I mean the house, not the person.

We may add that Middleton takes indefiniteness for granted from the absence of the article, though showing its presence is not always a proof of definiteness. I have no objection to take ἅ as

by itself (it is substantially the same principle, but from not seeing the mental or metaphysical noun M. broke down in prepositions and the like) and the noun, etc., as itself something stated about ■. Only the ■ indicates something clear to the speaker, not yet to the hearer, ■ being the person or thing I have in my mind, which is γεραι■ς, and then the hearer knows. When I say ■, I say something exists which I am thinking about: what I explain is what follows. Hence εστ■ν etc. meets the case without ■, in words of having. If I have, I must have something, and so on. Accounting for omissions is another thing from accounting for the use. Middleton's work did not require it, and he has not done it, save as illustrating the use and his theory; my principle does, and claims to account for every case, save only common and proverbial expressions which affect brevity, as "he is gone down town," they say in America: it is a useful abbreviation, but no question of grammar. "Gone into harbor" may mean a particular one, but it is a state; and so in Greek, ε■ς λιμ■να, κατ■ π■λιν, of Piraeus and Athens, quoted by Middleton. But these are special cases; not rule, but habit from locality, and found in all languages. I do not find Middleton treat such a case as γυν■ ε■χε. But I find no omissions which are not explained by the answer to "What?" That is, an attributive or a personal name. With a genitive it is part of the word. In ψυχ■ς ■ργανον τ■ σ■μα, ψυχ■ς ■ργανον is one idea. You might say τ■ σ■μα ■στι τ■ ■ργανον τ■ς ψυχ■ς, but there it would be reciprocal and exclusive, not merely attributive or a qualification. I take up ■γγελος φα■νεται, ■νθρωπος ■π■ντησε. Supposing for a moment that it was merely the Greeks not having an indefinite article, accounting for the article's use is not touched, nor the explanation of a multitude of omissions, when it might be by a given principle. But I am not content with this. In good Greek we should have generally τ■ς, as in Luke. ■γγελος Κυρ■ου I believe may be partly taken as Hebrew language in Matt. 1; 2 but we have in Mark ■νθρωπος; in Luke ■νθρωπος τις. I doubt its being strictly good Greek to leave it out, save in proverbs and apologues which affect what is characteristic and abound in such expressions in all languages (Greek has τ■ς, which has the sense of an indefinite article, and uses it); as we see in Luke 7:37 (Mark 5:25, γυν■ τις), Mark 5:2, 21, Luke 7:12, etc., Luke 6:17, Acts 6:7, John 12:9, Acts 23:9, Mark 7:25, Matt. 9:20. These passages my memory has furnished from scripture, and such have to be accounted for.

My conviction is that τ■ς answers to the indefinite article as to the absence of any word. The difference is this: τ■ς notes an individual object like ■, only generalized like "a," "an." The word by itself answers, as I said, to "what?" ■, τ■ς, or ■στις gives one whole individual object. When there is nothing, it is a scene before me, the anarthrous word saying "what" it is. Thus several are with ■δο■, what? γυν■, ■χλος. The last generally has ■ as contrasted with individuals, or the particular crowd that followed Jesus. But the article would be given with any known body of people, ■ δ■μος. We have ■χλος πολ■ς πλ■θος. We have also ■νθρωπος as in Matt. 4:4, 13:28, 31. A concordance will furnish many others.

The result of the use of these words to my mind confirms the principle: ■ is a whole, a particular individual, τις an individual separated in thought from others. The absence of the article simply in the nominative is always characteristic, not individual. In Luke it is generally τις, and better Greek. ■χλος τις could hardly be, because it is a confusion of individuals, a crowd, and can scarcely be individualized; ■ suits, for it is a known pointed out crowd. When I say ■νθρωπος τις, I separate that man from others; so ■γγελος τις, I think of other angels, etc. When I say, ■νθρωπος, ■γγελος, γυν■, I think of the kind of being.

Hence in proverbs, parables, fables, which describe, it is more usual to omit the article, unless they read as if a real history. Chat echaude is the kind of thing, un chat echaudo is an individual cat. English has not this unless very rarely in proverbs. If I say ἄγγελος, it is not ἄνθρωπος or other means employed. If I say ἄγγελος τις it is distinct from other angels. I do not know that I have discussed this form of its application, but it is the same principle. The absence of the article gives kind or attributives, not an objective individual, though it may be such. Grammarians must not make a rule for what is merely the shortening tendency of habits of speech. All aphorisms or substantive statements as such are anarthrous. Perhaps brevity occasioned it; but in fact they are in their very nature essentially characteristic and only so-it is their object. Chat echaude craint l'eau froide. Chat echaude characterizes the thing which fears even cold water; l'eau froide is not grammatical, it would be de l'eau froide.

So πᾶντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος is all essentially characteristic; were it τῶν χρημάτων, it would be a certain set of things. So here of ἄνθρωπος: the being that has this character or title is measure of all things. Here a measure would do in English, or the, because it is merely characteristic, no object: in fact, it is the predicate. Man is not here looked at as a person; it means humanity, or what man is.

Take again Isocr. page 8, B; καλῆς θησαυρῆς παρ' ἄνδρι σπουδαῖω χήρις φιλομνή: Id. page 28, α, λήγος ληθῆς καὶ νύμιμος καὶ δίκαιος ψυχῆς γαθῆς καὶ πιστῆς εὐδωλον ἴστι. In all these cases the phrases express moral characteristics, and are not viewed as objects of the mind. It has the force of anything that has this character-a χήρις φ.- λήγος ληθῆς, any one which is such. This is not an abstraction but a universal; that is, a species which is known by a character, a predicate of each individual which has such a character. There may be all sorts of λήγοι, but not such as this. ἄνθρωπος points out an object, an individual if you please, a real subsisting thing to the mind about which I affirm something. An abstract noun (not a universal) is an objective personification of the idea, and hence as such would have the article; but a universal, or species, is the character of all the individuals composing it. Its being in the place of the predicate changes nothing. When I say ἄνθρωπος, it is evidently such; it is the character of all the beings of the species. It is this character which makes it a μέτρον; the individual man is-that would not be characteristic. And when I put the article, it ceases to be characteristic and becomes an object; ἄνθρωπος ἴστι ζῶν λογικῶν. I personify the whole race in order to predicate something about it. This would not do for an aphoristic sentence. See the multitude of sentences in James of this character.

