

had found him out. He must have brought up his family badly too, like Eli, and this is the natural result. "I told you so." "See how the prohibition against wine is brought in just there." These answers do not always proceed from coarse brutality as one might think: they generally come merely from levity, heartlessness, and self-sufficiency. "My dear brothers," as Cromwell used to say, "I beseech you to consider that it is possible you may be wrong." And consider too, that whether you are wrong or not, such explanations as those are only likely to fill the sufferer with indignation and draw down a rebuke from God on the Zophars, Bildads, and Eliphazs who torment His stricken servants with their shallow conceits.

There is another class of those who, with much better intentions than these, yet are perhaps more irritating. They approach the sufferer with an airy cheerfulness, and with complaisant smiles tell him that it is all for the best. "This is sent for his good" (fancy a man consoled by the thought that, for instance, his sons are struck down for *his* good!), and again "there are millions worse off" than he: this last form of consolation is doubly irritating to a right-minded person, as in the first place it insults the sufferer by assuming that he can be consoled, instead of pained by the fact that other people are suffering more than himself; and, secondly, it takes away that little morsel of consolation that everyone finds in believing his own misfortunes are peculiar. Solomon knew these people and said it was like taking away a garment in winter to sing songs to those who have a heavy heart. We are not told by the All-wise to rejoice with them that weep.

But we are told to act as He did Whose mission it was to comfort those who mourn: "Jesus wept." To "weep with those that weep," and not to pretend to know too much of the mysterious causes of their suffering. It is possible we may be mistaken in our judgments. Why is it that one of the most honored and influential of God's servants at this time on earth, who has for years endured continual extreme bodily suffering and domestic sorrow, is (now while I write) protractedly struggling with pain and death, just at the time when we would think his powerful voice most needed to combat those attacks on the foundations of the faith which he has already withstood? Why should Carey, when translating the Bible into twenty four heathen languages, be obliged to hear the screaming of his mad wife from the adjoining room?

"Teach thy tongue to say, I do not know." From the Jewish Talmud comes that advice, but it is sound and good. Nothing produces so much infidelity as the idea that we have to account for everything, or that there is any human being who can -- in respect of its absolute origin -- account for anything. Goethe's Doctor begins by thinking he knows all things (though, as a few matters have been discovered since his time, be probably would not pass a modern school-board examination). He had thoroughly and painfully studied, he says, Philosophy, Jurisprudence, and Medicine, *und, leider! auch Theologie*, -- "unfortunately" indeed, for when a man

exhausts all that, there is nothing but Demonology left, and it is no wonder he took to it. Yet he could not then tell the cause of the restlessness in his own heart, nor find a means to cure it. How much he must have known, that Doctor then, by his own account of what he had *durchaus studirt!* Yet I think that the man knew more, who discovered the laws of the solar systems and said he was only like a child picking up shells on the shore while the ocean of truth stretched beyond him out to infinity. Did it ever occur to you when such and such an one has been followed by calamities; and men said God was chastening him for his sins, that perhaps the truth was, the devil was punishing him for his righteousness? Such mistakes have been made since Job's time.

How patiently we can bear the trials -- of others. We are optimists then: everything is for the best. But when sorrow knocks at our own door, we are pessimists; then we think Schopenhauer may be right after all, and "think that the bottom is come out of the universe when our own gallipot leaks."

"Teach thy tongue to say, I do not know."

If any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought {1 Cor. 8:2}.

He knows merely the outsides and secondary causes of things: of the primal causes, the inward origin, the "fourth dimension," of even the simplest object we know nothing. If the Learned Critic can explain to me what it is that makes one little brown seed come up with a red flower and another little brown seed come up with a blue flower, I will explain to him every mystery in every part of the universe, from the Bathybius to the Gadarene pigs.

We know some things however, though not yet indeed as we ought: -- that knowledge, though a good thing, puffeth up, and that intellectual pride was the original damnation, and it is the special danger of the present day; that, whilst knowledge puffeth up, charity buildeth up. We know that, if a man love God, the same is known of Him. We know that our blessed Redeemer wept in sympathy with human sorrow, and that in all our afflictions He is afflicted; and we know that there have been some here on earth who in the midst of the most crushing disasters could calmly say,

Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him {Job 13:15}

-- that there is

"A faith which sees the ring of light
Round nature's last eclipse!"

Forbidden Diet. The Swine: The Hare.

