

## 1 John 2:21 (James Lampden Harris) 56247

Sufferings of Christ, the Church and Other Papers, No Lie is of the Truth

Article from <https://bibletruthpublishers.com/bible-truth-study-bible/btsb>

My Dear Brethren, I am well aware that the communication I felt it needful to make to you the last Lord's-day, caused pain and sorrow to many of you. But I am persuaded that it has not cost you so much in hearing it, as myself in making it. I had conferred with no one, although anxiously exercised in my own mind, as to what it was right, as the servant of Christ, to do. I received a request from you, through our brother Mosely, that I would be with you on one of the Lord's-days during his absence. After writing to our brother, Mr. Randal, to say that I hoped to be with you on the 31st, I learned that the teachers of Ebrington-street, Plymouth, were asked by you exactly on the same terms as myself. I cannot interfere with your liberty of asking the help of any you please, but as the servant of Christ I must act in responsibility to him. There is no hindrance on your part, to my ministering among you; the hindrance is entirely on my part, because I dare not be associated in fellowship of labor with those who hold doctrines injurious to the person of the Lord, and subversive of his work on the cross. It is a case in which I solemnly believe neutrality would be sin; and, under the circumstances in which I found myself placed, silence would be neutrality. "He that is not with me, is against me." I have a very defined judgment as to the previous moral question, yet serious as I regard that, it is nothing in comparison with a question of doctrine affecting the glory of the Person, no less than the integrity of the cross, of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I believe it however to be due to you, to set the point at issue before you, in order that you yourselves may see that I have not wantonly caused you sorrow. It would be a matter of some difficulty, to bring before you the needful evidence of facts, in order for you to form a judgment on the moral question; but the evidence of false doctrine is of another kind, the one who teaches it is the witness against himself -he becomes "self-condemned"; so that if we have authentic documents of what is taught, we have the ground before us of forming a righteous judgment whether any (to us) novel doctrine, is further light graciously brought to us by the teaching of the Holy Ghost, or whether it is heresy privily brought in.

Before bringing the doctrine in question before you, I would remark, that in my judgment, the principle you have proposed to act on, true so far as it goes, is not one applicable to the present case. I understood it to be, that you would judge that which you heard ministered in your own presence: in other words, that you would not judge error until it was publicly preached. Now, I believe it to be the duty of Christians, at all times to bring what they hear, to the test of the "law and the testimony" -that they ought "not to believe every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." All teaching to Christians assumes the ground of their having a spiritual capacity for judging what they hear. "I write unto you," says the Apostle, to the babes, "not because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth." But while fully allowing your proposed principle to be a most important and valuable principle so far as it goes, it will not apply in the present case, or in any case where error is sought "privily" to be brought in. Even in a case of morals it would not apply. Supposing I came among you with some moral charge against me, which I refused to clear up, you would not judge me by my present good behavior among you. The case is much stronger, where doctrine is concerned; because, however important the conduct of Christians is, truth is more important, because the glory of Christ Himself is so immediately concerned. Now there is ample ground before you, for estimating what the doctrines really are. The Remarks in the "Letter to certain brethren and sisters," and the "Observations," which in no instance impugn a single principle advanced in Notes on Psa. 6, are authentic documents before you. Many expressions of the Lecture on Psa. 6 are modified -one disowned, and another retracted, but the substance of the doctrine therein taught is confirmed. Many statements, valuable statements concerning our common faith, are set forth in both these publications, but the serious doctrinal error, remains unretracted. Error is not less error, because surrounded by truth, but is only more dangerous, because less suspected; just as poison would be in our common food. "No lie is of the truth." And although as a general rule, it is by far happier to seek to establish the soul in the truth, yet there are occasions when the more stern and painful duty of nakedly exposing doctrinal error is needed. Such, I believe to be the positive duty of every true-hearted saint in the present instance, and in seeking to do this, it is well to keep before the mind the great point, without adverting to many others, which, although important, are only collateral. And first, to narrow the question as much as possible -let it be clearly understood -that it is not a question touching the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, neither is it one touching his humanity. The Person of the Lord is not the point, but the deep dishonor done to his person by this doctrine. And in order still to narrow it more, the question is not what the true doctrine of the cross is, but whether this doctrine does not necessarily undermine it. There are pious Roman Catholic writers, yet none of us would accept ever so accurate a statement of the cross from them, as a defense of Popery, because the system of Popery effectually undermines the cross. And I would add also, that in examining a defined doctrine, so far as it is defined, the intention of those who teach it does not necessarily enter into the consideration. We have to do with the naked bare doctrine -the intention of those who introduce it may be considered afterward. It would be a great mistake to suppose that a really pious person might not introduce most vicious doctrines, such as if received would subvert the soul. I cannot for a moment believe that the Apostle Peter had, by his conduct in withdrawing himself from the company of the Gentile believers, for which he was publicly blamed by the Apostle Paul, any intention of acting contrary "to the truth of the Gospel." But an action insignificant in itself, would vitiate the truth of the Gospel. We do not judge the intention of "the Pharisees who believed, who said except ye be circumcised," &c. Their doctrine subverted souls. That was the point to be solemnly judged.