Matt. 14:25 furnishes also a usage from abbreviation as in English. " I had fourth watch ": regular English would give " the fourth watch " contrasted with the third. But this is needless; it is the short characteristic of a known object. Quakers say, " fourth day," " third month," not " the." It is the same principle but more obscurely. So as to Matt. 22:38. The Jews measured the commandments to make out righteousness; as ποῖα ἔντολὰ μέγαλη says the young man (which has this well-known character). The Lord answers, not by formally comparing this with other commandments, but by so characterizing it. I do not think He means a first and great, though the grammar would bear it, but an absolute characteristic. This is first and great; but δευτέρα only by δευτέρα, the commandment so to be characterized. But this is brief familiarity of language, not grammatical distinction.

■v ■ρχ■, John 1:1, is evident; ■v τ■ ■ρχ■ would at once lead me to the beginning of something, whereas ■v ■ρχ■ is characteristically (that is, universally and absolutely) such. This form of thought is rare in English, but is found " in measure," " in part," but only where it has become from use characteristic and abstract. In Greek it is much more common, particularly with ■v, as also with ■κ. When a word in English is used characteristically, the form is found, particularly in characteristic words, " in anger," " in pain"; but we say " in a bad temper," because it is one kind of temper.

I should rather suppose Acts 7:36 to be used as a proper name; the rather as we have ■v τ■ ■ρ■μ■ in the same passage. Α■γ■πτω and ■ρυθρφ are as articles, that is, indicate an object, as a name sufficiently does.

In John 4:37, I apprehend, ■ ■ληθιν■ς must be taken as an attribute of ■ λ■γος, not as a predicate; "in this is the true word " [verified]; whereas in 1 Peter 5:12 it is the usual form. In the former ■στ■v has the sense of subsists. I find Winer and Middleton both take it so.

If we cannot seize characteristic universals, we shall never get at the use of the article.

As to the article in το■ μην■ς, it is no way difficult; it is like the month, has the force of each, and points out a particular month, inasmuch as it is each one. Distinctive parts would have the article as in contrast with another part: as " a half" is only a quantity, " the half" is in contrast with the other half. Contrast always has it. A class would bear no article; it is an idea, not an existence, being a predicate of something else, as πατ■ρ is a character, not an existing one pointed out. So ■vθρωπος, Θε■ς, though the words may become by an article a specifically existing object. Words joined by a conjunction are also persons joined to some idea by the article, or the same person as ■ Θε■ς κα■ σωτ■ρ. These are qualities of the one who is ■. It is sometimes irregular in form; as, when there are two ambassadors, ■ is with the first only, but the reason remains the same.

I do not deny that there is a difference when the adjective is first and when the noun is first, though it is hardly apparent sometimes. It is so in French, but the object, c'est un temps rude, is in contrast with doux or agriable; while un rude temps is but one idea. I apprehend it is the same in Greek. I doubt the exactitude of Hermann's rule, that in ο■ ο■κτρο■ πα■δες the principal stress is on ο■κτρο■, in ο■ π. Ο■ ο■κτρο■ it is rather on πα■δες. For in ■ ποιμ■v ■ καλ■ς there is emphasis on καλ■ς. In the phrase ■ κ. π. there is no emphasis anywhere, only distinction from one not καλ■ς. So in τ■ ■γιον πv. it is the Holy Spirit, not another; but τ■ πv. Τ■ ■γιον brings ■γιον into relief.

As for the expression τ■ ■μαρτωλ■ (Luke 18:13), it is evidently distinctive, as if I should say, Who is the sinner of the world? The publican answers, I am. He is the sinner. It is contrast, but so characterized in comparison with all others.

## Angels and the Law

---

It seems clear from Psa. 68 that the display of external glory of fire, etc., on mount Sinai was by the ministrations of angels. This was the solemn sanction given to the law and its promulgation. Compare the details, Ex. 19:16-18. This is fully confirmed by Deut. 33:2. Compare Heb. 1:7, quoting Psa. 104:4. 2 Kings 1:10, and 6:17, afford analogous examples of Jehovah's making His ministers a flame of fire. So even in the bush, when there was, as to its form, an angelic manifestation of God, the bush burned with fire. Moses spoke with the angel in the bush. What is particularly referred to in the passages we are considering is that the angels were the immediate instruments through which they received the law, the manifest glory which gave it its sanction. Not that they spoke or personally addressed the people. Josephus (Antiq. 15 c. 5 s. 3) says, τῶν μὲν ἀγγέλων ἔροσος καὶ σέλους εἶναι τοῦ κρυφοῦ φάσματος, μὲν δὲ τὴν κλισητὰ τῶν δογμάτων, καὶ τὴν σιτήτατα τῶν τοῦ νομοῦ δι' ἄγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαθόντων. That is, the functions of ambassadors are treated as akin to those of the angels, or divine legates. The character of authority attached to the law was angelic, not the incarnation of God Himself whether speaking on earth or from heaven. In Josephus, as we have seen, Herod uses the word angel as God's ambassador to prove the sacredness of their persons, the Arabs having killed his. This is merely cited to show the Jews' apprehension of it. Gal. 3:19 is, in sense, being enjoined through angels by the hand of a mediator. Ἐξ διαταγῆς, in Acts 7:53, is "at," "by occasion of"; as, "they repented at the preaching of Jonas," by occasion of, through the means of. The passages quoted from the Old Testament make the character of their intervention pretty plain. The whole of the first two chapters of Hebrews is to show the superiority of the Christian revelation to Judaism by that of Christ to angels, first, as a divine person, and, secondly, in the counsels of God as to the exaltation of man.