It appears somewhat strange that Keshub Chunder Sen's religion of Yoga has not been more successful than at present seems to be the case, for it has in it every element of popularity. The only way of accounting for its failure is in

recognizing the truth of what Talleyrand cynically said to the founder of Theophilanthropy, when the latter was bewailing the poor reception which the public were giving to his invention. It is very hard indeed to make a new religion popular. If one however could perpetually preach it, deny oneself all rest and comfort, be put to death and rise again to establish it; it might eventually succeed; but otherwise 'tis poor work. The fact is that people -- with the exception of a few, like the hare-brained Athenians, always looking for some new thing; and a few professional sceptics (who have generally credulity enough to believe almost anything, have we not lately seen a leading atheistic teacher become a believer in Madame Blavatsky's Theosophic "miracles"?) -- the fact is that the bulk of people are very reluctant to accept a new Faith: otherwise Chunder Sen's Yoga³⁰⁰ would have had a world-wide acceptance, for it fits human nature to perfection. It consists in selecting the fancy bits out of the other religious systems (rejecting the rest), and joining them neatly together, for all the world like a patch-work quilt, though perhaps hardly so useful.

Now these remarks apply to such passages as the eleventh chapter of Leviticus, where certain prohibitions and restraints are announced to the Israelites as to diet and other matters. For we see round us those who take portions of the Jewish religion, who put themselves nominally under the Jewish law, keep the Jewish feasts, and ceremonials, and appropriate the Jewish promises: but do we ever see a single person abstaining from the meats forbidden to the Jews, or submitting to those restraints which are inconvenient?

For instance we ask, "Why do you follow the lines of worship ordained for the Jews, and appropriate the Jewish feasts, ceremonies, and promises?"

"Because it is thus commanded in the Scriptures."

"Commanded to the Jews, yes. They are also commanded to offer animals in sacrifice, not to eat pork, nor to light fires on the Sabbath. Do you also obey these commands?"

"No, all that is different."

"Ah, that is different. You think then that you are at liberty to take what you like and leave what you don't like. So did Chunder Sen. Yoga? I am afraid that will not, do."

These directions respecting food were given to the Jews, firstly, in order to make a distinction between them and all other peoples, for at that period God had an object in secluding His own people that they might have a fair trial by being kept from mingling with other nations and their contaminations. Now, however, the people of God are sent out amongst the peoples of the world to disseminate their principles and are to be distinguished not by outward actions

or garb, but by what is inward and spiritual. Therefore what was physical with the Jews becomes typical to the Christians.

Now there is perhaps nothing that has so much effect for good or bad on human beings as what they consume for the nourishment of the body, and appropriate for the nourishment of the soul. A foul-eating people will be in most ways physically foul, and a foul-thinking man will be in most ways spiritually unclean. Consequently all that the Jews took into the body by eating, must be cleanly, and all that the Christian takes into the soul should be pure. Some think it strange that the Hebrews' God should concern Himself about the details of their diet. It would be still stranger if He did not; if He allowed those whom He called His peculiar people to eat such loathsome food as was then common, or even such as so civilized a people as the Chinese now esteem delicacies, rats, birds' nests, dogs, and lizards; whilst others eat infinitely worse.

Appetite is a matter primarily of inherent tendency and though, to be sure, it may be trained by custom and restrained by such directions as these before us, yet the great principle that develops itself in the passage before us is this, -- the difference in the natures of beings: where there is any being with an unclean nature, it for ever remains so unless it have a new nature. In the Hindoo fable the dove flies down to the marsh and seeks to enchant the crane, which is eating snails, by recounting the beauties of paradise. At length the crane draws its beak out of the mud and enquires whether there are any snails there. The dove is afraid there are not. At least has never noticed them. Whereat the crane buries again its beak in the mud with an air that implies that the conversation is irrelevant and intrusive. Heaven itself were hell to the crane without snails.

As to Israel, almost the whole natural realm -- the earth, the air, the sea -- was at their disposal for food, but there were certain restrictions. The forbidden things were in general things unwholesome or unsafe for that climate: that is natural and very obvious. But all these things were given to them for ensamples and are typical in many ways. For instance, taking them as types of natures or characters, to be clean an animal required the foot divided -- that is, the principle of separation in the "walk" or general conduct, for there is evil in the earth, the foot must not sink into it. But this feature by itself a swine may have, and this principle without the chewing of the cud only produces the ascetic or pharisee -- a hard, rigid, uncomfortable, God-forsaken, religiousness, whose highest reach of piety consists in,

God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men
{Luke 18:11}.

On the other hand, the camel or hare, which chews the cud but does not divide the hoof, is equally to be rejected, though perhaps it is not entirely so objectionable. This indicates a nature that eats spiritual food -- that which is unseen is spiritual -- and food that has been dead but is now alive again in resurrection (i.e., grass or grain, whereas the carnivora

300. This is something of the principle of Lewis Carroll's "Caucus Race." The competitors started when they pleased, ran as far as they liked, left off when they felt disposed, and all took prizes.

only feed on what is dead), but at the same time a nature which has no principle of stability and separation in its walk.