It will also simplify the inquiry to state that it is allowed that the doctrine propounded is neither taught by Christ himself, nor by his apostles.

I will now present to you the leading doctrinal statements, corroborated by Extracts from the three papers, and briefly remark on them.

That Christ, by his position, relatively to man and Israel, was "obnoxious to," "exposed to," "threatened by" the wrath of God, the curse of the broken law, an death.

That He had, previous to his baptism by John, experiences wrought on His soul by the power of God, corresponding to this relative position.

That God inflicted on Him grievous sufferings, because He was found in this position.

That these experiences and sufferings of the Lord Jesus, previous to his baptism by John, are the subject of many of the Psalms, of which the sixth, the thirty-eighth, eighty-eighth, hundred and second, and hundred and nineteenth are given as specimens.

As to the first of these heads; I quote the following extracts:

"These were the character of the curses, which had fallen on Israel, because they had transgressed the law, broken the everlasting covenant; so Jesus became part of an accursed people, a people who had earned God's wrath by transgression &c,... so Jesus became obnoxious to the wrath of God, the moment He came into the world" (Lecture on Psa. 6, p. 12)."

"And if it be asked, was then the Lord Jesus subjected during his life, to all the inflictions that were due to man as man, and Israel as Israel? I answer, No! To be obnoxious, that is, exposed to, certain things, is a different thing from actually enduring them. His faith, His prayer, His obedience, all contributed to preserve Him from many things, to which He was by His relative position exposed, and by which He was threatened (Remarks, pp. 8, 9)."

"And is it a new doctrine, that Jesus by his birth became obnoxious, that is exposed, to all the sinless penalties of fallen man? I do not say, that they all fell upon him. Some did not. He was exposed for example, because of his relation to Adam to that sentence of death, that had been pronounced on the whole family of man. Relatively, He was exposed to that curse; personally, He evinced his title to freedom from it; and His title to life by keeping that law, of which it had been said, "this do, and thou shalt live" (Observations; p. 9)."

In p. 15, Observations, it is stated, Jesus became "one of a nation, that was exposed to all the terrors of Sinai." And again, p. 18, "poverty, hunger, blindness, disease, and (if their hearts had not been hardened) terror of soul was their portion from the Lord. Such was their condition, when Jesus came to be one amongst them."

I would not needlessly multiply quotations, but I must add one more under this head.

And Jesus as man, was associated with this place of distance in which man, in the flesh, was, and he had, through obedience, to find his way to that point, where God could meet him, as having finished his appointed work, glorify him, and set him at his own right hand, in the heavenly places, and that place was death on the cross; death under the wrath of God (Remarks, pp. 31, 32).

Now these statements necessarily involve this; that Christ could not take the place of a surety and substitute for others, until He himself was relieved from these several liabilities under which He had come, by reason of His relative position to man and Israel. Something was needed to be done for Himself, before He could do anything for others. Hence the doctrine of the atonement of Christ is really undermined, for Christ is no longer one who needed nothing to be done for Himself, but one who was under common liabilities by reason of His relative position to man and Israel; and therefore there is no longer any sure ground for a sinner to rest the salvation of his soul on. For I ask, can any of us risk the salvation of our souls on the work of one, who needed first himself to be delivered from the wrath of God, the curse of the broken law, and death as the wages of sin, to which we ourselves, as sinners, are liable?