## On Colossians 1:19

---

EVERY correction of scripture is of moment. I beg to suggest one, the occasion for which it appears to me exceedingly mars the sense. I refer to the expression " It pleased [the Father] that in him should all fullness dwell." The English reader may see upon the face of it, that the word " Father " is put in by our translators. This is extremely bad theology, depriving us of the development of glory in the Person of our most blessed Lord. "All the fullness was pleased to dwell in him." In its present reading it is merely the pleasure of the Father about the Son, which I apprehend to be a mischievous derogation from the divine glory of the Son, to deprive us of the revelation of that in which to me Christianity consists—a revelation of the Trinity known in the relationship in which we are brought by faith to it. In the second chapter we have the fact, "All the fullness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily; " that is, in the incarnation of the Son. While He was the Son in personal union with flesh as Jesus, there could be no separation of the Son from the Father or the Spirit, though most distinct in their relationship. Therefore the Lord says, though He wrought Himself the miracles, " The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works "; and again, " If I cast out devils, by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." That He was the Son, however, is the direct object of faith, but revealing the Father; and therefore " He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." In a word, the fullness of the Godhead (as is declared by the Spirit concerning Him) " dwelt in him bodily." These things may be difficult as to human explanation, but not as to communion, where the Spirit of God is; for He reveals in communion, according to the power of truth, and no way else. And I believe that, while the human intellect will break itself to pieces against the glory of the divine revelation, the fullness of our joy and hope, and the soundness of our Christianity, and, consequently christian strength and energy, chiefly depends upon the distinctness with which we are cognizant of the unity and trinity, withal made known to us in the Incarnation, which is the revelation of it. " God resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble." I believe it to be a revelation, and known, where only it can be known, in communion, by those made partakers of the Spirit by faith in Christ Jesus: all else will stumble somewhere, and these too, if they be not humble.

## 2 Thessalonians 3

---

2 Thess. 3, like 2 Tim. 3, does not contemplate public church discipline, but private duty. If no one else so acted, I ought. The Church might, for a time, neglect its duty, be in so low a state as to be unable to carry it out; but I am to act on the Apostle's precept if it be so. I add excommunication by the Church is not the only discipline exercised, or to be exercised, towards saints. A case may arise when I should not maintain free intercourse with the saint, and excommunication by the Church not be called for. Such preliminary faithfulness may prevent excommunication being necessary: of course, scripture is to guide both. Excommunication for everything is a proof of weakness. At any rate, no direction for the Church supersedes individual duty, founded on the directions of the word of God. Nothing can meet an individual responsibility. It acts between us and God.

## Rightly Dividing the Word

---

To the Editor of the " Bible Treasury."

Allow me to make a remark on " Rightly dividing the word of truth," the first article in your number for May (1858). In the general principles and spirit of the article I cordially agree and judge it to be most timely. But the path of wisdom is a narrow one-one which the vulture's eye has not seen. And there is a point in the paper in which the word does not seem to me to be rightly divided, or rather, that is attributed to the passage (2 Tim. 2:15) which is not in it.

It involves, I am satisfied, very important consequences in spiritual judgment, or I should not perhaps have noticed it. I am not aware that I differ from the writer in general practical result. It is a point which has been a good while on my mind, and, while hesitating whether it was God's will that I should formally notice it, the article of which I speak gives, by its statement, direct occasion to do so. The point I refer to is in the following passage: "According to all this Timothy is here told of a house that he has to leave, and not (as the first epistle had told him) of a house in the midst of which he was to ' behave ' himself." I find no direction whatever in the passage to leave the house-no trace of such a thought, but other directions given which exclude the thought. And this is evident in the change of language which the article introduces into the scriptural phrase, " We are, therefore, to purge ourselves from it, and not strive to purge it." Now the passage does not tell us either to purge it or to purge ourselves from it. I admit that the thought of purging it is wholly foreign to the passage: no such thought is presented to the believer to guide his conduct. But he is not told to purge himself from it, but to purge himself from the " vessels to dishonor." " If a man shall purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel made to honor, fit for the master's use." A vessel where? The master of what? " The foundation of God standeth sure. The Lord knoweth them that are his." No matter what the confusion and evil, there is divine security; " and let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity." There is the unchangeable character of human responsibility, whatever state the nominal or real church may be in. But there is no direction to depart from the house. It is not said that we are to purge ourselves from it, but from the vessels to dishonor, which are not it. If Christ be the master of the house-whatever vessels are in it-how can we? Whatever consequences may be drawn, the first and essential point is to hold fast the word itself. I am satisfied the point is not an unimportant one, and that the truth gives more true separation and departure from iniquity than any misapprehension of the word of God can, however upright in purpose it may be.

Faithfully yours,

OYTΣ.

## Obedience and Sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ

---

The words "of Jesus Christ" apply to both. The whole passage characterizes the position of the Christian with reference to that of the Jew, in virtue of being begotten again to a living hope. (Compare 1 Peter 2:4, 5, and Matt. 16:16.) Our inheritance is incorruptible-is in heaven. The election of the saints is according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, made effectual, not by such earthly deliverance as Jehovah had wrought, but by sanctification of the Spirit: all natural references, by contrast, to Israel's portion, especially as Peter writes to the sojourners of the dispersion. So again, the double character of Christian standing before God. It is Christ, not the sealing of a legal covenant, not the blood of bulls and goats. We are set apart, by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost, to the sprinkling of Christ's blood, and the obedience in which He walked on earth-practical obedience. The obedience of Christ differed from the law in every way. Law promises life when we have kept required and imposed commandments; Christ's obedience was the expression of life in love. Self-will-lust-exists in us: law forbids its gratification. If I submit, I am counted obedient. Christ never obeyed thus; He came to do God's will. Obedience was never for Him a bridle put on a contrary will. We need, alas! such a bridle still; but proper Christian obedience is the delight of our new nature in doing the will of God, whose commandments and word are the perfect expression of it for us. It is what James calls "the perfect law of liberty." Christ's motive for action was the will and word of His Father; so it is ours as Christians. "Begotten again," for the spiritual Jew, conveyed the idea of a new state, such as Ezek. 36 presents, and referred to in John 3. The whole truth being now made clear, we know that this takes place by the communication of a new nature in Christ. He becomes our life, being a quickening Spirit. Hence it involves a new position, even His own, as the object of faith now.