Such natures as these can charm with their apprehension of the highest spiritual themes while their lives are low and unworthy. Balaam was such an one. How lofty the flight of his spiritual emotions; how base his cunning and avaricious life. The pathos of Lawrence Sterne over the caged bird and the dead donkey has drawn tears from thousands who perhaps would have been touched only with contempt did they know of the cruelty with which the writer neglected his own wife and home; yet his sermon on conscience is one of the finest things I ever read. In Bunyan, Christian and Faithful are met by "a tall man more comely at a distance than at hand." This man is extremely fluent on spiritual matters and quite charms Faithful with his fine discourse. Christian however is not so much enamored. He says that the man's name is Talkative, and that "notwithstanding his fine tongue he is but a sorry fellow." Faithful replies, "Well, he seems to be a very pretty man"; whereon Christian says, "That is to them that have not a thorough acquaintance with him, for he is best abroad; near home he is ugly enough . . . all he hath lieth in his tongue." Faithful then says this reminds him of Lev. 11 and Deut. 14. "The hare cheweth the cud, but yet is unclean, because he parteth not the hoof." And this truly resembleth Talkative: he cheweth the cud, he seeketh knowledge; he cheweth upon the word, but he divideth not the hoof. He parteth not with the way of sinners." "You have spoken," says Christian, "for aught I know, the true gospel sense of those texts."

And for aught I know, too.

Israel's Diet: continued.

In regard to the quadrupeds selected and rejected then we can see a fair evidence of a spiritual application, but that may not be quite so obvious in regard to the fish and birds.

A fish to be accepted must have both scales and fins. The scales were considered by Agassiz to be of sufficient importance to form a basis on which to distinguish the different species, and this basis has been generally accepted. They form a bright, strong, flexible, defensive armor, and may remind one of Eph. 6:11. With this armor the fish are more hardy, and less liable to be injured and influenced by passing external impressions. The fins are serviceable for balancing, guiding and staying. (Of course all fish swim through the water by means of the tail, therefore fins can -- in a way -- be done without, as far as mere progress goes.) In addition to this the fins are rudiments of higher powers. We see this in the development of their pectoral fins into a kind of limb in the climbing perch, and into a kind of *wing* in the flying gurnard and *Exo Volitans*. Fins consequently suggest a nature which has poise and self-control, and has also in itself the impulses and rudiments of faculties which belong to a higher existence, a life in a celestial sphere. We need not believe in the evolutionary dogma, that one animal changes

into another just because it has rudiments of faculties which that other possesses, any more than that a kettle will ultimately become a teapot because it has a spout: still there is a relationship between the wing and the fin which is traced back even to the saurians of the paleozoic times, and there is an embryo wing implanted even in the most unlikely places, as in caterpillars. The human caterpillar, feeling his proneness, sighs, "O that I had wings like a dove!" Some day perhaps, when he has passed through the chrysalis stage, they will come.

The birds of prey are excluded --

. . . the vulture and the kite after his kind, every raven
after his kind {Lev. 11:13-15}.

These feed not only on death like the carnivora, but on corruption. This is the nature that finds delight in the contemplation and appropriation of what is not only dead but foul and putrid. But is there any such nature? Unfortunately we know too well that there is, and when we stand outside the cage of a bird like the African "Sociable Vulture," and see it plunge its reeking beak in some loathsome carrion, we are apt to wonder what enjoyment it finds in *that*. But this is typical. There are European Sociable Vultures as well who feed on garbage, it may be.

All of this description are unclean, whether they are characterized by power and dignity like the eagle, cruelty like the hawk, impudence like the cuckoo, or the ponderous and shallow gravity, the stupid wisdom, of the owl. "I don't believe," said Fox, "any living man is half so wise as Lord T--- looks." Amongst them all there is none so impressive looking as the owl -- to those that do not know that his omniscience is only parochial; that his attitude of grave impartial rebuke is only the fear to commit himself; that his preference for the twilight is not because he loves meditation (for he is only dozing when he looks so thoughtful), nor because of his exceptional devoutness, but simply because he is always confused by the daylight. His demeanor of calm disparagement does not mean a bit that he is superior in sanctity to everyone else: it only means that he thinks himself so. It is the general censoriousness which characterizes this predaceous nature. We can forgive him much on account of his purblindness, but surely it is going too far when, like the *mantis religiosa*, he spells "pray" with an "e," instead of with an "a."