I do not draw this as an inference from the doctrine stated, it is the doctrine of the tract that Christ was in "a condition out of which he was able to extricate himself and from which he proved he could extricate himself, by his own perfect obedience (Remarks, p. 12). Remember this has nothing to do with the cross. He was in such a position, that if he had not been able to "extricate" Himself out of it, He could not have been the surety and substitute for others. Hence necessarily follows that the glory of the Person of the Lord is disconnected from his suffering on the cross, and it is the glory of His person which gives all the value to the cross; and instead of seeing the Prince of Life crucified, we see one escaping Himself from wrath, the curse of the law, and death, crucified. Can such a one be my surety -my substitute? Can I confide the salvation of my soul to one who has been under the same liabilities as myself? I cannot. And here I add that such a statement entirely obscures the glory of Christ's humiliation, and the perfection of His sympathy. The doctrine of the Lord's humiliation is blessedly stated in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians. "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient," &c. All the voluntariness of His humiliation, and the voluntariness of His obedience, is entirely obscured by this doctrine; for He was by force of His position in distance from God, and by urgent necessity obliged to obey, to get himself out of it. And instead of regarding him in the perfection of sympathy, entering into all the sorrow and trials of others, these sorrows and trials came upon himself by reason of his relative position, and he had, by prayer, to be delivered from them. Such is, in my judgment, this Christ-dishonoring and soul-withering doctrine.

Statements are made in the three papers, that Christ was delivered from some of the liabilities under which by His position He was, by His faith, prayer, and obedience, but this was only partially; the actual deliverance from this position is stated to be by His baptism by John, and then He took new ground, so that the position of Christ himself before his baptism by John and after, was answerable to that of an Israelite bowed down under all the terrors of Sinai, and from thence brought to realize all the blessings of Mount Zion. "The difference between the two dispensational positions held by the Lord Jesus, in the midst of Israel previous to his baptism, and that which He dispensationally and ministerially took when anointed by the Holy Ghost" (Remarks, p. 23.) Christ, by His relative position, was exposed to wrath, the curse of the broken law, and death, and then by His baptism by John His position in relation to these things was altered, and He took new ground, answerable to that which a sinner takes, when from distance He is brought near to God by the blood of Jesus.

I briefly remark on the extract, p. 9 of Observations, that Christ evidenced His title to freedom from the curse of death, and His title to life, by keeping the commandments, that such a statement entirely obscures the truth that "in Him was life," that "He had life in Himself," that He was "The life," that no one could "take it from Him," that He "laid it down of Himself," &c. And note, there must, according to this statement, have been some period when he might have claimed life by keeping the law. When was it? And if he earned a life by keeping the commandments so as to be delivered from the curse of death to which he was exposed by his relative position, could he afterward lay down

that life for others? Surely not, when he had earned it for himself. I do therefore very deliberately affirm that this doctrine most seriously affects the truth of the atonement of Christ, yea, I must say, subverts it.

But the passage of the Remarks pp. 31, 32, is on this point awfully conclusive, however it may contradict other statements, because it plainly teaches, "that Christ" was, by His relative position, in the distance in which man was; and had to work His way to that point where God could meet man, and that was "death, death on the cross, death under the wrath of God." Now if Christ had to meet God there, by reason of his relative position, and to be delivered out of it for himself, how can the cross be vicarious at all for others?

II. That Christ had wrought on his soul by the power of God, experiences corresponding to this position, before His baptism by John.

"But in the Psalms, where we especially read the inward experiences of his spirit, we find not only the sufferings of those hours of public ministry but sufferings also which pertained to Him, because He was a man and because He was an Israelite, sufferings therefore which cannot be restricted to the years of his public service, but which must be extended over the whole of that period during which he was made sensible under the hand of God, of the condition into which man had sunk, and yet more into which Israel had sunk in his sight (Remarks pp.1, 2).

"And lastly (which is indeed the thing more than anything else distinctive of these sufferings of Jesus of which I speak) that God pressed these things on the apprehensions of his soul according to his own power and holiness, and caused him to feel part of that which was exposed to the judgment of his heavy hand (Remarks, p. 14)."

"If then the soul of Jesus had realized, experimentally realized, and that too under the hand of God, and to a degree 'we little think the fearful condition of Israel (Remarks, p. 22)."