## The Similarity of Jude and One Part of 2 Peter

---

The similarity of the Epistle of Jude and one part of the Second Epistle of Peter has attracted the attention of, I may say, all critical and most (even attentive) readers of scripture. All manner of speculations and methods of accounting for it have been resorted to and discussed, to which I shall not now direct the attention of your readers. My increasing conviction is, that any one reading the word of God, with the help of the Holy Ghost, will know far more of it than any learned speculator, who, in virtue of the way he takes it up, has not the key to scripture, and misses the proofs even of its divine authorship which shine out with unhindered brightness to one taught of God. It must be remembered that science on points of learning has no occupation where things are not obscure, and hence lives in doubt and darkness. Where a thing is clear and certain, there is no use for it. My object will be here rather to notice the peculiar character and object of the epistles.

I will only add this remark: the little attention I have been able to pay to the wanderings of the human mind, has convinced me that the blessed word of God has not only furnished direct truth from Him, which is its most sweet and gracious object, but it has met all the errors into which the working of the human mind about God has led men. When once one becomes ever so little familiar with these wanderings, the corrective analogies of scripture statements, the way in which the manner of teaching the truth meets them all, cannot fail to strike the mind. Infidels (who did not fail of course to find them out, and who had no sense at all of the holiness and grace which shine in the word and assure the simple mind who its Author is, but occupying themselves with mere external circumstances connected with it) alleged they were borrowed from Egyptians, Alexandrian Jews, and I know not who else. Grave and serious men-as Gale in his " Court of the Gentiles," and the like-sought to show that the Gentiles had borrowed them from the Jews. I do not myself believe either to be correct.

Noah and the first patriarchs had a large knowledge of God as then revealed in creation, judgments, and testimony; of promises, warnings, sacrifice, etc.: and as to the early events of divine history, they were much more familiar with the details than we are. But man did not like to retain God in his knowledge, and idolatry was set up, and (with many traditions of these early times preserved, and various deeds of wickedness which made the mighty men which were of old the " men of renown " of after ages, as scripture speaks, preserved in their memory) an immense system was established, in which shreds of ideas of the true God, mental speculations about Him, facts as to the deluge, its character, causes, and author, dim remembrance of paradise, vivid recollections of wickedness before the flood, and of the persons spared in it, the greatness of men's rebellion exalting the men of renown into gods (while yet they are treated as reprobate, so as to puzzle mythologists); the sun, moon, and stars brought in, peopled by the imagination with a personified existence of the departed great ones; a knowledge that the serpent was the cause of the evil and of knowledge, yet therefore worshipped as God; hence the flood looked at as vengeance, yet mixed up with the serpent having to say to it; the deification of the ark itself as a preserving mother connected with the earth itself as the womb of nature and of all things; and all

this mixed up with the most degraded and degrading superstitions that corrupt human nature could indulge in practiced, yet mystified into abstract notions-all were used by Satan to obscure and confound the mind, and leave to conscience, which he could not help, some possible shady Tartarus and Elysium, or the transmigration of souls, and, as Paul declares, some " unknown god " to be declared to them.

The whole process is exactly depicted in Rom. 1 Volumes of heathen mythology may be read, but the whole result is there depicted, it is the most perfect picture of it all, not a moral element of it lost. Now this to me is divinely perfect; it knows, judges the whole scene, and dismisses it with that just estimate, leaving the mind free to appreciate in the clear atmosphere of the true God's presence, and breathing that pure air, all that grace and truth can reveal in the person of Jesus Christ, and the gospel of His grace, to enjoy the truth.

This is merely a striking example of what scripture is in this respect. I do not believe that there is a maze of falsehood (sometimes with elevated approximations to truth in the way of knowledge, but never to any relationship of man with God), not an error by which Satan has deluded man and kept him thus from God, which is not met in the word. We may have more need for this than we are perhaps aware of. My conviction is, that the world-for the non-entity of infidelity cannot satisfy it -will fall back into delusions of mystical and mythological idolatry in a way very little suspected. Men will have no need to believe this. It may be a mental speculation for some, an image for the imagination for others, a habit acquiesced in by all, the power of Satan riveting the delusion on the mind. It has a hold which is not faith, but which is power over the mind of man. How many believed the golden image in the plain of Dura was a god? How many refused to bow down to it? And when once set up, acquiesced in, when for mercenary motives, men have bowed to it, and thus their moral power is lost; when power enforces it, amusements and ease, and national associations or hopes interest in it, men ready to accept it, explaining it by mental subtleties connected with the mysterious power of nature, and, having abandoned conscience and the true God, having lost His safeguard-Satan's network is complete, and the superior influence he exercises over their mind, besides the apparent wonders he may work, binds them without escape to that which they do not perhaps believe nor love: they cannot -but are entangled in-like from interest, while they despise and fear.

Allow me to make a remark here. One may ask, How should the blessed word of God occupy itself with all these horrible perversities? We have to be simple concerning evil, and wise concerning that which is good. Surely we are. And this is exactly what scripture has happily made men comparatively, wherever it has been received. These miserable horrors have died down even from society as a system, and been forgotten. Thank God it has! It has been a deliverance of man even outwardly in relationship with God. And it is one of the perfections of scripture, that it has done it by the revelation of good, so as not to enter into, though briefly judging in its moral character, the evil it met with in the world, and, as I have already said, has thus left the mind free to be occupied with good. God forbid that the saints should get out of this blessed position! It is just their special blessed privilege from God; and I believe the word to be their complete arming in every respect, supposing always the strength and aid of the Holy Ghost-grace working in the heart. And see how wise in this is scripture, that is, our God in His word. When this kind of evil is met with, it is discovered and judged. A man versed in the mischief, finds it alluded to, judged, guarded against, by the form of some truth. The simple saint gets the truth itself in all its power, and never learns the

mischief at all. The moment one has learned it, it is condemned and shown to be false. Man, in reasoning, would have displayed-developed- all the evil to answer it, and filled the mind with it; but He who is goodness and light can dispel evil and darkness, according to the perfectness of His divine wisdom, by the display of Himself, yet in such sort that no one but must see they are opposite to what He does display, if the mind has them before it: yet he who enjoys the good and the light has no need to turn to the other to know light is light, and goodness good. The measure in which God does touch on these confines of darkness is the measure in which in grace it is needed by men.