A habit of inherent fault-finding is one of the most commonly known features of this nature and one of the most rapidly developed. But it finds faults not so much from a desire to correct them as that, from a natural aptitude, it looks for them in every direction (except inwardly). It loves to pick up morsels of evil from all sides, and whilst shaking its head over them and appearing to condemn them, quietly puts them in the mouth, masticates and ruminates them. Finally, whatsoever things are untrue, whatsoever things are dishonest . . . unjust . . . impure . . . unlovely and of bad report; if there be any vice; if there be any blame, the carrion-feeding

nature thinks on these things. The elements of all these evil tendencies are of course in each of us. But if we have also been granted *new natures*, we have the power to

reckon dead {Rom. 6:11}

and

make no provision for the flesh {Rom. 13:14}.

Was not old Ulysses right (to speak as a man) when he smote down the scurrilous Thersites with rough blows, and Achilles when he slew him?

But oh, for the wings of the dove

covered with silver and her feathers with yellow gold!

Though we

have lien among the pots {Psa. 68:13}

yet may we be so. "Not as a raven but a dove The Holy Ghost came from above," -- that wisdom which is from above, first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. It is simple concerning evil, wise concerning that which is good. Far from the carrion-feeding natures, it rejoices not in iniquity, but in the truth, imputes no evil but hopes all things and believes all things. Nay, even when the evil is unquestionably there, it is slow to see it, as to which we read even of the Most Blessed, that if He should mark iniquities who shall stand; that He had not seen iniquity in Jacob nor perverseness in Israel . . . (though there was little else there). The Lord, I think, would be well pleased to see more of the same nature in us all; that we might have dove's eyes and not vulture's. Thus the Bridegroom says,

Behold thou art fair, my love; behold thou art fair; thou hast doves' eyes within thy locks {S of S 4:1}!

In general too, all creeping things -- all crawling, prone, and groveling natures -- are rejected. But if they

had legs above their feet to leap withal upon the earth (Lev. 11:21)

like the locusts, they were accepted. For these had an inherent power that could overleap those earthly obstacles that the absolutely prone nature is stopped by. "If you cannot plough through the log," Abraham Lincoln used to say, "plough round it. It is better still when there is that inward faculty, which he himself possessed so largely, that enables us to rise over it.

Lepers And Leprosy.

Pursuing the subject of the *natures* of creatures in Lev. 11, we have man brought before us in the succeeding chapters. In the twelfth we find him, to be of such a nature -- shapen in iniquity . . . conceived in sin³⁰¹ -- as to require that there should be a sin offering even in connection with his birth,

before he had committed any action good or bad, and then under the figure of the leper we have a truly frightful picture of that which a sinful man may become.

This horrible and melancholy disease is not, I think, so much a type of sin in general -- other diseases typify that -- but of some of the worst forms of sin, especially in respect of its loathsomeness and corruption, its contagion and its impossibility of cure, save by the direct power of God.

That the type is of this character, and not, as has been so frequently supposed, a type of sin in general, is shown by the fact that the leper is invariably shut out from the camp.³⁰² Now

the thought of foolishness is sin {Prov. 24:9};

but it would be very wrong to suppose that one should be shut out of the assembly for that or any such offences as those for which milder forms of discipline are prescribed. On the other hand the apostle refers to various kinds of sin³⁰³ with which if professing Christians were corrupted, they were not to be kept company with, not so much as to be eaten with. Thus Peter, guilty of an error of judgment and a lapse of moral cowardice that even such a wise and brave man at times falls into, commits a most sectarian offence in refusing to associate with certain Gentiles. He is rebuked, but it would have been outrageous to expel him from the assembly for that. Whereas the incestuous man in the church at Corinth they were peremptorily commanded to put away from amongst them; and the same extreme treatment was necessary in cases where the corruption was of a spiritual rather than a moral character, as with the blasphemers Hymenæus and Alexander; or where it was of a doctrinal character, as for instance in the case of the Nicolaitanes,³⁰⁴ Spiritualism, Blavatskyism, &c.

This action has to be taken, not from harshness and severity, but because of the corrupt and deadly nature of the contagion. There is place enough indeed for compassion and sorrow. The subjects of such disease -- whether spiritual or physical -- are of all the afflicted race of mankind the most to be pitied. There is no condition more terrible except one; and that is the condition of those who could shut a leper out of the camp, or a sinner out of the church without sorrow and reluctance. Angels must look on such beings as these with indignation, and devils with complacency.

But is the thing itself so very bad? for so many are constantly saying that the disease is not infectious or contagious at all. At St. Kitts they thought so till lately when they find the number of lepers nearly doubled in the last few years through their being allowed to pass to and fro amongst the people. So now there is "great alarm" and will probably

302. [So in the assembly the sinner as such has no place any more than the leper in the camp. "If any man sin" is quite distinct, and in no way sets aside the usual application of the type. E.D.B.T.]