"Moreover the exercises of soul which his elect in their unconverted state ought to have, and which they would have, if it were possible for them to know and feel everything according to God; such exercises, yet without sin, Jesus had (Observations, p. 26)."

"We may hear of Sinai or think of Sinai, but Jesus realized it as the power of an actual subsisting relation betwixt his people and God (Observations, p. 29)."

"(The Lord Jesus was as much alone in his living estimate under God's hand of the circumstances of human life, as in enduring wrath upon the cross (Observations, p. 36)."

"Jesus was often made to pass through this awe and terror," i.e. of death and Hades (Lecture on Psa. 6, p. 14)."

Mark first, these experiences are said to be wrought on the soul of Jesus by the hand of God. They are entirely distinct from the spontaneous actings of His soul entering into the condition of man and Israel, and the things around him; as surely it did in depth of feeling, and real sympathy, because He estimated everything according to God. "He needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man."

Again, the experiences thus wrought on His soul, by the hand of God, were such as to make Him feel what it was to be part of an accursed people, which was exposed to the judgment of his heavy hand -what it was to feel in his own soul, the condition into which man had sunk; what it was to feel the curse of the broken law; what it was to feel the terror of death and Hades; what it was to feel as God's unconverted elect. I repeat it, that it is what He was made to feel, as his condition, by reason of His relation to man and Israel; and out of which, He was praying to be delivered; and was seeking to extricate himself; and not his entering in depth of sympathy, into the condition of others, weighing and estimating what that condition was, and working to deliver them out of it. It was for Himself He felt; for Himself He worked. He was made to feel under the hand of God the awful condition in which He Himself was, and out of which He was crying to be delivered.

Once more I ask, whether this which is stated to have been the experience wrought in the soul of Christ, by the hand of God, more or less, for eighteen years, must not have been the experiences of the soul of Christ, when on the cross. Was He not there made to feel under the hand of God in His inmost soul, what it was to be under the curse of the broken law -what it was to be part of that which was exposed to the judgment of his heavy hand -what it was to have the awe and terror of death, death as the wages of sin pressed on His soul in the most intense manner, by God himself? Was not such His experience, when God "made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin? And now, mark to what this doctrine amounts, that the Lord Jesus had the Same kind of experience pressed upon His soul, by the power of God, when He stood in such a position relatively to man and Israel, as to need deliverance from it for Himself, as he must have had when made sin for us on the cursed tree, and when He bore our sins vicariously. It may be said, that on the cross He was made "distinctly" a sacrifice for sin -on the cross, vengeance in wrath was poured out on Him -but as to experience, it was no new experience which Jesus had on the cross, He had been made for many years to feel in His own soul, on His own account, what He felt for a while in His soul on the cross for others. I cannot see the possibility of escaping this conclusion. And it is well to remark, that in the Remarks, the contrast is made, between the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, before His baptism by John, and His ministerial sufferings; so that this character of experience, arising from His relative position, is entirely severed from that on the cross, by the new kind of experience, which He had after His baptism by John. Jesus stood alone in these sufferings and experiences on his own account, by reason of his relative position, as He stood alone in His sufferings on the cross. He needed, so far as experience goes, to go through the same for Himself, by reason of His relative position, and that alone; as He did for others on the cross. I ask you to consider, whether this doctrine of the experience of the soul of Christ, under the hand of God, is not both degrading to his Person, and subversive of His work on the cross.

III. That God inflicted on Christ grievous sufferings because He was found in this position.

"So the hand of God was continually stretched out against him, in various ways. He was chastened every morning ' My loins, he said, are filled with a loathsome disease.' Now we do not read of such chastening after he began his public ministry, but before that, I doubt not that he was often so afflicted (Lecture on Psa. 6, p. 12)."

"The texts also which apply to our Lord's bodily sufferings require equal revision as to their translation. The 7th verse of Psa. 37 is an example. The word which our translators have rendered "loathsome disease," &c. "My loins hast thou filled with burning heat, or dryness" is the revised translation."

"In our case, I suppose perturbation of soul as well as derangement of body, is always more or less connected with, though not necessarily originated by, indwelling sin. In our Lord's case, of course, this could not be, for He was sinless (Remarks, pp. 17, 18)."

"He admits that He was exposed to hunger, thirst, weariness, and partook of the common cup of human sorrow. This is an important admission (Observations, p. 21)."