Now the light of Christianity-I do not say its living power merely-has banished all these specters of evil in their obvious and direct power; or rather they are become specters, furnish the materials for mythological dictionaries, classical lore, and learned speculation, Asiatic researches, Egyptian hieroglyphics, pantheons, or the newest raised winged bulls of Nineveh to be gazed at in a museum. The public mind knows it only thus; and hence the saint's mind has no connection with it. But it was not so when the scriptures were written. The public mind was full of them, though philosophers began to speculate and to scorn, and many to be weary of them. Still habits were all formed on them. When Paul healed an impotent man, they were going to offer him sacrifice; and the dignified silence of Barnabas set him up to their minds as Jupiter; and the fervent discourse of Paul established him in their eyes as Mercury. If he was stung by a viper, Nemesis (vengeance) would not suffer him to live; and when he received no harm, they changed their minds and said he was a god.

As to the mass, this system was connected with power, and when they saw power, they still attributed it to what were devils and not God; and so imbedded was this in their mind, that even speculative minds, the novelty-hunting Athenians, thought he was a setter forth of new gods, because he preached Jesus and the resurrection, taking the last (I suppose) for a goddess. And so did this seek to encroach, through man, on the divine work to spoil it, that the spirit of Pythoness will announce Paul and Silas, the instruments and servants as those of the most high God, not speaking indeed of Jesus, but accrediting herself by associating her testimony with them. And your Simon Magus would purchase this preferable power which threatened to eclipse his own, the hollowness of which he knew well enough to be surprised at the reality. The power of Satan was met by something like itself, only true and divine. When the mind now pries into the evil then prevalent, it discovers the allusion. Scriptures do take up the fables of idolatry which were then clothed with the energy of satanic power, and allude to and judge them. They preceded the judgment pronounced upon them, and the forms in which truth was expressed so as to condemn them, and deliver the enslaved mind. Jewish ceremonialism was a laborious system to preserve by most gracious care some men at least in the knowledge of the true God, and that knowledge by them, when the degradations of abominable idolatries were carrying all before them, till the true Light and promised Seed should come. God would not have a second deluge; the world is reserved for fire. He would have something preserved amid the moral deluge with which Satan had overwhelmed the mind of man. The truths were from the beginning, many of the great facts recorded in scripture notoriously before the record of them; the corruptions man's first effort, the remedy wrought out for them in clothing the truths in certain positive revelations, judging and preserving from corruptions, God's gracious and merciful interference. That is the real history of the world; at least for my part I do not doubt it.

Hence, while the truth as revealed is enjoyed by saints historically as to creation and all God's subsequent ways with men, and in fine the light itself in Him who created, in whom grace and truth came, those who pry into the old evil, now a matter of learned lore, find in scripture the allusions and reference to it. The forms of truth there meet the corrupted truth and corruptions which Satan had entangled man in. And as the universal mind was familiar with these things then, even the New Testament alludes to them. But here a distinction is to be made when the full blaze of divine light shone out in Christ to form the new thing. There was need of naught but that-God Himself fully revealed. Truth, grace, power, all in actual exercise, what was a Simon Magus or an idolatrous speculation?

It faded into its own nothingness before the light. We know (for we all have knowledge) that an idol is nothing. The shadows in every sense fled away. The life was the light of men. What could even (to say nothing of the blaze of truth) a cast-out devil or a silenced oracle do, save make its votaries rage against those who wielded a power which would not own it, and which, absolute, universal, and inexorable in its claims as the true God must be, would brook no fellow (whatever grace it might act in)-receive no conciliating homage from what it came to destroy-against those who overthrew delusion and destroyed power (every high thing that exalted itself against the knowledge of God), delivering man from under Satan's thralldom maintained through both: which dealt indeed with Judaism as the depository of truth as long as any fear of God was by the utmost patience to be hoped for, but then judged it as sinking into the common level, as associated, in its enmity to the power it would not acknowledge, with the idolatry it had been a witness against?

But alas! for men were still the depositories of truth, and the Lord to give it its full heavenly character was gone on high. This revealing energy of good gradually declined. The truth doubtless remained the same. Blessed be God! it is written truth, but the vessel of its living manifestation lost its conservative energy. And the power of the enemy began to creep in there where the power of deliverance for others ought to have been found. And remark here, the Church's energy and power is in grace, in God. If it is only a delivered, it is a weak body. It must be a delivering body to be a preserved one, because that is the power of God's presence in Christ, and in Christianity. Mark the humblest gathering of saints, or an individual Christian. If there is not energy of positive testimony which acts on others, there is decline. God in grace cannot be inert in testimony in a world of sin. It would be a contradiction in the very terms.

Hence in the decline of Christians we find constant allusions to all manner of kinds of evil lost sight of, so to speak, in the light of the earliest promulgation of Christianity. Take the Epistles to Timothy, those of John, even the Colossians and Galatians already, Peter, Jude. False teachers, corruption, apostasy, Antichrists, Antichrist, begin to appear in the waning light of the Church. This decline of the Church is the capital source of the evil, but not the only form it takes. The delivering power once enfeebled, the old suppressed evils rise again, modified perhaps, as it would be to meet the case, but the same -human corruption and self-will, idolatry or heathenism, Judaism bereft of all that was of God in it, speculations into the ways of an unseen world.