303. In: 1 Cor. 5:11 and elsewhere.

304. 1 Tim. 1:20, Rev. 2:15.

301. Psa. 51:5.

be a reaction toward stringency like the reactions in former centuries, when there were laws such as those in Scotland, where one who escaped from a leper asylum was hanged or buried alive. M. Pasteur lately said that the Swedish Dr. Hankel had found the microbe; but two years ago at a meeting of the Epidemiological Society, high medical authorities, speaking in vigorous terms of warning as to the increase of the disease in India and England, brought in two London lepers and showed the leper germ in their saliva by a microscope. Dr. Thompson, who had had charge of a leper hospital, said his experience satisfied him that the disease was contagious. Other authorities testified to the same effect. Père Damien, it is said, received the disease through flies settling on a part of his head where the flesh was abraded. In Robben Island they distinctly traced the contagion in the cases of two boys lately. That is a terrible place, Robben Island. Conceive an abode of maniacs, convicts -- half of whom are murderers -- and lepers. "We passed through one ward, and then another and another," says a visitor. "Here one could see a poor fellow sitting huddled up on his bed, ceaselessly rocking himself to and fro to ease the pain. . . . A truly awful sight was a poor man with both eyes gone . . . In a corner, working quietly was a leper tailor. . . ."

In dealing with the matter, the first thing necessary is to prevent contagion and therefore anything resembling the disease was regarded with suspicion and the patient for a time secluded. While things are even doubtful, it is so desirable to be on the right side that a state of quarantine is requisite. Precise and elaborate tests were given by which to distinguish the disease from ailments which resembled it in appearance. These are detailed, but the importance of the enquiry hinders them from being trivial. A mother sometimes looking at her sick child, will feel her heart beat with a suffocating anxiety as she watches the doctor examining the little pimples upon it. If they are rose-colored, it is only chicken-pox; if they are red colored it is the small-pox. The mark of leprosy is at first the

white bright {Lev. 13:24, 38}

spot. It doesn't look at all so bad in beginning. The Roman poet had a good deal of reason for saying that, if Sin were only to be seen in her natural deformity, instead of being disguised with all false attractions, men would hate her instead of loving her (though I think this is chiefly true *at first*; after awhile all her foulness does not repel). Leprosy does not look at all bad -- at first.

There must be the utmost deliberation and care in judging. It is either malice or wicked thoughtlessness to attach so horrible a stigma, whether in a physical or spiritual sense, without entire certainty. When the professing church shut out Arius (notwithstanding his eloquence and accredited piety), I believe it was entirely right. When it shut out men like Luther and Wesley, it discredited itself and not them. The same is true as to private judgments. The main test of leprosy was that, whereas the other ailments tended to become better and

more restricted as they were watched and cared for, leprosy always tended to become worse and *to spread*. Everyone who has noticed the course of leprous and zymotic morals or doctrines will recognize the accuracy and importance of the similitude.

Bacon says it is of the *philosophia prima* that, whereas in medicine when a disease is at its height, it is less likely to be communicated than when it is in progress, so also in morals, when a man's life is quite abandoned in wickedness, his example is much less likely to be pernicious than the example of one in whom vice has not yet extinguished all the good qualities. Macaulay, while objecting to this being regarded as a first principle, says that it is a "very happy similitude." Undoubtedly the principle illustrates the striking verses in Lev. 13 where it was commanded that when

the leprosy cover all the skin of him that hath the plague
from his head even to his foot, . . . the priest shall . . .
pronounce him clean {Lev. 13:12, 13}.

It was on the distortion of a principle like this that the Spartans used to thoroughly intoxicate their slaves in order that their children, seeing them in their debasement might be shocked and repelled. Had they however only partially intoxicated them, their children might have been only amused and attracted.

Provision For The Leper.

It seems pitiless to put the leper out from the camp, but in reality it is in pity that it is done, pity to others. Moreover there are some evidences that God has a special consideration for the dreadfully unfortunate creatures thus expelled from the company of their fellows, and that -- on some occasions at least -- He reveals Himself in an especial nearness to the Banished, as in the case of that ecstatic vision to the exiles of Judah in the forty-fifth Psalm. And here is matter for thought: "Where God can go, I may go," say some: but no; not always. To go there may mean defilement to the disciple, but He can no more be defiled by any contamination than the sunbeams which fall on the pestilent swamp. The Lord who touched the lepers without contracting defilement goes where and does what He pleases: we should go where and do what we are told.