The doctrine taught is that from the age of twelve years to thirty the Lord Jesus Christ, the Holy One of God, was visited by grievous bodily disease by the hand of God. It matters little, whether we say that His loins were filled with a loathsome disease or with inflammation, or burning heat; the point is, What is the warrant for this bold affirmation, that the Holy One of God was ever so afflicted? It is allowed that the sacred historians never tell us that He was so afflicted; and therefore to assert that He was, appears to me an outrage on our Christian sensibilities, merely to support a theory. I add also, that the text from Isa. 53, "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses," is applied by the Evangelist to our blessed Lord in his ministry (Matt. 8:17), showing not that he was afflicted with sickness, but how deeply He sympathized with those whose sicknesses He cured.

As to "admitting" that our Lord hungered, &c.; surely it is no admission to believe what the Scriptures have revealed. It is divine certainty which makes me acknowledge that He hungered and was weary, and not an inference drawn from the condition in which Jesus was. And on the very ground that I receive as an infallible truth that Jesus hungered, thirsted, was weary, sighed, grieved, wept, namely, because the Scriptures reveal it, I reject entirely the doctrine that He was grievously afflicted by God with loathsome sickness, namely, because the Scriptures do not reveal it.

And now, lastly, as to the Psalms, which are said to express the experience of the Spirit of Jesus, and His sufferings under the hand of God previous to His baptism by John, viz., the 6th, 38th, 88th, 119th, 102nd. Of these the 6th, 38th, and 102nd, have been usually called penitential Psalms, and, as such, appointed by the Church of England to be read on Ash-Wednesday. The 88th is one of those appointed by the Church of England for Good-Friday, so that its application to the cross, by a large body of Christians, at least, is distinctly marked. I first notice, however, Psa. 119, which is applied to the Lord Jesus, as soon as He was sufficiently matured in age to enter on the general responsibilities of life around him" (Remarks, p. 15). I first ask for a careful perusal of all these Psalms which are said to express the experience, and sufferings, and exercise of the soul of the Lord Jesus, not as vicariously bearing the sins of His people, not as their surety, not as entering by the spontaneous actings of His soul into the condition of His people by perfect sympathy, but arising from His own relative condition out of which He was seeking to extricate himself. By an altered translation, it is sought to get rid of the difficulty of the last verse of the 119th Psalm. "I have gone astray like a lost sheep." As it stands, it is said it could not be applied to Christ. See Remarks, p. 18. But the translators have rendered the word morally, as I doubt not, correctly, in Isa. 53, "All we, like sheep, have gone astray," and why not here? The question is as to the application of the Psalm to the personal experience of Christ -before His baptism by John -when He was in a position out of which He was seeking to extricate himself. But v. 67 of the same Psalm is necessarily (not by its translation, but by its context) to be taken morally. "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept thy word." Was this the experience of Christ himself?

As to the other Psalms here mentioned, I again say let them be read, and remember the frequent confession of sin in Psa. 37 is not vicarious confession, i.e., not feeling the sins of others of which He was bearing the judgment as His own, but an experience pressed on His soul by the power of God by reason of the position in which He was, and out of which He was seeking to be delivered, and from which He was delivered by the baptism of John.

The distinction made between "wrath in chastisement" and "wrath in vengeance" (Remarks, p. 10), cannot be allowed. It is not for us to determine the sense in which wrath is to be used. The question is what is the meaning of wrath in these Psalms, for it is this wrath which it is stated He suffered not vicariously, He suffered it as due to the position in which He personally was, and out of which He must "emerge," before he could take the place of the substitute for others. It was the wrath due to the broken law, and the sunken condition of man, which it is said he suffered. And when I read, "Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deeps. Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves Thy fierce wrath goeth over me; thy terrors have cut me off" -if this be wrath in chastisement, what is wrath in vengeance? It is not my intention in this letter, to examine all the statements made and test them by Scripture. If needed, I shall publish an examination already written of the Remarks, and also of the Observations, both which publications show more clearly than the Lecture on Psa. 6 what the doctrine is. At present, my desire is to show you that there is need for you to examine and judge this doctrine. Further it is plainly intimated that Christ's foot slipped from the heavy burden He had to bear; and remember that it is not the pressure of the sins of others which is meant. Compare Psa. 38:16 and Remarks, p. 17, foot note, second paragraph.