This divides itself into two great branches. First, man's relationship to God as such, which was corrupted in heathenism, and set right, though without a full revelation of God which man could not have borne in Judaism, and with a full revelation perfectly set right in Christianity, a point often lost sight of, yet insisted on by the apostles in their preaching among the heathen or where heathen

were; and, secondly, the special relation in which revelation set men with God, and especially Christianity as superseding all others by its public light, that is, the responsible position of the Church on earth as set of God in the place of testimony-to keep and witness the good thing. One related to the government of the world, men, Jews, Christians, as walking responsibly on earth, right on to the end, connected with sin and righteousness as such before God (of course including and judging by the light of Christianity and the rights of Christ now). The other, to the special responsibilities and failure of the Church, as established as a witness on earth of the heavenly things she had in connection with an exalted Savior on high.

This then gives a double current of testimony as to evil. On the one hand, the departure or apostasy of the Church as a professing body here below, of course making way for the other evils, while a special one within itself; on the other, heathenism (in whatever form of development), Judaism, revolt of man against God, corruption: the latter, between man and God; the former, between the professing church and its peculiar judgment. I cannot now enter into Paul's view of it. You will find it in 2 Thess. 2 in its prophetic character, the power of evil working, and in 2 Tim. 3, in its moral character. On part of this I may touch another time, if I can, the Lord permitting. I may notice also here the testimony of John, which views it in connection with the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the fruits and character of divine life, as manifested in man, in Him and so in us, as that which thus doubly tested the true knowledge of God. But I must confine myself now to Peter and Jude. Now Peter takes up this whole question in connection with man's relationship with God, of course in the light of Christianity, the government of the world: Jude, the relationship of the Church with God and Christ, as the responsible vessel of testimony in grace.

Common evils were before the eyes of both-evils connected with the rising up again of the power of old corruptions and perversions of truth, freshly preserved even from the time of Noah himself; but they are treated in a different way. Peter speaks of sin against God; Jude, of apostasy from the place in which any had been set. There were three great principles of evil at the time-mental speculations into an unseen world (and the powers of nature and production), what seemed humility, but intruded into things it had not seen, vainly puffed up in a fleshly mind; this connected with the alleged evil of matter, whence prohibitions to marry, to eat meat, not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh. It is commonly called Gnosticism. The second was Judaism, the third heathenism; all opposed to Christ, all coalescing; Gnosticism forming the link between heathenism and Judaism, and of all of which the elements will be found in the corruption of Christianity which calls itself the Church, and have made of it, looked at in man's responsibility, the great power of evil in the world.

Redemption by the work of the Lord, and regeneration by the word, are clearly stated in the first epistle of Peter. But it is not my object to unfold this here. The Christian is seen, as the scattered Jews had been, a pilgrim in the midst of the world in which he is a stranger. He is not seen, as so often in Paul's epistles, risen with Christ, and sitting in heavenly places, but as walking on the earth, though begotten again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance reserved in heaven for him, and he kept by the power of God for its revelation in the last time. Hence also there is little development of doctrine in Peter-much direction how to walk. The revelation of Christ will bring the full deliverance. Till that time they were to hope to the end, having the loins of their mind girded, and sober. Hence, while the great fundamental truths of salvation and eternal life are clearly stated for the salvation of souls, we have the government and

dealing of God with men and saints in this world. If a man love life, and would see good days, he is to behave so and so. Who could harm them if they followed what was good? If they suffered for righteousness' sake (compare Matt. 5:10), they were happy, they were to sanctify the Lord of Hosts, and not to be troubled. It was not a warning not to grieve the Holy Spirit, but as pilgrims and strangers to refrain from what warred against the soul; under evil to be patient, as Christ had borne everything. They are not looking to join Christ in heaven by resurrection, but for Him to come for deliverance. Meanwhile the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ear open to their prayers. Blessed and consoling truths! but which evidently regard saints down here, and God's government of the world.

So we have Noah saved through the judgment of the world by water. The gospel has been preached that men may be judged or live. The time was come that judgment should begin at the house of God, clearly on earth. The righteous are with difficulty saved across the dangers and harassments of Satan's power: what shall be the end of the sinner and the ungodly? Still they are to commit their souls in well-doing to God as to a faithful Creator. Hence, though the full declaration of the Father and of the Spirit is found, yet, generally speaking, God is spoken of as God having to do with men as a Creator- Governor; and Christ is Lord, not Son, which indeed He is not called in the Epistle. This but shows its perfectness; everything is in its place and divine order. It falls in with the preaching of him who announced that God had made that Jesus whom they had crucified both Lord and Christ. As such He is presented here. Still the truth is plainly there. Blessings are demanded for them from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The second Epistle goes farther on into the evil than the opposition of an ungodly world and a need of chastisement to the Church. Apostolic care was soon to fail; and he would put in writing, for their after-security, what would put them on guard against other forms of wickedness than a hostile world. The kingdom still is the limit of their hope, save in the one word at the horizon-" the day-star arise in your hearts." The power and coming was what He had declared, and he desired their abundant entrance into the kingdom. The mount of transfiguration had confirmed the prophets in their testimony to that manifested glory which men could see, which Peter and his two fellow disciples had seen on earth; and the prophets prophesy of events on earth, though they testify to Christ's ascent to heaven, as does the apostle also (1 Peter 3:22).

But this righteous government goes farther than the kingdom. The wicked, who trusted in what eye could see and what to man's willfully a deceived heart was stable, would be met by a judgment which will set aside all that dust can trust in: the day of fire and perdition of ungodly men, when the whole goodly scene of an adorned world will melt under the fervent heat of the fire which God's wrath has kindled. He who can create can destroy, and He who has destroyed all form and comeliness can create anew, and will new heavens and a new earth, where sin will not be. The flood had, once and for a time, in vain cleansed a polluted world from its horrible defilement, and left but a memory of the guilt and the catastrophe as a warning to rebellious men. In vain. Nature renewed its order, and man his sin, and he willingly believed that it had been so from the creation, and would be so yet onward. That Christ should come was mocked at. Here we are evidently in questions of the judgment of the world-of men. It is a scene which runs through from creation to the fiery judgment of the world, then formed, at the very end of its eventful history, man righteous or wicked before God- the world the scene of the display of His government. Only the last days, which then He will have to say to, were to be characterized by mocking at the coming of the

righteous Judge closing the day of patience, and bringing in the day of judgment.