But we have not learnt the first rudiments of Christianity if our sympathies do not go out after the outcast and afflicted, to pray and desire that their way may be through darkness to light, through sorrow to joy, through misery to God. How must the celestial light of the gospel seem to shine with unutterable brightness in a place like the Leper Settlements in Molokai or Robben Island, like a constellation in the blackness of a midnight sky. These poor wretches who have no hope on earth have appeared to be especially ready to welcome the proffer of hope for a future life, and divine sympathy. The four lepers shut out of Samaria reached the spoil first after all, and became privileged ambassadors: the

ten lepers of Samaria lifted up their blighted eyes and saw One approaching them whom the princes of the earth shall seek in vain. There may be more compensations than we know of in some of these afflicted lives, especially if we join on time to eternity, for the one is not complete without the other.

Here is a chord sounded in the bass, -- discordant, jarring, wailing, repelling. . . . Wait, till we sound this treble chord *with it* . . . Ah, that is different; now it is a complete concord; the higher clef is joined on to the lower, interblends with it, explains and harmonizes it. The celestial answers to the terrestrial and resolves its wailing discords. It may be that the higher chord is a long and weary time withheld . . . and meanwhile the jarring and wailing goes on, "No one so utterly desolate, But some heart, though unknown, Responds unto his own; --

"Responds -- as though with unseen wings
An angel touched its quivering strings;
And whispers in its song,
'Where hast thou stayed so long?'"

When shall we cease to reason within ourselves as though time were all and death ended all. It transfigures everything to lengthen our view and widen our horizon, to see that eternity is joined on to time, that our journey does not cease at the cold disconsolate wharf, but stretches out beyond over the illimitable and infinite sea. In the poem beginning "La tombe dit à la rose," the grave enquires of the flower what becomes of all the "tears" that fall upon her bosom in the dawn, and the rose replies that she transforms them into a perfume "d'ambre et de miel." She demands then what the grave does with all those who fall into its ruthless maw, and the grave says he transfigures them into celestial spirits. Death does not end all. It is merely the line which comes between the bass and treble clefs.

Is there not a special design and appeal of the heavenly invitation to those who have a miserable destiny in this world?

The poor have the gospel preached to them {Matt. 11:5}.

Christ is specially at home in the Lazarettos. He can contract no contamination and His sympathizing words give present consolation and future hope. *Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.* I think of the times when the Black Death, the Plague, and Cholera stalked, grim and ghastly, through the habitations of men, and of the red cross painted on the plague-stricken houses, with the words "Lord have mercy upon us" underneath; and think how strange it is that this Roman gibbet, once the infamous symbol of a penal death, should be now a universal symbol of sympathy and mercy. What misery has it covered through the long dark ages! What consolation it has yielded! I cannot easily forget what a negress once told me of the Christian leper assemblies in the West India Isles; what solace it is to them in all their misery to have a hope and portion in Christ; how they fulfil His dying request to eat bread and drink wine together in

remembrance of Him; how the bread had to be broken and placed on the wrists of some, because their hands were -- gone! . . .

Resuming consideration of the matter typically, we find that God has made especial and elaborate arrangements to meet the desperate need of persons in this terrible condition. There were four things required, namely Healing, Pardon, Cleansing, and Consecration. As to the first, men have tried many things but there seems no authentic case of real leprosy cured by human means on record. Dr. Koch's injections are the latest means used in Robben's Island, but without the slightest success. We think we know everything now that they tell us that the white blood-corpuscles or phagocytes eat up the disease germs. We have only to increase the number of phagocytes and disease is killed; yet somehow men still suffer and die. Nor would we in any way undervalue the skill and service of those who have advanced the medical science in the van of all the others; but simply say that leprosy, or sins of leprous types, God alone has been able to cure, and -- so far as we at present know -- God alone by direct power ever will be able to cure.

But there was much more besides curing.

This shall be the law of the leper in the day of His cleansing. He shall be brought unto the priest, and *the priest shall go forth out of the camp.* . . .

It is not a thing that is to take place in heaven by-and-by, but now and here (as to the antitype).

And behold if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper . . . {Lev. 14:2, 3}.

Then succeeds a long and elaborate, though happily familiar and well-understood, series of types; concerning which it is perhaps simplest to say that when our blessed Savior stretched out His hand and touched the leper with the words

I will, be thou clean {Matt. 8:3, Mark 1:41, Luke 5:13},

He fulfilled them all and supplanted them all.

The Leper (continued.)

In accordance with the principles already referred to, there was a special provision made for the leper, even in respect of his cleansing and consecration. Besides the usual sin, trespass, and burnt offerings required by others, there was the impressive and expressive ceremony of the Two Birds. By the command of the priest these birds were taken, and one of them

killed in an earthen vessel over running water {Lev. 14:5}.