In concluding, I must observe that the respected name of Dr. Hawker is brought forward as a shelter for a doctrine which he would have repudiated with his whole soul. And this too, with the avowal that Dr. H. entirely differed on a most important point, which is, in fact, the very point at issue. I will only advert to the quotations from Dr. H. in p. 67 Observations, "Now Jesus, as the sinner's surety," &c.

"Standing thus, though holy, in our nature, and the representative of all his people, the moment he entered our world, the consequences of the curse attached itself to Him and seized upon Him.

Now the doctrine of these tracts is the very opposite to this, viz., that Christ not as the surety, not as the representative of His people, became obnoxious to the wrath of God, death, and the curse of the broken law, and had to extricate himself from these liabilities before He could stand in the place of their surety, or their representative, a statement, I hesitate not to say, which that man of God would have repudiated as derogatory to the glory of the Person of his Lord, whom He loved and served.

I do therefore ask you, solemnly to weigh this doctrine, what it really is. It is not taught by Christ, or his apostles. The apostles have taught largely on the sufferings of Christ; those in which we can have fellowship with Him, and those which He endured alone on the cross; but they have not, in the remotest way, hinted at any such class of suffering and experiences, as those taught in these tracts. It remains either, that

this doctrine is a new revelation of something which the apostles had not revealed to them, or a heresy privily brought in. And having formed my judgment deliberately and solemnly before God, as to its real character, I desire, by the grace of God, to expose and oppose this doctrine with the most open and determined hostility. And I would rather be excluded from ministering, in all assemblies of Christians, and find opportunities of preaching Christ to individuals, than identify myself with any, where a doctrine so dishonoring to God, so degrading to Christ, so depreciating to the cross, is not disowned. I do not ask you to receive anything, because I say it; but to test everything by the Scripture, and by that "unction which you have from the holy one."

I remain, your affectionate brother and servant in Christ, and for His sake, J. L. HARRIS.

November 6, 1847

POSTSCRIPT This characteristic of heresy, "privily brought in" has been peculiarly marked in the present case. I had no idea of the extent of secret note-circulation, before the Notes on Psa. 6 came into my hands. I have now in my possession, copies of, and extracts from, other notes, which have been circulated as deep truth. I do not say who is responsible for these notes, but some one is. These, while they contain the same doctrine, are, in expression much more fearful -indeed, in some instances, almost blasphemous -in others most absurd. It is indeed sad, to find that a sense of propriety has not hindered this circulation of notes, as it has been so repeatedly reprehended. No one can object to a person taking notes of what they hear; but to propagate doctrine in this covert way, savors of anything, rather than the spirit of Christ.

I ought, perhaps, to have noticed the Scriptures from the New Testament, which are tried to be brought to support this doctrine.

The will of God, therefore, determined the character of these sufferings, (i.e., before His baptism by John) and their amount. "It became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," Heb. 2:10 (Remarks, p. 3).

As this is quoted, it appears to be a general statement, but the important causal conjunction, FOR, is omitted, which connects it with the former verse, and this entirely alters the sense, and shows of what sufferings the apostle is speaking. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man. FOR it became, &c.

"In the first place, consider what is involved in that verse in the Hebrews, in all points tempted like as we are, yet, without sin. How wide the application of the principle of this verse (Remarks, p. 14)." Its blessed wideness is fully granted; but it is not wide enough to embrace a class of temptations, into which we can never come. "I cannot but think that those who object to these things, must find much difficulty in receiving that verse, "He learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Observations, p. 58)."

For one, I do not find any difficulty, save indeed, of estimating the depth of grace which led the blessed Lord to take this place. Let us look at the full quotation, "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered, and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation, unto all them that obey him; called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec." The thought of the Son humbling himself to learn obedience, gives to me a very different thought from that of one by force of his position obeying to extricate himself. In the text, it is connected with resurrection, when He was called of God to His priesthood; in the tracts to His suffering before His baptism by John, and deliverance by that baptism. And if we read that marvelous chapter, Isa. 1. where He who "clothed the heaven with sackcloth," speaks, as having "the ear of the learned," and to "the tongue of the learned," -there is the school of suffering from man, but an appeal to God. This might be pursued farther, but I must close.

[clickbible.org](http://clickbible.org)