Now, in this scene, two classes are brought in, the righteous and the wicked: only a peculiar character is given to the form under which, as regards Christians, the wickedness would flow in. False teachers bring in heresies of perdition, denying the Master who bought them. It is not the Lord here in the sense of Jesus our Lord; it is He who by purchase has a title over all men. The head of every man is Christ. It is not all, that God has power over all men, all flesh; Christ has power over all flesh, and this by right of purchase as well as creation. This they will resist. It is not a question of abandoning church privileges, but a denial of divine rights which judgment will settle, and of which the melting of the whole scene when man has figured in his own eyes with haughty pretensions, while He who could put them to the proof was away, would be the final confusion-the close of the scene in which such folly would be displayed. Hence he recalls the great instances and examples of similar judgments. The angels sinned: they are down in chains of darkness reserved to judgment. Noah, the preacher of righteousness, was spared, the world of the ungodly destroyed; Sodom and Gomorrah were overthrown for an example to the ungodly, and righteous Lot delivered. The Lord then knows how to deliver the godly, and to reserve the unjust to a day of judgment to be punished-till then, patience and godliness.

The great characteristics of the evil are human will shown in haughty pretensions and rejecting authority-the restraint of God on the soul gone-the lordship of Christ denied by them and rejected; and, with it, haughty rejection of all authority came in: with this the will, which cast off what was above it, indulged itself in the vile gratification of its own fleshly lusts.

But this was brought in by covetous false teachers using feigned words. This was in connection professedly with the way of truth, so that it was evil spoken of. Thus we see in Peter the evil connected with the Church, characterized by rejection of Christ's lordship, self-will, and lust. It is wickedness, though it has sprung up in connection with the truth. And it is wickedness looked at in the presence of a God who judges the earth, and has given solemn proofs of it, and reserves the angels for it-a faithful Creator who will preserve the souls of the faithful across it all; and judgment is looked at as reaching on to the dissolution of the elements of this visible creation. God is a God of judgment, and, though slow to anger, will surely punish wickedness. This excludes the mere idea of special apostasy. Angels sin; the world is ungodly; Sodom and Gomorrah live ungodly, and judgment awaits them, or has been executed; and so it will on these despisers of Christ and all lordship. Every hope of nature will perish in nature's dissolution under God's hand.

I would add, in passing, that this makes clear a passage which has often perplexed people-preaching to the spirits in prison. It relates only to those of the time of Noah. Peter speaks of Christ's Spirit in the prophets. The believers were a little flock: so was Noah's family. Christ was present only in Spirit: so He was in Noah's time; yet those that despised it were in prison, and such would be the portion of those who slighted the testimony of Christ by the Spirit now. They would be reserved in prison for judgment. So it was with the Old Testament saints then dead. Promises had been announced to them, not possession given; so that, as walking as men on earth, they were thereby subject to judgment accordingly; and, if the testimony were received, live according to God in spirit as saints were called to do now.

A God judging walkers on earth, and looking for righteousness; at last a new heaven and new earth, wherein it dwelt: such is the testimony of the Holy Ghost by Peter.

I now turn to Jude. Here we shall find the Church and the falling away from its standing, the leading subject of the Spirit. He was giving diligence to write of the common blessed subject of their edification, but was forced to turn to write on evil coming in. The Church itself (the witness of good in the midst of, and thus against, evil) was becoming, by its decline, and this subtle secret work, the vessel itself of mischief. It is not teachers bringing in pernicious ways, so that the way of truth should be evil spoken of. Men were crept in unawares amongst Christians themselves who were ungodly, turning grace in lasciviousness; they denied the only Lord God (the word Lord is the same word as the " Lord " that bought them, not the usual one, and means the absolute authority of a master over his slaves). In 2 Peter it is the Master that bought them; here the dominion and absolute authority of God as such and Christ's lordship with it. They are the same class as Peter speaks of; but there they were covetous teachers of wickedness, here creepers into the Church who got in among the saints. They were in their love feasts, feasting with them fearlessly; and these were the objects of judgment as testified from the beginning of the world, from Enoch's witness, who, caught up to God in heaven, testified to the world what was coming on it from the Lord, through the ungodly, whose proud speeches had spoken loud against Him. The evil Enoch spoke of was this ungodliness and resistance against the Lord, of those who said " Our tongues are our own: who is Lord over us? " Jude shows how it comes in. The Church which, in a certain sense, was delivered out of the world, having in its bosom these creepers-in possessed of this spirit, was in danger, as a body on the earth, of departure from its standing, as all who had gone before it. It had been set outside the world to show the goodness and holiness of God, and not merely the one God's sole authority, but the lordship of Jesus Christ. If this let in what denied it and lost its first estate, the only remedy was judgment and not another witness. Hence apostasy and leaving their first estate is the point pressed here, not the fact of wickedness.

The Angles are not simply such as "sinned|"; they left their first estate and kept not their own habitation; they are reserved for judgment, as Sodom and Gomorrah, going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example. It is not here the rescue of any remnant, but the simple judgment on their leaving nature's path. So, though Israel were redeemed out of Egypt, God afterward destroyed them that believed not. The evil then was not maintaining their original standing. This might be natural evil, as Cain; or religious, as Balaam; or openly rebellious, as Core. When it took this character, perdition comes in. They are twice dead, naturally, and by apostasy, after professing; they had no real fruit: what apparently they had, withered. They were clouds, but they had no water. The judgment will be executed against them when the Lord comes with ten thousand of His saints; but they were creeping into the Church then. Hence, as it was connected with the present dispensation, the Church as a witnessing body on the earth, he does not talk of the day, nor of dissolution of the elements, but of the Lord's coming, which will judge the apostates of this present time. Further, Peter, speaking of the judgment of the world, speaks of Christ's being revealed to it, and on to the melting of the present frame of things by the fire of judgment. He does not speak of Christ's coming with respect to the saints, save as mocked at by the scoffers. Jude, dealing with the Church and the apostates of this dispensation, brings in the Lord with His saints judging them; but, when addressing directly his salutations to the saints, it is their being before Him. That is his ground, because he was dealing with the Church's portion- " now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty."