That is of course the death of Christ

come in the flesh {1 John 4:2, 3},

-- the earthen vessel, -- and in inseparable connection with the living "water of the word." Birds pertain to the ethereal sphere; that is to say, the highest conception of His being and personality is required in such a case as that before us. Of

course it is always the same Christ in absolute perfection that is our atonement in fact, but the different values of the figures used indicate the different degrees of estimation in which His work is held by persons of different capacities. The poor man, that is, the man with a poor capacity and apprehension, brought a handful of meal: that was *his* apprehension of Christ -- very meager, the rich man brings a bullock; that is his apprehension of Christ, a far higher degree of estimation. A great difference in apprehension but no difference whatever in application, for in each case the infinite merits of the infinite Savior apply. This difference of capacity to apprehend is often caused by the sense of the evil of sin being weaker in one than in another. The poor woman in Luke loved much, for she felt that she had been forgiven much;

but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little
{Luke 7:47}.

In the leper's case it is not so much amplitude of apprehension as altitude of apprehension that is contemplated. It is the soul from out of its dungeon in the deepest abyss of human woe looking up and apprehending the advent of the heavenly Christ in His most celestial aspect, imprisoned and dying in the "earthen vessel," -- albeit over running water, -- and the cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop -- that is to say, all that pertains to the glory,³⁰⁵ majesty, and ambition -- and even the humility -- of the world, dipped in the blood, buried in the grave of Christ.

Happily that is not all, or it were but a dead hope. The priest takes in his hand, with the cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop, the second bird, the living bird; and plunging them all under the blood of the dead victim, he sprinkles the leper seven times therefrom -- thus identifying him in the most solemn and awful way with the whole of these transactions. He then lets the living bird loose in the open field, and the leper is pronounced clean. The meaning of all this is very obvious. It is the death and resurrection of Christ. In the slain bird He is delivered for our offences; in the freed bird He is raised again for our justification. It is liberty out of condemnation. The idea of setting birds free in order to express deliverance from captivity, -- as, for instance, the lazzaroni of Naples did in honour of Nelson after the battle of the Nile, by which conflict they considered their liberties secured, -- is a very old and well-known one. In this case, the bird being dipped in the blood of the slain one is identified with it. It is in a sense the same bird. It is the same Savior risen again from the dead, and the fact is full of infinite meaning. Yet unfortunately how few give it consideration. How few consider what is implied by the resurrection of Christ,

for if Christ be not raised . . . ye are yet in your sins
{1 Cor. 15:17};

there *is no justification*, nor is there assurance that the

sacrifice is sufficient and acceptable, nor that there will ever be any resurrection at all.

Yet how many Christians there are who see only the slain bird, who stop at the cross and do not go forward to the opened sepulchre; and in consequence of this do not see how great and thorough their deliverance has been. That is why at the beginning the apostles used to preach

Jesus and the resurrection {Acts 17:18}.

The details are then given of the cleansed leper's consecration. He is the only one except the priest concerning whom such particulars are given. He is submitted to the action of water (the word), of blood (the Atonement) and of oil (the Holy Ghost). The water goes all over him. The blood is put on the tip of his right ear, the right thumb, and great toe, and then the oil on the same places, signifying that all that pertains to his *actions*, "*walk*," and *receptivity* should be in accordance with the solemn ordeal through which he has passed -- should be such as is not unbecoming to one who has been cleansed by the blood of Christ and sealed with the Holy Spirit. *Noblesse oblige*. For the future his position demands of him a certain course of action, attitude, and thought. *No blood is put upon the head itself, but the remainder of the oil is poured thereon*.

The head of every man is Christ {1 Cor. 11:3},

and when Christ personally is typified, He is anointed without blood, for He was personally sinless and needed no expiation. Thus when the High Priest is separately consecrated,³⁰⁶ he is bathed and then directly the oil is put upon him in the same way as, when our Lord was baptized in the Jordan, He was

anointed by the Holy Ghost {see Acts 10:38}

by the immediate descent, in the form of a dove, of the divine Spirit. Had it been anyone else, atonement (either typically or otherwise) would have been required before the anointing could take place.

Thus is the leper raised from the very lowest depths of human misery to the highest altitudes of divine felicity, the variety and extremity of his need only serving to disclose -- in a way that nothing else could -- the exhaustless affluence of the unsearchable riches of Christ.

The Two Goats.

One of the incidental proofs of the inspiration of the Scriptures is the way in which the precepts and commands are intermingled with the principles and historical circumstances whence they originally sprang. In that way not only is avoided the monotony, which is the bane of classified theology, but the ethical lessons are conveyed gradually and are impressed mnemonically by the context; whilst the precept throws light on the principle and the principle on the precept, the book

305. Psa. 92:12, 2 Sam. 1:24, 1 Kings 4:33, &c.

306. Lev. 8:6-12.

interpreting and illustrating itself; as Giuliani used to say that Dante was his own interpreter, "Dante spiegato con Dante." If the Bible had been constructed by professional theologians, it would have had a methodical arrangement like their own writings, no doubt, -- doctrines here, history there, precepts somewhere else -- all neat, symmetrical, and useful as a kitchen garden. Whereas it has been arranged more in the way in which God makes a continent, with a gigantic appearance of disorder which becomes more and more orderly and magnificent as we view it from higher and more comprehensive standpoints. Moreover, it is more difficult to avoid meeting the precepts when they are everywhere interspersed with the text.

After dealing in Leviticus with the subject of the leper, where human *nature* is shown in its most repulsive forms, we find some chapters of precepts which show by implication what horrible things it is capable of doing, and these are immediately connected with the atonement in the important and well known sixteenth chapter. They were very real sinners, these Israelites, these men for whom the atonement was provided. But, thank God, the atonement provided is very real too. And that is the difference between a divine gospel and a human religion. The human inventions are so grotesquely inadequate, inconsistent, and inconsequent, that they are seldom or never meant to be taken seriously. The reply of the ancient oracle (which fairly represents popular religion in all ages) is that men "To the pure precincts of Apollo's portal" must "come pure in heart, and touch the lustral wave." There is no hope for the real sinner, but for the fictitious "pure in heart" it says, "One drop sufficeth for the sinless mortal; All else e'en ocean's billows cannot lave!" Now if a man be pure, he does not require cleansing at all; whereas those who really require and desire cleansing are informed that there is no power that can accomplish it. Men do not practice such preposterous foolishness in any other matters; no one ever saw a doctor professing that one drop of his medicine was sufficient for those who were perfectly well, and that not all the medicine he possessed could save any sick person.

They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick {Matt. 9:12}.

The fountain which God opens is

a fountain . . . for sin and for uncleanness {Zech. 13:1}.

Thus as these chapters which recount such a fearful catalogue of sins are connected with the Great Day of Atonement, so does the sense of sin at all times -- in some form and degree -- lead to the apprehension of the atoning work of Christ. And it is the weakening of this sense of sin that in recent times has been undermining the doctrine of atonement and other foundational doctrines of Christianity. A recent writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* says, "With us the notion of sin has long, been abolished. Adultery is the contravention of a certain article of the Code -- the violation of a contract signed in the presence of such and such lawyers." Though I refuse to

believe that such words are true of the bulk of the French people, yet unquestionably they are true of a very large number in that and all other nations professedly religious.

There are a great many who fancy they can see quite well; but when their eyes are tested, it is found that they are very defective: that they are myopic or, it may be, suffer from "Daltonism" -- they are incapable of distinguishing certain colors, most frequently red. These people are astounded when told of the defect and find that others can see what they cannot. There is often the same kind of defect in the spiritual sight, and frequently those who assume to guide are unwittingly stone blind to the most important things which exist, and exist terribly, without their knowledge. These blind guides are more dangerous than the engine drivers who cannot distinguish the red lights on the railway that we hear of sometimes, for those lead only our bodies to destruction. One of the most fatal infatuations is for me to suppose that a danger does not exist because I do not see it, as one of the most stupid is to think that a phenomenon cannot exist because I do not understand it.

But the "advanced" theologians will find it more difficult to remove the atonement from the hearts of the people than probably they think. They have not yet quite succeeded in removing it even from the creeds. Heidelberg and Brooklyn must have been somewhat surprised lately when at the burial of that strong man of God who repudiated their "modern criticism," the multitude burst with a great emotion into singing, "*Dear dying Lamb, Thy precious blood Shall never lose its power!*"

The great Day of Atonement was ushered in with the most solemn, awful, and imposing ordinances. When modern criticism says that atonement by blood is shocking and terrible, it says what is true. It is meant to be shocking and terrible, for sin is shocking and terrible. The especial feature is the taking of the Two Goats, which give the two great aspects of the death of Christ. The first goat is the LORD'S lot: it is slain in order that His justice maybe vindicated in respect of the presence of sin in the world, (apart altogether from the question of the forgiveness of *sins*). On the head of the second goat all the sins of His people are charged and it is sent into the wilderness bearing their offenses for ever away from them to a land not inhabited -- where there is no one to know them or charge them upon us. The first aspect -- where God has the first and highest claim on the atonement -- is perhaps little considered by us. In this sense Christ tasted

death for every man {Heb. 2:9}.

The blood was sprinkled once on the mercy seat, for one testimony is sufficient towards God, but it is sprinkled seven times before the throne out towards men, for the testimony must be repeated over and over again to man in order to be effectual. Goats are taken, because whilst they are really clean, yet they are put in the place of being unclean and