This inroad of old principles of evil, known from angels downward through the solemn judgments of the flood, and of Sodom and Gomorrah, were in view of both Peter and Jude. Peter applies it to the judgment of men and the world by God; Jude, to the witnessing body's ruin, and the apostasy of these not kept of God through the evil creeping into the Church, as the place of holy witness in and to the world.

Peter ranges over the whole scene of creation, from the angels' sin to the final dissolution of the elements into their primeval chaos, to be renewed into " a new heaven and a new earth; " and tells of a righteous sovereign God of judgment, who would not bear with sin, and cannot brook rebellion. Christ was set forth as Lord; but in judgment he tells of a faithful Creator, who ever spares and delivers the righteous, and has proved He will, so that He may be trusted. Righteous and sovereign title, and Christ's position in it, characterize the testimony of these epistles-God and the world are in view, and God in righteous judgment.

Jude comes down to a nearer and closer scene. Evil men have crept into the Church, and, corruption once in, the place of witness becomes the scene of the power of evil. The old evils arise, but, as taking their new birth-place in the Church, they give to these engaged in it the terrible character of apostasy. The flesh, great pretensions within the Church, ending in hard speeches against the Lord Himself; and then that judgment by His coming, of which the Lord of old had spoken by the mouth of Enoch, the ancient prediction of judgment finding its objects in the apostates from the last resource of grace. Their present character the New Testament unfolded. It was creeping into the Church for this purpose. The extent to which the imaginative part of Gnostic heathenism had gone; the way it had linked itself with Judaism; the way it had left the prints of its defiling foot-marks on nominal Christianity, on what has the public place of the Church, few (I believe) are aware.

The philosophic Jews believed that the stars were animated beings, which was Sabaism.

The influence of heathenism on the Fathers, particularly of the Alexandrian school, was frightful; no one can doubt that such as Origen and Clement were largely tainted with it. The inroad of the old evils into the western and less imaginative (and therefore more orthodox) Christendom was more plodding Judaism as to its character. Still it did not escape the inroad of evil. There is the worshipping of saints and angels; there is the forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats; there is pretended human righteousness by works and ordinances; there is really the worship as well as the grace of Christ widely denied. That is, the elements of Judaism, Gnosticism, and heathenism, are all there-their development checked, but there, and characterizing the system-the mass having cast off the lordship of Christ really altogether. This element is restrained, but ever ready to burst out when God's restraint is taken off.

What a deliverance Protestantism was, in respect of all this, people are little aware. But that, alas, has lost its moral force; it has turned to infidelity. The light that is in it is become darkness on one side, where it had cast off the old Judaeo-heathenish Gnostic system; and on the other, where it retained some elements of this, having lost its vital power, it is returning to it again, as the dog to his vomit, to plunge itself willfully, and therefore hopelessly, into the evil which God is about to destroy, because nothing but judgment remains. The masses, when mind is active, you will see, I doubt not, turn to rationalist infidelity; the upper orders and governmental powers to be under the influence of Judaeo-heathenism. Still, as yet, God holds the reins, and there is One, who, if He

shuts, no man can open; if He opens, no man can shut; and in the energy of His grace, it is our part in all wisdom, for the days are evil, to assert the Lordship of Christ, the spiritual holiness of His name in the world, and the perfectness of His redemption, gift of a God of love when no good was in man, and perfect in reconciling us to Him. The written word is the great unchanging sure rule, where God Himself speaks; pointed out as the safeguard in the last days, when the pretensions of the Church, which contradict Christ's lordship (for I have a lord, not a lady, over me, and cannot serve two), and corruption, are rising up, as we wait daily for Him who shall present us faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy.

I have but sketched, and roughly I am quite aware without any false modesty, the great principles of these epistles; but I trust I have done it sufficiently according to the truth to enable saints in reading them to avail themselves of what I have said as a help, as far as it is such. If it awaken them to a sense of the dreadful character of the evil which is coming in, apostasy letting in the aggravated and more subtle flood of old evils long ago set up by Satan, and make them feel that they have really to do with the enemy, it will be really useful. Only let us remember that, while walking quietly through the world subject to the powers that be, as of God, not expecting men to harm us if followers of that which is good, happy if it is for righteousness or for Christ we suffer, Christians should be in nothing terrified by their adversaries, an evident token to them of perdition, and to themselves of salvation and that of God. And if Christ's Lordship be denied, covertly by setting up the Church's authority, or openly, they still believe He is Lord and with power to maintain His Lordship, even all power in heaven and in earth. Our part then is to keep the word of His patience, and our security and joy with Him will be complete.

Critical persons have been struck with the similarity of the subjects of part of Peter and Jude. It could not be otherwise; these are the expressions of the evil they were combating and which was then creeping in; the part that most strikes critics, the heathen were all thoroughly familiar with. The Spirit was dealing with what was before them. The way of dealing with it was quite distinct. The great public examples of judgment also were equally before and known to all; but Jude quotes an instance (Israel) to his purpose, which Peter does not; and Peter refers to final dissolution, Jude to Christ's coining with His saints. There is what must have been common; but the testimony as to it is perfectly independent.

Courtesy of BibleTruthPublishers.com. Most likely this text has not been proofread. Any suggestions for spelling or punctuation corrections would be warmly received. Please email them to: [BTPmail@bibletruthpublishers.com](mailto:BTPmail@bibletruthpublishers.com).

Courtesy of BibleTruthPublishers.com. Any suggestions for spelling or punctuation corrections would be warmly received. Please email them to: [BTPmail@bibletruthpublishers.com](mailto:BTPmail@bibletruthpublishers.com).

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

---

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
  - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**[www.sermonindex.net](http://www.sermonindex.net)**